

LOCATION:	Land Adjacent To Chobham Farm Cottage, Philpot Lane, Chobham, Woking, Surrey, GU24 8HD,
PROPOSAL:	Erection of single storey side extension.
TYPE:	Full Planning Application
APPLICANT:	Mr S Hollis
OFFICER:	Mr Ross Cahalane

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it has been called-in by Cllr Victoria Wheeler due to concerns regarding inappropriate over-development within the Green Belt.

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This application relates to a proposed single storey side extension to a new dwelling in the Green Belt, approved and implemented under 17/1131.
- 1.2 It is considered that the proposed extension would not form a disproportionate addition to the host dwelling in the Green Belt. The proposal would not give rise to an overdominant or incongruous impact upon the host dwelling and the rural character of the area, nor would it adversely impact the amenity of surrounding neighbours. The proposed parking provision is also considered sufficient for the size of the resultant dwelling. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The 0.34 hectare application site is to the north east of the main dwelling of Chobham Farm Cottage. The site formally contained a stable block and associated ménage and hardstanding leading from the access of Philpot Lane, which also serves Chobham Farm Cottage. The new dwelling as approved under 17/1131 is currently under construction.
- 2.2 The application site is on the east side of Philpot Lane, in a rural location within the Green Belt beyond any defined settlement. Philpot Lane is characterised by low density development set in spacious plots. The area has a verdant character which is considered to be a defining feature of the area.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 17/1131 Single storey dwelling including rooflights, basement, revised vehicular access and parking area, entrance gates, landscaping and bin and cycle storage, following demolition of ancillary stables and outbuilding and removal of ménage and hardstanding.

Decision: Granted.

- 3.2 18/0402 Single storey dwelling including basement, revised vehicular access and parking area, entrance gates, landscaping and cycle storage following demolition of ancillary stables and outbuilding, and removal of menage and hardstanding.

Decision: Refused.

- 3.3 18/0477 Variation of Condition 2 (Approved plans) of 17/1131 (New single storey dwelling) to allow for enlarged basement area.

Decision: Granted.

- 3.4 18/1014 Lawful development certificate for the existing new 2m high close board fencing to north of main dwelling of Chobham Farm Cottage.

Decision: Granted.

- 3.5 20/0396/NMA Non material amendment to 17/1131 (new dwelling) to allow for alterations to front porch and entrance elevation.

Decision: Granted.

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey side extension.
- 4.2 The proposed extension would consist of hipped pitched roof forms concealing a lower crown roof, and would have a maximum width of approx. 6.9m, maximum depth of approx. 9.7m, maximum eaves height of approx. 2.5m and maximum ridge height of approx. 3.8m.
- 4.3 The proposed extension would provide an additional two bedrooms, resulting in a four bed dwelling.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 5.1 Chobham Parish Council Objection for the following reasons:
- Proposed development represents a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original buildings and is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt (NPPF)
 - The Parish Council contends that the “original” should be classed as the stable buildings on the plot prior to the redevelopment (NPPF)
- [Officer comment: See Section 7.3]*
- Discrepancy in ownership of land between Chobham Farm Cottage and new dwelling (as shown in 19/0674/FFU) must be resolved in order to retain control the openness of the Green Belt (NPPF)
- [Officer comment: The current application does not rely upon any land/development outside of current ownership]*
- The Parish Council is not satisfied that there will be no net increase to the flood risk in the vicinity (DM10).
- [Officer comment: See Section 7.7]*

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 At the time of preparation of this report, one representation of support and two of objection have been received.

6.2 The following matters are raised in support:

- Percentage increase would be less than 30% and therefore not a disproportionate increase.
- Extension would complete symmetry of house and make it more balanced.
- Will enable the property to function as a family sized property appropriate to the size of the plot.
- Will enable short term local employment opportunities in the construction sector.

6.3 The objection raises the following matters relevant to the current application:

- Developer has misused planning law and procedure.
- Has used up all structural rights with original application.
- Impact on openness of Green Belt.
- No further expansion should be allowed, including below ground.
- *[Officer comment: See Section 7.3].*
- Dwelling is hideous and not in keeping with the area. Grass roof should be installed to mitigate.
- *[Officer comment: See Section 7.4].*
- Increase in people, noise, cars, traffic and pollution.
- *[Officer comment: See Sections 7.5 and 7.6].*
- The land is flood plain and has been in and out of flood since October.
- Land around development has been raised preventing volume and flow of floodwater – will be made worse by further development.
- *[Officer comment: See Section 7.7. Reports of adjacent land works were forwarded to the planning enforcement team for investigation].*
- Impact on habitat and biodiversity.
- *[Officer comment: It is not considered that the proposed extension above an existing basement would lead to a material impact].*
- Address is wrong – should be land adjacent to Chobham Farm Cottage.
- *[Officer comment: The application address has been changed, although the application site has historically formed part of Chobham Farm Cottage].*
- Current development not in accordance with approved plans.
- *[Officer comment: Application ref: 20/0396/NMA has been submitted to seek to rectify this].*
- Development has been ongoing since 2016. It would seem that the developer did not make his full intentions known at the time and is still trying to circumvent the planning system.
- *[Officer comment: Each application must be considered having regard to relevant current planning policies].*

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

7.1 The application proposed is considered against the policies within the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 (CSDMP), and in this case the relevant policies are Policies DM9, DM10 and DM11. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the advice contained within the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (RDG) are also material considerations to the determination of this application.

7.2 The main issues to be considered are:

- Principle and appropriateness of development in the Green Belt;
- Impact upon the character of the area;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Impact on access, parking and highway safety;
- Impact on flood risk, and;
- Impact on infrastructure.

7.3 Principle and appropriateness of development in the Green Belt

7.3.1 Paragraph 145 of the NPPF states that:

A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt.

One of the listed exceptions to the above outlined in paragraph 145 is:

c) 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.

“Original building” is defined in the NPPF annexe as “A building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally. For the purposes of this case, the original dwelling is that consented under the 2017 permission.

7.3.2 The previous planning applications have established that the application site, prior to its redevelopment, formed previously developed land (PDL/ brownfield land). Consequently, its redevelopment benefitted from support under Para 145 g) of the NPPF, as there was no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the previous development.

7.3.3 The applicant has submitted the current proposed extension as a separate planning application, on the basis that the approved dwelling would be at an advanced stage of construction by the time of the determination of this application. On this basis, the applicant contends that the proposal can be assessed under Para 145 c) of the NPPF as quoted above. It is accepted that there is no statutory definition of “substantially completed” and that this must be decided as a matter of fact and degree.

7.3.4 The applicant has now provided photographs to show that all external elevations of the 17/1131 dwelling have now been completed, along with its roof. This has allowed for substantial internal works, including plastering, kitchen appliances, bathrooms, electrics and plumbing, with decoration works well advanced. In light of the above, the dwelling as approved under 17/1131 is considered to be substantially complete. On this basis the proposed extension to this dwelling, is a separate building operation, and can be assessed under para 145c) of the NPPF.

7.3.5 The following table compares the current proposed extension with the 17/1131 approved dwelling:

	<u>17/1131 approved dwelling</u>	<u>Proposed extension</u>	<u>Differences</u>
Footprint (above ground)	176 sq m	54 sq m	+30.7%
Volume	565 m 3	151 m 3	+26.7%

The roof form of the proposed extension would also be fully single storey, and would be between approx. 0.5m – 1.2m lower than the highest roof form of the host dwelling.

- 7.3.6 The NPPF does not contain specific percentage figures for extensions to buildings in the Green Belt. However, the Local Planning Authority is of the view that the above proposed footprint and volume increases to the “original” dwellinghouse (as approved and implemented under 17/1131), coupled with the lower single storey form and massing in relation to the dwelling, would mean that the extension is not considered disproportionate for the purposes of Para 145 c) of the NPPF.
- 7.3.7 No objections are therefore raised on Green Belt grounds, as the proposed extension is considered to benefit from support under Chapter 13 of the NPPF. An informative is added to remind the applicant of the existing planning condition removing permitted development rights for any additional extensions, roof additions or outbuildings to this dwelling.

7.4 Impact on character of the area

- 7.4.1 The NPPF requires design policies to concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally. Development which fails to integrate into its context, promote or reinforce local distinctiveness and fails to take the opportunity to improve the character and quality of the area and the way it functions should be refused (paragraphs 59, 61 and 64 of the NPPF). Policies CP2 (iv) and DM9 (ii) of the CSDMP reiterate these requirements.
- 7.4.2 The area in the vicinity of the site is verdant and rural in character, with surrounding residential development set behind mature shrubbery with open land to the east. The proposed extension would be set back at some distance from the highway boundary with significant mature screening along it. Its siting would also be at sufficient distance from the site boundaries to avoid the creation of a cramped appearance.
- 7.4.3 The proposed extension would be single storey in appearance, with some traditional design features including hipped pitched roof forms and decorative brick features to reflect the design of the host dwelling. The extension would also have a lower roof form towards the side, and would also be set back here from the main front elevation to give a subservient appearance.
- 7.4.4 It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not give rise to an overdominant or incongruous impact upon the host dwelling and the rural character of the area, in compliance with the design requirements Policy DM9 of the CSDMP.

7.5 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.5.1 Policy DM9 states that development will be acceptable where it respects the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and uses. It is necessary to take into account matters such as overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light and an overbearing or unneighbourly built form.
- 7.5.2 The proposed extension would remain sited up to approx. 11m from side boundary of Hook Meadow to the northeast. Given this separation distance and the single storey form proposed, it is considered that no adverse impact to amenity would arise in terms of loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact. It is considered that the proposal would not give rise to adverse harm to the amenity of the other surrounding neighbours, given the significant distance to the elevations and private amenity areas.
- 7.5.3 In light of all the above, in accordance with Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the CSDMP the development would respect the amenities of neighbouring properties.

7.6 Impact on access, parking and highway safety

7.6.1 The dwelling would still utilise the existing access to Chobham Farm Cottage, as approved following consultation with Surrey County Highway Authority. Although the proposed extended dwelling would have four bedrooms, it would still be served by four off-street parking spaces – also as previously approved. This parking provision is considered sufficient for the size of the resultant dwelling. It is therefore considered that the current proposed development would not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

7.7 Impact on flood risk

7.7.1 The eastern edge of the application site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3a, with the rest of the site, including the area of the proposed extension, within Flood Zone 1. A site-specific flood risk assessment (FRA) was provided under previous applications, to take into account the implemented 17/1131 dwelling and its larger subterranean basement (18/0477), and the Environment Agency raised no objection. The proposed extension would be constructed on top of the approved extended basement. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not lead to a material increase in flood risk either within or around the site.

7.8 Impact on infrastructure

7.8.1 Surrey Heath's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule was adopted by Full Council on 16 July 2014. As the CIL Charging Schedule came into effect on 01 December 2014, an assessment of CIL liability has been undertaken. As the proposed extension includes residential floorspace that is less than 100 sq m, the development would not be CIL liable.

8.0 POSITIVE/PROACTIVE WORKING

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

a) Provided or made available pre application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.

b) 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.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 It is considered that the proposed extension would not form a disproportionate addition to the host dwelling in the Green Belt as approved and implemented under 17/1131. The proposal would not give rise to an overdominant or incongruous impact upon the host dwelling and the rural character of the area, nor would it adversely impact the amenity of surrounding neighbours. The proposed parking provision is also considered sufficient for the size of the resultant dwelling. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

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:

Proposed context plan (Drawing No. CP101); Proposed ground floor plan (Drawing No. 104); Proposed roof plan (Drawing No. 105); Proposed elevations (Drawing No. 106) - all received on 06 December 2019, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

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 to match those of the existing building.

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. The applicant is reminded that Condition 12 of the 17/1131 planning permission for the dwelling removes permitted development rights for any further extensions, roof extensions or outbuildings.