

ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

AT

3 FORD ROAD, BISLEY, GU24 9EJ

SUPPORTING PLANNING STATEMENT



RTPI

Chartered Town Planner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction and background	3
2. Site description and review of planning history	4
3. Description of development proposed	5
4. Summary of relevant planning policies	6
Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (2012)	6
Residential Design Guide (2017)	7
National Planning Policy	7
5. Acceptability of development proposed	9
Principle of the development	9
Impact on character of the area and the Green Belt	9
Impact on residential amenity	12
6. Conclusion	13
Appendix 1: Email from SHBC confirming date of Green Belt designation.	14
Appendix 2: Appeal Decision Allowed for Extension in the Green Belt	15

Ref. 23-040-SPS-01

Version: D

Author: PB

1. Introduction and background

- 1.1 This report is written in support of a planning application for the erection of a two storey side extension to the semidetached house at 3 Ford Road, Bisley. A full description of the proposal is set out in section 2 of this report.

- 1.2 This supporting planning statement sets out why the proposed development is acceptable having regard to the policies of Surrey Heath Borough Council in addition to national planning policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2. Site description and review of planning history

- 2.1 The site is occupied by a 3 bedroom semi-detached house adjacent to no. 4, located to the north of Ford Road. There are several other properties in the locality and the surrounding area is predominantly low density rural.
- 2.2 Having regard to the Policies Map 2012 (East Sheet) of the Core Strategy and Development Management DPD the site is located in the Green Belt. It is not within a designated Conservation Area or an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In addition, the dwelling is not statutory listed.
- 2.3 An online search of the Council's website does not show any planning history for the property.

3. Description of development proposed

3.1 The proposal will comprise the following accommodation to the side and rear of the existing house:

Ground Floor

- Kitchen/living area

First Floor

- Bedroom with en-suite
- Bathroom

3.2 The rear elevation will have three new dormers in the roof to serve the new bedroom, new bathroom and bedroom 4 in the original house.

3.3 Materials for the brickwork walls will match the existing house, as will the roof tiles.

3.4 The Gross External Area (GEA) of the existing house on the ground and first floors is 97.2m². The GEA of the property after the extension would be 162m².

3.5 Given the generous width of plot, the proposed side extension can be adequately accommodated, and there would be no impact on the existing drive and on-site parking areas.

3.6 Overall, the extension will be proportionate to the existing property with an increase of only three rooms, and the materials and design will be consistent with the existing house.

4. Summary of relevant planning policies

- 4.1 When considering the merits of development that requires a planning application the Council, in its function as the local planning authority, has a requirement to determine that application in accordance with the policies of its Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise¹.
- 4.2 Therefore, in preparing this planning statement consideration has been had to relevant policies of Surrey Heath Borough Council's Development Plan as set out in paragraphs 4.3 – 4.5 of this report. The following local and national policies are relevant to this proposed development.

Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (2012)

- 4.3 **Policy CP2 “Sustainable Development and Design”:** The council will require development to meet various criteria. The most relevant to this proposal is:
- To ensure that all land is used efficiently within the context of its surrounding, and respect and enhance the quality of the rural environment.
- 4.4 **Policy DM9 “Design Principles”:** Development will be acceptable where it achieves various design principles including:
- (i) High quality design;
 - (ii) Respects the local environment having regard to scale, materials, massing and bulk;
 - (iii) Provides sufficient amenity space and respects the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

¹ Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, section 38(6).

Residential Design Guide (2017)

4.5 Side Extensions: Principle 10.3

- Side extensions should not erode neighbour amenities or the character of the street scene and local area;
- Proposals should remain sympathetic to the main building, and not project beyond the building line;
- Important gaps between buildings should be maintained;
- A minimum gap of 1m between the building and side boundary should be retained.

National Planning Policy

4.6 The Government's national planning policies are set out in the 'National Planning Policy Framework' (NPPF) 2021. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

4.7 Paragraph 7 establishes the overriding principle that the planning system is to contribute towards sustainable development. Paragraph 8 explains that there are 3 strands to sustainable development – economic, social and environmental. In relation to social it includes the following reference to housing:

“...to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations...”

4.8 Paragraph 11 identifies the importance of the concept of 'sustainable development' and that in terms of decision making this means, inter alia:

“...approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay...”

4.9 In relation to applications for planning permission, paragraph 47 refers to these being determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

- 4.10 For proposals in the Green Belt, paragraph 149 says construction of new buildings are considered inappropriate but exceptions to this include *extension of a building* provided that it does not result in 'disproportionate additions' over and above the size of the original building. In this respect the NPPF does not define 'disproportionate'.

5. Acceptability of development proposed

- 5.1 Having regard to the circumstances of the existing dwelling and the Council's planning policies, the main planning considerations in relation to this proposed development are:
- Principle of the development.
 - Impact on character of the area and the Green Belt.
 - Impact on residential amenity.

Principle of the development

- 5.2 The property is established in a small cluster of residential properties and buildings in a semi-rural area. The existing property sits within a generous-width plot and only a small proportion of the plot is occupied by buildings.
- 5.3 The proposed extension is consistent with the scale and appearance of the existing house. It will be of a proportionate scale to the property with the addition of only two rooms, and the materials and design will be sympathetic to the existing house.
- 5.4 The proposal is making efficient use of land within the context of its surroundings. The modest extension is also respecting the quality of the rural environment and therefore complies with Core Strategy and Development Management Policy CP2 and the NPPF.

Impact on character of the area and the Green Belt

- 5.5 It is understood that there was a minor rear extension constructed at the property in the 1970s to "round off" the building at ground floor level. However, this pre-dates the designation of the Green Belt in this area which was done by the Council's 1987 Local Plan, as confirmed in a recent email from the Planning Policy and Conservation Team. A copy of this email is provided as **Appendix 1** to this report. Therefore, for the purpose of assessing the development against the requirements of the NPPF, we consider the "original building" to be the property as it stood when the Green Belt was designated in 1987.

- 5.6 The design is consistent with the existing style and appearance of the house, and subservient to the scale of the host property. The width of the existing house is just under 8m and the proposed side extension is only 4m which represents about half the existing width. It is no higher than the height of the existing ridge and would not appear unduly prominent or out of keeping with the Ford Road streetscene.
- 5.7 The Gross External Area (GEA) of the existing house on the ground and first floors is 97.2m². The GEA of the property after the extension would be 162m² representing a 66% increase. There is no adopted local plan policy which specifically addresses extensions to existing dwellings situated in the Green Belt and therefore policy guidance is deferred to the NPPF. Paragraph 149 states an extension to an existing building is a legitimate exception to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which does not result in disproportionate additions. There is no definition or quantum identified in the NPPF in relation to “disproportionate”. In any event, the 66% increase is comparatively high only because the existing house is a modest size in the form of a traditional semi-detached cottage.
- 5.8 Even if the NPPF or an adopted local plan policy did include a specific maximum limit of increased floorspace, this should not be applied in a rigid formulaic manner but instead the proposal should be the subject of a planning judgement having regard to matters such as design, scale and the context of the site. Such a judgement should conclude whether or not the extension would have a harmful effect on the openness or visual amenities of the Green Belt. In this context, we draw your attention to an appeal decision which was allowed for an extension which increased the size of the original dwelling by 81%. The proposal was in Shalford near Guildford, the appeal was allowed in February 2009 and the appeal decision is attached as **Appendix 2**. Paragraph 6 of the appeal decision letter states:
- “...applying the presumption against disproportionate additions in the Green Belt requires the exercise of planning judgement as to matters of scale, size, design etc.”*
- 5.9 The appeal decision concluded at paragraph 7 that the extension was a proportionate addition to the original dwelling in terms of its size, scale, design and character. There was therefore no conflict with local or national planning policies relating to Green Belts. The same conclusion can be reached for the current proposal at 3 Ford Road using the proper planning judgement of the relevant issues.

