



Mrs H Morris-Ruffle  
14 St Georges Business Centre  
St Georges Square  
Portsmouth  
PO1 3EZ

Contact: Chris Gent  
Phone: 01483 444470  
Fax: 01483 444646  
Email: [christopher.gent@guildford.gov.uk](mailto:christopher.gent@guildford.gov.uk)

Date: 25/01/2021

Dear Mrs Morris-Ruffle

Location: West Winds, Portsmouth Road, Ripley, Woking, GU23 6EW  
Regarding: Residential extension.  
Reference: 20/A/00417

Thank you for your pre-application enquiry received on 04 December 2020. In response to your enquiry I hope that you will find the following information helpful.

Site description / constraints:

- site is located within the Green Belt

Relevant planning history:

20/P/01241 - Proposed part single-storey, part two-storey rear/side extension, including raising of the ridge line to accommodate a new roof, 6 roof lights, and a raised front terrace with railings and steps, following demolition of existing outbuildings. Refused on 07/10/2020 for the following reasons:

*1). The proposed development, by virtue of the floorspace uplift from the original building, width, depth and height, would result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. The development would therefore constitute inappropriate development, which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated which would outweigh the inherent harm to the Green Belt.*

20/W/00071 - Prior notification for a single storey 8 metre rear extension, 3 metres in height with an eaves height of 2.6 metres. Prior approval not required - 26/06/2020. (Officer note: This has not been implemented)

20/P/00848 - Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development to establish whether the

erection of a single storey side extension and side dormer windows would be lawful. Refused on 14/07/2020 for the following reason:

The proposed enlargement does not have planning permission by reason of Schedule 2 Part 1 Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), by virtue of;

*- the edge of the enlargement closest to the eaves of the original roof being less than 0.2 metres from the eaves; and therefore failing to comply with point B.2 (b)(i)(bb).*

### Planning considerations

#### Comparison to previous refusal 20/P/01241

The proposal, subject of this pre-application enquiry, varies from the previously refused scheme in the following ways:

- first floor has been reduced in depth by 3.5 metres
- first floor forward projecting gabled element has been removed
- floor area (at first floor level) has been reduced by 24sqm
- overall roof height lowered by 0.9m
- floor area (at ground floor level) has been reduced by 14sqm
- corner part of the single storey rear extension (i.e. that part of the extension which cannot be built out as part of the approved prior notification (20/W/00071) or certificate of lawfulness (20/P/00848) has been removed

In floorspace terms, the size of the original, existing and proposed building are:

- Original building: approx 96sq m (this does not include any outbuildings)
- Existing building: approx 105sq m
- Proposed (resulting) building: approx 189sq m
- The resulting building would represent a 97% increase in the size of the original dwelling, representing a significant uplift indicative of a disproportionate addition. The development also increases the footprint of the building by 52sqm and extends out the property at first floor level to create a full two storey building. Taking into account the significant increase in floor area, depth, width, height, bulk, mass and volume, the proposal results in a disproportionate addition to the original building.
- The following matters are put forward as very special circumstances (as they were under the previously refused application 20/P/01241).
  - allowed prior notification (20/W/00071) for a 8m deep single storey rear extension could be implemented and is therefore a credible 'fallback' position
  - whilst CLUPD (20/P/00848) was previously refused, it is acknowledged by officer's that side dormer windows could be built under permitted development either side of the existing roofslope, to almost the full depth of the property
- It is accepted that a permitted development fallback position exists.
- Following the significant reductions made to the buildings floor area uplift, size and bulk from

the refused 20/P/01241 application, it is my opinion that this revised scheme would result in comparable harm to the Green Belt, to what could be achieved under permitted development. As such, it is my view that the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness is outweighed by these considerations.

#### Impact of the development on the character of the area

- The properties along this stretch of the Portsmouth Road comprise two-storey detached dwellings and bungalows/chalet style bungalows of differing designs with a wide variety of external finishes. The existing dwelling is a detached chalet style bungalow with habitable accommodation inside its roof space.
- This application seeks permission to extend the existing single storey building to create an additional storey of accommodation at full two storey height, and build single storey extensions to the rear and side. Due to its size, traditional hipped roof design and appearance, it is my opinion that the proposal would be in keeping with the existing dwellings in the street.
- Full clarification of the proposed external materials have been provided. These are; white painted render, facing brick to match the existing, timber panelling to the existing ground floor bay window and matching clay tiles. Given that there is a mixed palette of materials in the surrounding area, it is my view that these materials are acceptable.

#### Impact on neighbour amenity

- As per the previously refused scheme, the proposal includes a large first floor window on its side (northern) elevation facing the neighbour 'The Retreat', serving a stairwell. It is noted that this would face directly towards the neighbours first floor landing window. Given that this window is annotated on the plans as obscurely glazed, it is my opinion that this would be acceptable.
- the submitted roof plan shows a total of four rooflights (one on each roofslope) however, these are not shown on the proposed elevations. In the event that an application is submitted you would need to ensure the elevations/roof plan accord with each other.

#### Next steps

- Submit a householder planning application

#### Conclusion:

Please note that this advice represents officers' informal opinion based upon the information you have provided. It is given without prejudice to any decision the Council may make on any subsequent formal planning application. A planning application will be the subject of publicity and consultation in accordance with the Council's procedures. These and other matters which may subsequently come to light, may result in additional issues being raised that are pertinent to the determination of the application.

Yours sincerely

Mr C Gent  
Planning Officer  
Planning Services