



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/24/3352281

Salinas, Deep Pool Lane, Chobham GU24 8AS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R & Mrs J Barnett against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2024/0238.
 - The development proposed is freestanding two open bay carport with connecting recessed workshop.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for freestanding two open bay carport with connecting recessed workshop at Salinas, Deep Pool Lane, Chobham GU24 8AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: PLAN/2024/0238, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall accord with those shown on the approved plan: Elevations and Floorplan.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; Car Port Location 1:500; Car Port Location 1:200; Elevations and Floorplan.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall only be used for the parking of vehicles and storage/ workshop use incidental to the residential use of the dwelling house, known as Salinas.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was revised in December 2024. I do not consider that there are any material changes in the Framework, pertinent to this appeal proposal. It is not therefore necessary to seek the views of the Appellant or the Council on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow and within the Green Belt. It is in close proximity to a number of agricultural and horticultural buildings and structures including another dwelling.
5. Paragraph 154 of the Framework sets out that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate except for a limited number of exceptions including c) the extension or alteration of a building providing that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The term 'disproportionate' is not further defined.
6. The Council has referred to Policy CS6 of its Core Strategy 2012, which confirms that it will exercise strict control over inappropriate development within the Green Belt as outlined under the Framework. Policy DM13 of the Woking Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) (DMP DPD) relates to buildings in and adjacent to the Green Belt. There is a general presumption against the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt subject to a number of exceptions, including the extension and alteration of buildings where the proposal does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the building as it existed. The policy does not further define 'disproportionate' additions, but the Reasoned Justification refers to a range of 20-40% of the original volume of the building but that each case will be judged on its individual merits.
7. The Council has regarded the proposed car port and workshop as a new detached building and for this reason has concluded that it would not fall within one of the exceptions under Paragraph 154 of the Framework. However, as a result of its proposed uses, its modest scale in relation to the main dwelling and its siting well within the domestic site and in close proximity to the main dwelling, it is my view that the proposed carport with workshop would be a normal domestic adjunct to the main dwelling. It would therefore fall to be considered under Paragraph 154 c) of the Framework. Policy DM13 of the DMP DPD is not specific on these types of buildings although I have noted that the Reasoned Justification to the policy does refer to outbuildings and garages within 5 metres of the building being considered as part of the original building. The Appellant has confirmed that the proposed development would be within 5 m of the main dwelling.
8. I have limited information before me on the size and volume of the original dwelling with which to assess the proposed development. The Appellant has confirmed that the extension for which permission was granted in November 2020 was never implemented and the permission has now expired and that the existing dwelling is therefore the original dwelling. I have no reason to take a different view. On the basis of my site visit and the information before me I am satisfied that the footprint, height and overall volume would be seen as a modest and subservient addition to the main dwelling.
9. Therefore, and taking all these factors into account, the proposal would not amount to a disproportionate addition to the original building and would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Because of this, the building would not be

harmful to openness or to any of the purposes of the Green Belt. It would accord with the provisions of Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy, Policy DM13 of the DMP DPD and the Framework.

Other Considerations

10. Given its design and modest scale and in the context of the range of buildings in the immediate vicinity I am satisfied that the proposed development would not detract from the character or appearance of the local area, and there are no immediate neighbours to be affected by the development. The Council also raised no concerns in respect of these matters.

Conditions

11. In terms of conditions, the materials should accord with those set out on the approved plan to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area, and the approved plans should be listed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning. I shall also add a condition to require the permitted development to be used for its intended use to protect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR