



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2023

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 MARCH 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/22/3301043

7 Pirbright Terrace, Guildford Road, Pirbright, Woking GU24 0LR

- 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 Patrick Sloan against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/P/02573, dated 13 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear extension, two storey front extension, and conversion of attic to bedroom and ensuite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension, two storey front extension, and conversion of attic to bedroom and ensuite at 7 Pirbright Terrace, Guildford Road, Pirbright, Woking GU24 0LR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/P/02573, dated 13 January 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: 20010-PL-02 revision B; 20010-PL-05 revision I; 20010-PL-06 revision H and 20010-PL-07.
 - 3) No construction above ground level shall take place until details of the design, materials and finishes of the windows, barge boards and eaves treatments have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the details required by condition 3, all other materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. It is noted that the description of development on the appeal form and decision notice do not include reference to the conversion of the attic. Its removal from the description of development is not explained but it is referred to within the main parties' evidence. Therefore, for completeness I have included it within the decision above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

4. 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 the proposal should be considered under paragraph 149 c). This exception requires that the extension or alteration of a building does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
5. Policy P2 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LP) refers directly to the tests in the Framework. Although it amplifies some of the definitions within the Framework tests, in relation to extensions and alterations it only clarifies what is meant by original building.
6. The host dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached house within a row of similarly designed semi-detached pairs, known as Pirbright Terrace. The pairs are closely positioned and the majority, if not all, have been extended. The most common extension appears to be a two-storey infill between the side and front elevation, followed by a single storey rear extension. A high proportion of the properties in Pirbright Terrace have one or both types of these extensions, and there are a number which also have roof lights in the rear elevation.
7. The proposal includes the conversion of the roof space, but this would not physically alter or extend the dimensions of the original building. The proposed front extension would replace an existing, reasonably large porch. It would not extend the building footprint beyond the front or side elevations and the ridge height would be below that of the host dwelling. Observations of comparable extensions within the immediate area also confirm the overall proposed sizes would be proportional in relation to the original building. I am therefore satisfied these individual elements of the proposal would not constitute disproportionate additions.
8. The rear extension would increase the depth of the host dwelling. However, it would be of a scale appropriate for a residential property of this nature, as evidenced by it being physically smaller than other single storey rear extensions approved on properties within Pirbright Terrace. All of which have altered the original form of the property they are attached to when assessed against the historic map submitted by the Council. I am therefore satisfied the proposed size of the rear extension would be commensurate with and would not overwhelm the host dwelling.
9. The proposal, as a whole, would constitute an increase in floor area, but the physical characteristics of each element would be proportionate and, in combination, would not be so significant as to engulf the host dwelling. Therefore, I am satisfied the mass, bulk and size of the proposal would not constitute a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.

10. In conclusion, the proposal would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would comply with paragraph 149 c) of The Framework and LP Policy P2.
11. As the proposal would not be inappropriate development, it is not necessary to further consider the effect of the proposal on openness or the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Nor is it necessary to consider very special circumstances. There is also no other harm to weigh it against.

Other Matters

12. The host dwelling is within the Pirbright Conservation Area (CA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended, requires that I pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that conservation area.
13. The Council do not object to the proposed development in terms of harm to the CA, subject to materials and the details of the windows, barge boards and eaves treatments being conditioned. Given the proposed design and scale of the development already undertaken on the other properties in Pirbright Terrace, I agree that with appropriate conditions the proposal would preserve the character or appearance of the CA.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides certainty. However, given the nature of the proposed development, its location within the CA, and the limited details in the evidence before me, it is necessary to attach conditions 3 and 4 which relate to the proposed materials and detailing, as set out in my other matters.

Conclusion

15. 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, which would indicate a decision otherwise. The appeal is, therefore, allowed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR