

LOCATION: THE TRAVERS, STEEP HILL, CHOBHAM, WOKING, GU24
8SZ
PROPOSAL: Erection of storage outbuilding following demolition of the
existing (retrospective). (Amended plans rec'd 21/06/2019.)
TYPE: Full Planning Application
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs M Power
OFFICER: Patricia Terceiro

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it has been called in to the Planning Applications Committee by Cllr Tedder on the grounds that the replacement building is materially larger from the previous existing.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Retrospective planning permission is sought for the erection of a replacement outbuilding in the Green Belt. The current proposal is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Furthermore, it does not have an adverse impact on local character or residential amenity and is therefore recommended for approval.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The Travers is a detached bungalow located in land within the Green Belt. The site benefits from a large enclosed garden to the rear, containing a number of outbuildings. Parking is provided by one of these outbuildings, sited to the rear, accessed through a driveway. The remaining of the driveway's frontage is in lawn and contains elements of soft landscaping.
- 2.2 The building immediately to the east of the application site, is classified as a Grade II Listed Building, and currently accommodates a restaurant.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 There is no planning history relevant to the proposed development.

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Retrospective full planning permission is sought for the erection of an outbuilding following demolition of the existing. The building on site is currently under construction, however is not yet finished.

- 4.2 The proposed development is attached to an existing outbuilding on site by virtue of a covered hardstanding area. The proposal has a pitched roof and measures 9.7m in width, 5.1m in depth, 3.7m in ridge height and 2.2m in height to the eaves. In terms of internal floor space, the outbuilding is to be used for storage and as a garage.
- 4.3 The proposed materials are forest green plastisol cladding sheets to the walls, natural slate to the roof and timber to the windows and doors.
- 4.4 The applicant has clarified that the proposal in combination with the outbuildings it attaches to are to be used as a garage (for the keeping of classic cars), as a shed and as a garden workshop.
- 4.5 This application has been submitted following an investigation by the Corporate Enforcement team, following a complaint that the existing outbuildings on site had been demolished and replaced. This application covers the southern section of the building.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 5.1 Chobham Parish Council
- Initial comments: no objection.
- Revised comments: objection on the following grounds:
- Potentially misleading application material;
 - Proximity to boundary giving rise to overlooking;
 - Skylights, windows and patio doors not shown on drawings *[Officer note: following a site visit, it was noted that the plans represent the proposed development];*
 - Sewage concerns *[Officer note: for a householder development, this matter would be addressed under building regulations];*
 - Out of keeping and loss of openness.

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 At the time of preparation of this report 3 no written representations have been received which raise the following issues:
- The proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore not acceptable in principle;
 - The replacement building is materially larger than that the previous existing on site;
 - The proposal detrimentally impacts on the character of the area;
 - The proposal impacts on the residential amenities of the adjoining neighbours;
 - The proposal is too close to the common boundary with the common boundary with no 19 Burrow Hill Green;
 - The proposal contains rooflights which are not shown on the proposed plans.

6.2 The following matters have also been raised, however they would not constitute material planning considerations in this instance:

- The proposal would block the views from the properties to the north;

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The application site is located within Green Belt land, as set out in the Proposals Map of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP). In this case, consideration is given to Policy DM9 of the CSDMP. The Residential Design Guide (RDG) SPD 2017 also constitutes a material planning consideration. Finally, the proposal will also be considered against the principles of protecting the Green Belt land, in accordance with Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

7.2 The main issues to be considered within this application are:

- Principle of development within the Green Belt.
- Impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- Residential amenity.

7.3 Principle of development in the Green Belt

7.3.1 Section 13 of the NPPF contains specific policies relating to development within the Green Belt. Para. 133 states that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

7.3.2 Para. 143 sets out that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Therefore, and as per para. 144, the Local Planning Authority should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

7.3.3 Para. 145 of the NPPF states that a Local Planning Authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. However, exceptions are set out under that paragraph, and include the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building (bullet point (c)). Bullet point (d) states the replacement of a building as appropriate development, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.

7.3.4 Both the existing and proposed building are sited within the property's rear garden and in residential use, therefore in accordance with the above mentioned test under bullet point (d).

7.3.5 It is acknowledged that the flat roof section above the car port (see existing plans) has been replaced by a higher pitched roof. However, the maximum height of the proposed development remains as previously existing (i.e. 3.7m) and so does the floorspace (49m²). Given these similarities, it is not considered that the limited section of higher roof would give rise to a building that is materially larger than the one it replaces. The fact that the pitched roof is attached to the larger outbuilding means that, in effect, the proposal is an

extension to the larger outbuilding. However, given its relative size, it is not considered that the proposal forms a disproportionate addition to the existing larger outbuilding. Consequently, the building is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, in accordance with Section 13 of the NPPF.

7.4 Impact on character of area

- 7.4.1 Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (CSDMP) 2012 promotes high quality design. Development should respect and enhance the character of the local environment and be appropriate in scale, materials, massing, bulk and density. The RDG provides further guidance on extensions and alterations to a dwellinghouse. In particular, Principle 10.1 states that extensions will be expected to subordinate and consistent with the form, scale, architectural style and materials of the original building.
- 7.4.2 The proposed development is not visible from public vantage points and therefore it is not detrimental to the character of the road.
- 7.4.3 Whilst the building to the east of the proposal is a Grade II Listed Building, the proposal is similar in terms of size and siting to the demolished outbuildings and, as such, it is not considered it has any detrimental impacts on the setting of this Listed Building.
- 7.4.4 As such, the proposal does not adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and is in accordance with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP, the RDG.

7.5 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.5.1 Policy DM9 CSDMP 2012 states that development should respect the amenities of the adjoining properties and uses. Principle 10.1 of the RDG indicates that extensions should not result in a material loss of amenity to neighbouring properties as a result of overshadowing, eroding privacy or being overbearing.
- 7.5.2 Given the proposal's modest size and separation distance to the closest dwellings and their primary amenity areas, it is not considered that the proposal detrimentally impacts on these neighbours with regards to being overbearing or causing detrimental levels of light loss.
- 7.5.3 Although concerns have been raised regarding overlooking, all windows serving the proposal are single storey. The rooflights, placed at a high level, are for the sole purpose of letting natural light into the room they serve. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would cause any loss of privacy to the adjacent neighbours.
- 7.5.4 As such, the proposal is not considered to affect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties and is in accordance with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and the RDG.

7.6 Other matters

- 7.6.1 Surrey Heath's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule was adopted by Full Council on the 16th July 2014 and the CIL Charging Schedule came into effect on the 1st December 2014. Surrey Heath charges CIL on residential and retail developments where there is a net increase in floor area, however, as the proposal relates to a net increase in residential floor area less than 100 square metres the development is not CIL liable.

8.0 WORKING IN A POSITIVE/PROACTIVE MANNER

In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive, creative and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 38 to 41 of the NPPF. This included 1 or more of the following:

- a) Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered.
- c) Have suggested/accepted/negotiated amendments to the scheme to resolve identified problems with the proposal and to seek to foster sustainable development.
- d) Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposal is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, in accordance with Section 13 of the NPPF. It is further not considered that the proposal would result in adverse impact to the character and appearance of the area, nor on the residential amenities of the nearest neighbours. Therefore, the proposal complies with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and the RDG.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.
 - Drawing no 18-017-proposed S1 rev B, proposed plans and elevations, received 21 June 2019.
 - Drawing no 18-017 – block plan, received 25 March 2019.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and as advised in ID.17a of the Planning Practice Guidance.

3. The building works, hereby approved, shall be constructed in external fascia materials as stated on Section 5 of the Application Form.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Informative(s)

1. Decision Notice to be kept DS1.
2. Advice regarding encroachment DE1.
3. Party Walls (etc) Act 1996 DE3.
4. Building Regs consent req'd DF5.
5. The decision has been taken in compliance with paragraphs 38-41 of the NPPF to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner.