



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2022 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

**Decision by Sarah Housden BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 15<sup>th</sup> August 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/21/3285815**

**Ranmore Court, Hogden Lane, Ranmore Common RH5 6SY**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs J Tarbuck against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
  - The application Ref MO/2021/1159/PLAH, dated 14 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2021.
  - The development proposed is erection of a side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a side extension at Ranmore Court, Hogden Lane, Ranmore Common RH5 6SY in accordance with the application, Ref MO/2021/1159/PLAH, dated 14 June 2021, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: RH2020 - 01, RH2020 - 06, RH2020 - 02 Rev A, RH2020 - 04 Rev A, RH2020 - 03 Rev A, RH2020 - 05 Rev A, RH2020 -07 Rev A and RH2020 - 08 Rev A.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Preliminary Matters

3. During the planning application process, the appellant offered to remove a barn structure on the appeal property (Barn E on the application drawing no RH-11-Barn E and RH2020-06) in order to reduce the amount of built floorspace on the appeal site and to help facilitate the proposed development. However, the removal of the barn does not form part of the description of the proposed development and it is not clear from the evidence what mechanism would be used to secure its removal. My assessment of the appeal proposal has therefore been made on the basis that Barn E would remain on the site.

## Main Issues

4. The main issues in the appeal are:

- Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework); and
- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the surrounding area and the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

## Reasons for the Recommendation

*Whether it would be inappropriate development*

5. The appeal property is a large, detached two storey dwelling located on a generous plot. The current dwelling and courtyard complex of buildings were granted planning approval in 2010. The current dwelling is a replacement of the former dwelling on the appeal site.
6. Paragraph 149 of the Framework states that new buildings are inappropriate in the Green Belt unless they fall within the given list of exceptions. One exception is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. This is defined in the Framework as a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally. Whilst the Framework does not expressly deal with replacement buildings, it can be taken that the “original building” would be the replacement building or in this case, the replacement dwelling.
7. In refusing permission, the Council refers to Policy RUD7 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (Adopted 12<sup>th</sup> October 2000) (the ‘Local Plan’). The policy text is generally consistent with the Framework, including criterion 1 which states that proposals for the extension of dwellings will only be permitted where they would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. Notwithstanding that, the supporting text to Policy RUD7 of the Local Plan advises that the extension of rebuilt dwellings will be assessed in relation to the size of the dwelling as it existed at the end of 1968. However, the Council’s officer report bases its assessment of whether the extension would be a disproportionate addition in relation the size of the dwelling as it exists and that approach is consistent with the Framework.
8. The Council has identified that the proposed extension would have a floorspace of 122 sqm which would equate to a 16% increase in the floor area of the existing dwelling. The appellant accepts these figures and I have therefore no reason to conclude otherwise.
9. Whilst this calculation cannot be solely relied upon to assess whether the proposed extension would be disproportionate, it does provide an indication of the scale of the proposed development in relation to the existing dwelling. The amount of additional floorspace would be relatively modest and would be subordinate to the scale of the dwelling. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposed extension would extend beyond the existing side elevation of the dwelling, the planning drawings demonstrate that it would not add excessive bulk or massing to the dwelling. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, I do

not consider that the proposed extension would represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.

10. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would not comprise inappropriate development within the Green Belt as defined by the Framework and Policy RUD7 of the Local Plan. On that basis, there is no further need for me to consider the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt nor whether there are special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

#### *Character and Appearance*

11. It has been established above that the proposal would not be disproportionate to the appeal property. The scale of the proposed extension would not substantially alter the massing when viewed from the front elevation and would be partially screened by the existing gym. The increase in size will be more apparent when viewing the rear and south side elevations, but not unduly so, being subordinate in size to the property and its plot.
12. Whilst I acknowledge that the flat roof of the proposed extension would differ from the pitched roof design used in other elements of the building, it means that the height of the proposed extension would not exceed the height of any part of the existing dwelling. The presence of the balcony that spans the rear of the dwelling at first floor, would also help to tie in the flat roof form of the proposed extension with the existing dwelling. In addition, the design detailing including the windows in the proposed extension have been designed to match the existing house and the use of materials to match the existing dwelling, which can be secured by imposition of a condition, will also help ensure the proposal is in keeping.
13. The appeal site is within the Surrey Hills AONB. The appeal property is well concealed from public vantage points and neighbouring properties by trees and hedges and the alterations are considered to be proportionate and in keeping with the host dwelling. On this basis, I find the effect of the proposals on the AONB would be neutral.
14. I therefore find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property, the surrounding area or the AONB. On this basis the proposal would accord with Policy CS13 of the Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted October 2009) which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure development respects and enhances landscape character and protects the AONB. The proposal would also accord with Policies P1, P2 and P3 of the Surrey Hills Management Plan (2020-2025) which seek, amongst other things, to protect and respect the landscape and beauty of the AONB, ensure that development is not incongruous and is of a high quality design, respecting its landscape setting. The provisions of the Framework to conserve and enhance the AONB would also be met.

#### **Conditions**

15. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing dwelling to protect the character and appearance of the appeal property and the AONB.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

*Elizabeth Davies*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

*Sarah Housden*

INSPECTOR