- 5.10 As stated above, the design of the extension is consistent with the style and appearance of the house and it would be in keeping with the Ford Road streetscene. Having regard to Principle 10.3 “Side Extensions” of the Residential Design Guide, the proposal complies with *all* of its elements as follows:
- Side extensions should not erode neighbour amenities or the character of the street scene and local area;
 - Proposals should remain sympathetic to the main building, and not project beyond the building line;
 - Important gaps between buildings should be maintained;
 - A minimum gap of 1m between the building and side boundary should be retained.
- 5.11 The proposal also complies with Policy DM9 by virtue of a high quality design and respecting the local semi-rural environment.
- 5.12 The extension is only creating two additional rooms – a kitchen/living area on the ground floor and an additional bedroom on the first floor. It is a proportionate addition to the existing property and the generous side garden and on-site parking area would remain evident.
- 5.13 Paragraph 138 of the NPPF lists the five purposes that the Green Belt serves. The proposal does not conflict with, or prejudice, *any* of these purposes:
- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
 - b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
 - c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
 - d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
 - e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 5.14 The proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the semi-rural area and is clearly smaller scale compared to much larger properties at nos. 1, 2, 5 and 6 Ford Road. Consequently it would not be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and would respect the local pattern of development. It would therefore comply with the Residential Design Guide, Core Strategy and Development Management Policy DM9 and the NPPF.

Impact on residential amenity

- 5.15 There nearest property to the extension is the other semi-detached house at no. 4 Ford Road which would not be able to view the extended building. Nos. 2 and 5 Ford Road are further away with ample separation distances.
- 5.16 There would be sufficient amenity space retained to the side and rear for the existing occupiers and the amenities of neighbouring properties would be respected. The proposal would therefore comply with Core Strategy and Development Management Policy DM9 and the NPPF.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 This report has highlighted that the planning application for a two storey side extension is in accordance with the Council's planning policies and therefore is an acceptable form of development.
- 6.2 The proposal will not have any adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt, the character of the area or the residential amenity of neighbours and is therefore sustainable development in accordance with national policy.
- 6.3 Therefore, in the absence of any other material considerations to justify otherwise it is respectfully requested that planning permission is granted for the proposed development.

Appendix 1: Email from SHBC confirming date of Green Belt designation.

3 Ford Road

Kate Galloway <Kate.Galloway@surreyheath.gov.uk>

Tue 13/06/2023 13:57

To: Inception Planning - applications & appeals <applications@inceptionplanning.co.uk>

Cc: Jane Reeves <Jane.Reeves@surreyheath.gov.uk>

Dear Nick,

Thank you for your email and my apologies for the delay in getting back to you – unfortunately the answer to your question in respect of the Green Belt was buried in Paper files which are somewhat challenging to access. I've now had the opportunity to review the relevant paperwork and am confident in saying that the Green Belt in this location was designated through the Council's 1987 Local Plan.

I hope this is of assistance to you.

Best wishes,

Kate

Kate Galloway MRTPI
Planning Policy and Conservation Team Leader
Planning Policy and Conservation



Surrey Heath Borough Council

Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 3HD

Email: kate.galloway@surreyheath.gov.uk



Web: surreyheath.gov.uk

SURREY HEATH DISCLAIMER

This email and any attachments are intended for the addressee only. The information contained in this email is accurate at the time of sending however the council cannot account for events beyond the Councils control which may change the accuracy after the date of sending. The information contained in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, the use of the information contained in this email or any disclosure, copying or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately.

Surrey Heath Borough Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing email to ensure compliance with current procedures. This email has been checked for computer viruses prior to sending, but it is also your responsibility to virus check the email upon receipt.

For contact and service information, please refer to www.surreyheath.gov.uk

	<h2>Appeal Decision</h2>	The Planning Inspectorate 4/11 Eagle Wing Temple Quay House 2 The Square Temple Quay Bristol BS1 6PN
	Site visit made on 10 February 2009	
	by M T O'Rourke BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI	
	an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government	
		Decision date: 13 February 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/A/08/2081181
Kitchen Garden Cottage, Christmas Hill, Shalford, Guildford GU4 8HR

- 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 Michael Preston against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
- The application Ref 08/P/00657, dated 25 March 2008, was refused by notice dated 28 May 2008.
- The development proposed is single storey extension to the rear of the house.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for single storey extension to the rear of the house at Kitchen Garden Cottage, Christmas Hill, Shalford, Guildford GU4 8HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 08/P/00657, dated 25 March 2008, and the plans submitted with it, 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 extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issues

2. The appeal site is in the countryside outside of the settlement of Shalford within the Green Belt (GB). Planning Policy Guidance note 2 (PPG2) sets out the fundamental aim of GB policy to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and within the Green Belt (GB) there is a general presumption against inappropriate development. The construction of new buildings inside the GB is inappropriate unless for certain purposes. Paragraph 3.6 of PPG2 advises that *'provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building, the extension or alteration of dwellings is not inappropriate in Green Belts'*. The main issues are whether the proposed extension is inappropriate development for the purposes of PPG2 and development plan policy and its impact on the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Saved policy RE2 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 sets out the categories of new building that are not deemed to be inappropriate in the GB, repeating PPG2 and including the limited extension of existing dwellings providing it is in accordance with policy H9. Saved policy H9 is generally

permissive of extensions to dwellings in the countryside, but within the GB there will be a presumption against extensions to dwellings which result in disproportionate additions taking into account the size of the original dwelling.

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached cottages set back from the road on the north side of Christmas Hill. Both have been extended with single storey side additions and conservatories. The appeal proposal is to erect a further single storey extension to the rear to provide a study and bedroom providing an additional 26 square metres of floorspace. When regard is had to the floorspace of existing outbuildings and extensions, the Council calculates there would be an increase of 81% over that of the original dwelling which it contends would be a disproportionate addition amounting to inappropriate development that would unacceptably impact on the openness of the GB.
5. However Local Plan policy H9 is not prescriptive as to the maximum size of extension that is permissible and paragraph 5.39 sets out the approach to be taken; the principal consideration being the *'potential impact of the extension itself on the openness of the GB and the visual amenities of the GB in terms of its size, scale, design, materials and character'*. It goes on to say that small extensions, even where there have been a number of extensions to the original dwelling, may not necessarily be refused permission.
6. It is clear from the Plan's text that it is not the Council's intention that policy H9 should be applied in a formulaic manner and that applying the presumption against disproportionate additions in the GB requires the exercise of planning judgement as to matters of scale, size, design, etc. But other than the calculation of the cumulative percentage increase in floorspace, no case has been made by the Council as to why the proposed extension would have a harmful impact on either the openness or visual amenities of the GB.
7. With regard to the proposed extension, I note that in its committee report, the Council made no objection to its size or design, accepting that its roof pitch and form would respect the visual character of the existing dwelling, its dimensions would be modest and it would be sited sufficient distance from the common boundary to protect the neighbours' amenities. Materials would match the original house; the extension would not be visible from the road; and would have no adverse impact on the Area of Great Landscape Value. The proposal is for a small extension and whilst there have been other extensions to the house, and outbuildings, I am satisfied from what I saw on my visit that in terms of its size, scale, design and character, the extension would be a proportionate addition to the original dwelling. I therefore find no conflict with the provisions of policy H9 and therefore with GB policy RE2 and PPG2.
8. I have taken into account all other matters raised including the personal circumstances of the appellant's partner and need for downstairs accommodation. Whilst this is a material consideration, I have already concluded, for the reasons given above, that the proposed development would comply with national and local planning policies for the GB and that the appeal should be allowed and permission granted, subject to a condition requiring the materials used to match the original building.

Mary O'Rourke Inspector