



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2023

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/22/3303569

Cranbourne, Elstead Road, Shackleford, Surrey GU8 6AY

- 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 K Gillham c/o Mitchell Evans LLP against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/P/00617, dated 4 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear extension, single story side extension and enlarged entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension, single story side extension and enlarged entrance porch and patio extension at Cranbourne, Elstead Road, Shackleford, Surrey GU8 6AY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/P/00617, dated 4 April 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 010A and 012A.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall use materials in the construction of the external surfaces that match those used in the host dwelling.

Procedural Matters

2. It is noted that the description of development on the appeal form, and decision notice includes a patio extension. For completeness I have included it within the decision above.

Main Issues

3. The appellant has stated the proposed patio extension would fall within permitted development. Notwithstanding this, no objections have been raised in relation to the proposed patio extension, and the Council have not referred to this element within its reasons for refusal. I am therefore satisfied this part of the proposal is not contentious.
4. The main issues are, therefore whether the proposed single storey rear extension, side extension linking the main dwelling to the outbuilding, and porch to the main entrance of the dwelling (the proposed extensions) would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development

plan policies; the effect it has upon the openness of the Green Belt; and if the development is inappropriate whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstance necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

5. The appeal site contains a detached two-storey dwelling with first floor balcony to the rear and a large, detached outbuilding to one side. The site is a substantial plot which is enclosed to the rear by solid fencing. The frontage of the site is more open facing a small paddock and several large, detached dwellings. This group of dwellings is surrounded by a mix of woodland and fields and located within the Green Belt between the A3 and the village of Shackleford.
6. Paragraph 149 of the Framework states that the construction of a new building is inappropriate in the Green Belt but sets out 7 exceptions to this. On review of the evidence before me I am satisfied that the proposed extensions should be considered under paragraph 149 c). This allows for the extension or alterations of a building provided that does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size the original building.
7. Policy P2 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LP) refers directly to the tests in the Framework. However, it also amplifies some of the definitions when considering those tests. The Framework defines the original building as either a building as it existed on 1 July 1948, or if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was originally built. LP Policy P2, varies from the latter part of the definition by stating that if no building existed on 1 July 1948, then the original building is the first building built after that date.
8. The host dwelling was ultimately approved in 2015 and formed part of a scheme which included 3 replacement dwellings. From the information before me all 3 replacement dwellings appear to have been located differently to the original 3 dwellings and previously existing outbuildings, and it is not evident which dwelling replaced which. I note the Council refer to the host dwelling as a replacement of Southborough Lodge Farm, however the existing property adjacent to the appeal site also bares that name.
9. Therefore, on the information before me, the host dwelling and outbuilding were constructed after 1 July 1948 and their location would appear to have not been previously occupied by one of the earlier buildings. Consequently, for the purposes of this appeal the originally constructed form of the host dwelling would constitute the original building as defined by the Framework and LP Policy P2.
10. It is appreciated the host dwelling was permitted as a replacement dwelling, so its full impact on the Green Belt was assessed at the time of its approval and found to be acceptable. As such the original form of the host dwelling would form the baseline of reference when considering whether the proposed extensions would be disproportionate or not. The main parties agree that since construction the host dwelling has not been extended.
11. The proposed extensions would be single storey, and visually subservient to the host dwelling. The proposed rear extension and porch would both be

partially located within the existing footprint, below either the existing rear facing first floor balcony or the forward facing first floor overhang. The proposed side extension would be positioned between the host dwelling and outbuilding and would not extend beyond the front or rear elevation of either building.

12. The proposed extensions would therefore retain the compact footprint of the host dwelling and outbuilding within the appeal site and their single storey height would not significantly add to the overall bulk of that existing. The proposed extensions would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
13. In conclusion, the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would comply with paragraph 149 c) of The Framework and LP Policy P2.
14. As the proposal would not be inappropriate development, it is not necessary to further consider the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt or whether very special circumstances are necessary.

Other Matters

15. The appeal site is in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). AONBs are designated for the purposes of conserving and enhancing natural beauty and Section 85(1) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 places a duty upon me to have regard to these purposes in this decision. The Council did not object to the appeal scheme in this regard and I agree that due to the subservient nature of the proposal in relation to the existing dwelling and outbuilding, the special qualities of the AONB would not be adversely affected.
16. It is noted that the original permission for the host dwelling included a condition which removed certain permitted development rights. Since this appeal was submitted, the Council have approved the removal of that condition. This does not alter my findings.

Conditions

17. The Council has suggested 3 conditions which I have considered against advice in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to securing commencement within the relevant statutory timeframe, I have also imposed conditions requiring adherence to the approved plans and that matching materials should be used to ensure the proposal integrates acceptably with the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no sufficiently weighted material considerations, including the Framework, that would indicate a decision otherwise. The appeal is, therefore, allowed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR