

## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

6A PLAN/2022/0172

WARD: Heathlands

LOCATION: Warren Wood, Pyle Hill, Sutton Green, Woking, Surrey, GU22 0SR

PROPOSAL: Erection of a replacement two-storey dwelling plus basement level following demolition of existing dwelling.

APPLICANT: Mr Justin Meredith

OFFICER: David Raper

---

### **REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE:**

The application has been referred to Planning Committee by Councillor Azad who would like the committee to have the opportunity for a wider discussion on the merits of the application.

### **SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

The proposal is for the erection of a replacement two-storey dwelling plus basement level following demolition of existing dwelling.

### **PLANNING STATUS**

- Green Belt
- Surface Water Flood Risk (part of site)
- Thames Basin Heaths SPA Zone B (400m-5km)

### **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE planning permission.

### **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The proposal relates to a two-storey detached dwelling dating from the mid C20 which is built in a simple, traditional style. The dwelling occupies a large plot with mature trees and vegetation to the boundaries. Pyle Hill is characterised by large, individually designed detached dwellings in generously sized plots which gives a spacious and verdant appeal to the area. The proposal site is within the Green Belt.

### **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- PLAN/1997/0225 - Erection of one and two storey extensions to side and rear – Permitted 02.05.1997
- 80/0720 – First floor extension – Permitted 01.07.1980
- 78/1434 – Single storey extension – Permitted 01.12.1978
- 74/1031 – Alterations and extension – Permitted 01.12.1974
- 32954 – Alterations and extension – Refused 01.05.1974
- 2121 – Erection of a detached dwelling – Permitted 25.09.1947

## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

### CONSULTATIONS

- **Arboricultural Officer:** No objection subject to conditions.
- **Surrey Wildlife Trust:** No objection subject to conditions.

### REPRESENTATIONS

One objection and two representations in support of the proposal have been received.

The objection raises the following summarised concerns:

- Concerned about the loss of privacy and overlooking resulting from living areas being located at first floor level and the external staircase and balcony. This will be particularly pertinent when the trees lose their leaves in autumn and winter
- It is essential that the trees on the boundaries are retained

The representations in support raise the following summarised points:

- There is currently sufficient screening between properties which will be maintained in the future
- The existing property is no longer fit for purpose given the challenges of climate change and energy insecurity
- The modern design is fully in-keeping with the evolving street scene of Pyle Hill and would improve the overall appearance without detriment to the Green Belt

### RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

#### National Planning Policy Framework (2021):

Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development

Section 9 – Promoting Sustainable Transport

Section 11 – Making effective use of land

Section 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places

Section 13 – Protecting Green Belt Land

Section 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

#### Woking Core Strategy (2012):

CS1 – A Spatial Strategy for Woking Borough

CS6 – Green Belt

CS7 – Biodiversity and nature conservation

CS9 – Flooding and water management

CS18 – Transport and Accessibility

CS21 – Design

CS22 – Sustainable construction

CS24 – Woking's Landscape and Townscape

CS25 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

#### Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016):

DM2 – Trees and Landscaping

DM10 – Development on Garden Land

DM13 – Buildings in and Adjacent to the Green Belt

#### Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs):

Design (2015)

## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022)  
Climate Change (2013)  
Parking Standards (2018)

### Other Material Considerations:

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)  
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2015)  
The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017)  
The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006)  
Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended)

## **PLANNING ISSUES**

### Impact on Green Belt:

#### *Policy Context:*

1. The proposal site is in designated Green Belt and as such Woking Core Strategy (2012) policy CS6 'Green Belt', Woking Development Management Policies DPD (2016) policy DM13 'Buildings Within and Adjoining the Green Belt' and section 13 of the NPPF (2021) apply and these policies seek to preserve the openness of the Green Belt. The NPPF (2021) states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
2. The NPPF (2021) states that the erection of new buildings in the Green Belt is 'inappropriate development' with a limited number of exceptions which are listed in Paragraph 149. The NPPF (2021) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in 'Very Special Circumstances':

*"Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances...When considering any planning application, local planning authorities 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 resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations".*

3. One of the exceptions listed in Paragraph 149 is "*the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces*". The NPPF does not define the meaning of 'materially larger' however Woking DMP DPD (2016) policy DM13 sets out that the erection of buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate development with the exception of:

*"The replacement of buildings within the Green Belt (outside Mayford Village), where the proposed new building:*

- (i) is in the same use as the building it is replacing;*
- (ii) is not materially larger than the building it is replacing; and*
- (iii) is sited on or close to the position of the building it is replacing, except where an alternative siting within the curtilage demonstrably improves the openness of the Green Belt"*

4. The reasoned justification for policy DM13 goes on to state that:

## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

*“When assessing whether a replacement building is materially larger than the one it replaces the Council will compare the size of the existing building with that proposed, taking account of siting, floorspace, bulk and height. As a general rule a replacement building that is no more than 20-40% larger than the one it replaces will not usually be considered to be disproportionate, although this approach may not be appropriate for every site”.*

### Assessment:

5. The existing building is a two-storey detached dwelling dating from the mid C20 which has been incrementally extended over the years. The proposed replacement would be a large, two-storey dwelling which includes two separate first floor elements and a ramp leading to a garage and other accommodation at basement level.
6. The proposed increase in volume, floor area and footprint compared to the existing dwelling is set out below.

	Existing Dwelling	Proposed Dwelling (including basement)	Percentage Uplift
<b>Volume (Approx.)</b>	803m <sup>3</sup>	1,297.5m <sup>3</sup>	<b>61.5%</b>
<b>Floor Area</b>	241m <sup>2</sup>	390.5m <sup>2</sup>	<b>62%</b>
<b>Footprint</b>	151m <sup>2</sup>	220m <sup>2</sup>	<b>46%</b>

7. The proposal would result in a replacement dwelling which is approximately 61.5% greater in volume than the existing dwelling, 62% greater in floor area and 46% greater in footprint. This indicates that the proposed replacement dwelling would be materially larger than the existing and is therefore considered to constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The applicant's Green Belt calculations differ in some ways to the LPA's.
8. Notwithstanding the Green Belt calculations set out above, assessing the impact on Green Belt openness is not a simple mathematical or volumetric exercise. In Turner v SSCLG [2016] EWCA Civ 466 it was established that the concept of 'openness' is capable of having both a spatial and visual dimension and that when assessing the impact on openness, the decision maker should consider how the visual effect of the development would bear on whether the development would preserve the openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, current Planning Practice Guidance states that *“openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects”* (Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 64-001-20190722 Revision date: 22.07. 2019).
9. The existing dwelling adopts a relatively consolidated L-shaped footprint with a total overall depth from north to south of 18m. Whilst the proposed dwelling would be comparable in height to the existing, the proposed dwelling would adopt a roughly Z-shaped footprint which includes two separate first floor elements which are arranged on a north-south axis. The two first floor elements would have contemporary crown roof forms and would sit atop the ground floor element with a flat-roofed linking element with a roof terrace.

## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

10. The first floor elements would be 14.5m and 9.8m in length and would read as two visually distinct elements. The total depth of the proposed dwelling would be 27m, most of which would be at two-storey level. This depth, coupled with the two distinct first floor elements described above, is considered to result in a considerably elongated and overly bulky appearance and would extend the bulk, massing and volume of the development into the site considerably compared to the existing situation.
11. In addition to this, the proposed replacement dwelling also includes a basement level comprising a plant room, store, workshop and double garage. The basement would be accessed via a vehicle ramp on the south elevation. The ramp would be a relatively large and dominating feature on the dwelling and would be 8.2m in width and approximately 12m in depth and part of the dwelling would oversail the vehicle ramp. The basement level would be readily apparent from ground floor level and the below-ground volume of the proposed replacement dwelling has therefore been factored into the above calculations.
12. Overall, the proposal represents inappropriate development by reason of it being materially larger than the dwelling it replaces and also harms the intrinsic open character of the Green Belt. The Development Plan and national guidance require that the proposal should therefore be refused unless 'very special circumstances' exist which clearly outweigh the Green Belt harm and any other harm identified.

### *Whether Very Special Circumstances Exist:*

13. The applicant argues that the basement level should not be factored into the Green Belt assessment. S.55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is clear that "development" means the carrying out of building, engineering, mining or other operations in, on, over or *under land*" (emphasis added). Furthermore, as discussed above, the basement level and its associated engineering works would be a prominent feature of the dwelling and the subterranean level of accommodation and the ramp leading to it would be readily apparent, in addition to the considerable proposed above-ground development. In dismissing an appeal against a proposed replacement dwelling in the Green Belt elsewhere in the Borough (Appeal ref: APP/A3655/W/18/3210254), the Inspector concluded that the proposed above-ground development was materially larger but found that a proposed basement level with a ramp made the dwelling appear even larger: "*Whilst basement development is sometimes considered acceptable, in this case the access to the lower floors and extent of below ground walling that would also be visible would make the dwelling appear larger still.*"
14. The subterranean accommodation is considered to contribute towards the overall bulk, massing and volume of the dwelling and is considered an incongruously urbanising feature in this Green Belt location. The proposed basement level is considered to contribute towards the dwelling being perceived as materially larger than the existing.
15. The applicant draws attention to several planning decisions in the surrounding area which they feel justifies the proposed development. One of these is a recent appeal decision relating to a nearby proposed replacement dwelling at Hazels, Pyle Hill (PLAN/2021/0416). This was refused by the LPA partly on design and neighbour amenity grounds and partly as the replacement dwelling was considered materially larger than the existing and therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt. In allowing the subsequent appeal (Appeal ref: APP/A3655/W/21/3279153) the Inspector agreed that the proposal was inappropriate development in the Green Belt, however

## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

the Inspector found that Very Special Circumstances existed which clearly outweighed the harm to Green Belt openness. In that case, a realistic 'fall-back' position was considered to exist which comprised the existence of Prior Approvals for extensions, including the erection of an additional storey. The design of the proposed dwelling in that case was also considered a significant aesthetic improvement compared to the fall-back position. These factors were considered to constitute Very Special Circumstances which justified the permitting the proposal.

16. These circumstances do not exist with the current proposal as there is no realistic fall-back position for extensions. The existing dwelling is of a conventional tradition design and is unobtrusive in the street scene. The proposed development is not therefore considered to offer a significant aesthetic improvement compared to the existing. In any case, this factor alone is not considered to constitute a very special circumstance.
17. Nearby at South Paddock, Pyle Hill, a replacement dwelling was considered acceptable under permission ref: PLAN/2020/0559 which permitted a replacement dwelling which was approximately 58% greater in volume, 64% greater in floor area and 31% greater in footprint than the existing dwelling. However, this was in the context of a previous permission (PLAN/2019/1234) for a replacement dwelling which permitted a 54%, 33% and 31% increase in volume, floor area and footprint respectively. The later permission (PLAN/2020/0559) essentially infilled the valley roof permitted under PLAN/2019/1234 and therefore was not considered to result in a perceptible increase in volume, bulk and massing compared to what was previously permitted. These permissions were in the context of a further previous permission (PLAN/2018/1365) which was allowed at appeal (Appeal ref: APP/A3655/W/19/3232689). In this case the Inspector considered that the demolition of a large, detached outbuilding should be factored into the Green Belt calculations and considered that the proposal would consolidate development on the site, to the benefit of Green Belt openness. Again, this is not considered relevant to the current proposal as the proposal does not involve the demolition of multiple buildings or a more consolidated form of development.
18. The applicant also refers to permission ref: PLAN/2017/0083 at Ridge House, Pyle Hill however this relates to domestic extensions rather than a replacement dwelling and was therefore considered differently against Green Belt policy. Reference is also made to PLAN/2002/1051 and PLAN/2005/0615 however these were not determined under the current Development Plan and are not considered relevant.
19. Considering the points discussed above, the permissions and appeal decisions for replacement dwellings in the surrounding area are not considered comparable to the proposed development. Each case should be assessed on its own merits and in this case the proposal is considered to constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would result in unacceptable harm to Green Belt openness. There are not considered to be any Very Special Circumstances which would outweigh this harm.
20. The applicant also refers to the benefit of the removal of hardstanding on the site, however the amount of existing hardstanding is not considered excessive and is considered to have a very limited impact on Green Belt openness compared to the built development which is proposed.

### *Green Belt Conclusion:*

21. The proposed development would result in a replacement dwelling which is materially larger than the building it would replace and would impact detrimentally on the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal therefore represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would be harmful by definition and would impact

## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

detrimentally on the openness of the Green Belt. No Very Special Circumstances exist which would clearly outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt by reason of the proposal's inappropriateness and loss of openness and the further harm identified below. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Woking Core Strategy (2012) policy CS6 'Green Belt', Woking Development Management Policies DPD (2016) policy DM13 'Buildings Within and Adjoining the Green Belt' and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

### Impact on Character:

22. Section 12 of the NPPF (2021) states that “*The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities*” and that “*Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development...*” and requires proposals to “*add to the overall quality of the area...*”, to be “*visually attractive as a result of good architecture...*” and “*sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.*”
23. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that development should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land. Policy CS24 of states that ‘*development will be expected to...respect the setting of, and relationship between, settlements and individual buildings within the landscape*’ and to ‘*conserve, and where possible, enhance townscape character*’.
24. The existing dwelling to be demolished is not considered to be of particular architectural merit and therefore no objection is raised to its demolition. The proposed dwelling would adopt a distinctly contemporary design approach. The proposed dwelling would comprise two first floor elements with contemporary crown roofs which are distinct from each other and linked by a first floor flat roof and roof terrace above the rest of the dwelling at ground floor level. The dwelling would be finished in a mixture of brickwork and timber cladding and zinc roofing. The dwelling therefore adopts an unusual form and design although the design approach itself is considered to be distinctive and is considered to have merit.
25. The surrounding area is characterised by individually designed dwellings set in generously sized plots. The neighbour to the east at Wootton includes a distinctive two storey mono-pitched roof element with a modernist appearance. Nearby at Hazels on Pyle Hill to the south, permission has recently been granted at appeal for a two-storey replacement dwelling with a flat roof and a contemporary appearance (PLAN/2021/0416; Appeal ref: APP/A3655/W/21/3279153). In allowing the appeal, the Inspector noted that

*“The residential development at Pyle Hill is characterised by large detached, mostly two storey dwellings set within generous landscaped grounds. I observed that there were architectural differences in the form and materials. As such, coherence is principally derived from the verdant surroundings, broadly similar scale, spacing and their ordered relationship to the road. When viewed from Pyle Hill, this gives an impression of a sequence of impressive houses, each with an individual identity.*”

## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

*The proposed two storey replacement dwelling would reflect an unashamedly contemporary design approach different to most of the more conventional building types seen in the road. Nevertheless, it would respect the underlying important characteristics identified as it would be of a broadly similar scale to nearby residential development...*

*Moreover, the layout of the dwelling within its plot would broadly follow the established building line. This would maintain a similar set back from the road and ensure that the generous areas of garden were retained. It would also allow for balanced spacing between the upper floor of the proposed dwelling and those either side.*

*Within these parameters, given the spacious context, there is some room for individuality when it comes to the appearance and form of dwellings. The proposed dwelling would have strong clean lines that would be visually attractive and distinctive. Consequently, it would add interest to, and have a greater presence in the street scene..."*

26. There is considered to be an emerging context of individually designed and distinctive dwellings on Pyle Hill; the distinctive contemporary design of the proposed dwelling is considered consistent with this context. The key characteristic of the surrounding area is its spacious and verdant appeal. Whilst the replacement dwelling is considered considerably greater in bulk, scale and massing compared to the existing dwelling, the proposed dwelling would still sit within a large, established and spacious plot and mature trees and vegetation to the boundaries would be retained.
27. The design approach of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this context. However as discussed above, the proposed replacement dwelling includes a basement level. The basement would be accessed via a vehicle ramp on the south (front) elevation. The ramp and the engineering works necessarily associated with it would be a relatively large and dominating feature on the dwelling and would be 8.2m in width and approximately 12m in depth and part of the dwelling would oversail the vehicle ramp. The basement level and ramp would be readily apparent from ground floor level.
28. The subterranean accommodation and associated ramp are considered to have an overly contrived, engineered appearance. This type of basement accommodation is not found elsewhere on Pyle Hill and in this case is considered to appear as an incongruously urbanising feature in this Green Belt location.
29. The proposed development, by reason of the proposed basement accommodation and associated ramp, would result in an incongruous, contrived, urbanising and overly engineered form of development. to the significant detriment of the character of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Woking Core Strategy (2012) policies CS21 'Design' and CS24 'Woking's Landscape and Townscape', Supplementary Planning Document 'Design' (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

### Impact on Neighbours:

30. Woking Core Strategy (2012) policy CS21 'Design' requires development proposals to 'Achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, or an overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or outlook'. The Council's 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight' SPD (2022) sets recommended minimum separation distances for different forms of



## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

development including 20m for 'rear-to-rear' relationships and 10m for 'front/rear-to-boundary' relationships at two storey level.

31. The proposed replacement dwelling would sit within a large and established residential plot with mature trees and vegetation to the boundaries and the surrounding area features detached dwellings similarly set in large plots. The nearest neighbours are those at Kinkell to the north-west and Wootton to the east.
32. The proposed replacement dwelling would be located between 9m and 9.2m from the boundary with Wootton and this neighbour is positioned approximately a further 15.8m from the boundary. This separation distance is considered sufficient to avoid an undue overbearing or loss of light impact on this neighbour. The proposed dwelling would feature first floor side-facing windows which would serve as secondary windows to habitable rooms; these windows could therefore be required to be obscurely glazed with restricted opening by condition if the proposal were considered otherwise acceptable. A first floor roof terrace linking the two first floor elements is also proposed. This has the potential to result in overlooking and loss of privacy to Wootton however details of a privacy screen could be secured by condition if the proposal were considered otherwise acceptable.
33. The proposed replacement dwelling would be located 17.3m from the boundary with Kinkell to the north-west at its nearest point and this neighbour is positioned approximately a further 16m away from the boundary. The proposed dwelling features first floor west-facing habitable room windows and a roof terrace however the separation distances to this neighbour means that the proposal is not considered to result in an undue overbearing, loss of light or overlooking impact on this neighbour.
34. The proposed replacement dwelling would have a front-to-front relationship with neighbours on the opposite side of Pyle Hill to the south at Nettlecombe, Bay Tree House and Hazels. However, the proposal would be located in excess of 40m from the front elevations of these neighbours. The proposal is not therefore considered to result in an undue overbearing, loss of light or overlooking impact on these neighbours.
35. Overall, the proposal is therefore considered to result in an acceptable impact on the amenities of neighbours in term of loss of light, overbearing and overlooking impacts.

### Impact on Ecology:

36. The NPPF (2021) states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. This approach is supported by Circular 06/05 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation and is reflected in Policy CS7 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012). Bats and their roosts are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended). The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended) transpose the Habitats Directive into national law. Schedule 2 of the Regulations lists all species of bats as being European Protected Species. It is an offence to kill or disturb bats or their roosts. However, such actions can be made lawful through the grant of a license from Natural England, but only after it is satisfied that there are no satisfactory alternatives and that such actions will have no detrimental effect on the species concerned.
37. The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Roost Assessment and Bat Emergence/Re-entry Surveys and Mitigation Report. This includes bat emergence / re-entry surveys of the building which would be demolished. The surveys recorded a

## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

peak count of two common pipistrelle bats emerging from two different locations on the building along with moderate commuting and foraging activity around the building. The report identifies the roost as having a low conservation status and confirms that Bat Mitigation Class Licence (BMCL) will be required from Natural England to permit the works.

38. The application is also accompanied by a separate Ground Level Tree Assessment Report which assess the bat roosting potential of trees which would be removed. All of the assessed trees are identified as having low or no potential to support bats.
39. For the avoidance of doubt, there is a legal requirement under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) for the applicant to obtain a Mitigation Licence from Natural England prior to the carrying out of any activities that may kill, injure or disturb an individual or damages or destroys a breeding site or resting place of that individual. A planning condition requiring the applicant to acquire a licence from Natural England would not therefore be necessary as it is required by alternative legislation and secured by a separate permitting regime.
40. Overall, it is considered that there is a reasonable prospect of a licence being granted by Natural England. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not result in any significant or unacceptable harm to protected species, subject to compliance with the relevant legislation referenced above. The mitigation and enhancement measures identified by the applicant in the submitted ecology information could be secured by planning condition if the proposal were considered otherwise acceptable. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would accord with Policy CS7 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the NPPF (2021) and is considered to have an acceptable impact on ecology.

### Impact on Trees:

41. The proposal site has a large number of trees, predominately around the perimeter of the site, however none are protected. The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Report which details how trees would be protected during construction. Most trees are identified as being retained. Four trees are identified to be removed however these are all 'U' category trees which are identified for removal for safety reasons. The Council's Tree Officer raises no objection subject to compliance with the submitted information. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of the potential impact on trees.

### Highways and Parking Implications:

42. The proposal would utilise the existing access onto Pyle Hill and there is sufficient space to the frontage for at least 3x on-site car parking spaces in accordance with the Council's 'Parking Standards' SPD (2018). It is therefore considered that the proposal would have no significant adverse impact in terms of on-site car parking provision or highway safety.

### Sustainability:

43. The Planning and Energy Act 2008 allows LPAs to set energy efficiency standards in their Development Plan policies that exceed the energy efficiency requirements of the Building Regulations. However, such policies must not be inconsistent with relevant national policies for England. A Written Ministerial Statement to Parliament, dated 25 March 2015, set out the Government's expectation that such policies should not be used to set conditions on planning permissions with requirements above the

## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

equivalent of the energy requirement of Level 4 of the (now abolished) Code for Sustainable Homes - this is approximately 19% above the requirements of Part L1A of the Building Regulations. This is now reiterated in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Climate Change, which supports the NPPF. Therefore, whilst Policy CS22 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) sought to achieve zero carbon standards (as defined by the Government) from 2016, standards have been 'capped' at a 19% uplift in Part L1A Building Regulations standards in accordance with national planning policy and national zero carbon buildings policy. The LPA requires all new residential development to achieve as a minimum the optional requirement set through Building Regulations for water efficiency, which requires estimated water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day. Details of how the replacement dwelling would meet these requirements could be secured by condition if the proposal were considered otherwise acceptable.

### Local Finance Considerations:

44. The proposal would be liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The applicant has however submitted a self-build exemption form claiming relief from CIL. If the proposal were considered otherwise acceptable, the LPA would assess the application for exemption separately and the applicant would be required to submit a Commencement of Development Notice prior to any commencement of development.

### CONCLUSION

45. The proposed development would result in a replacement dwelling which is materially larger than the building it would replace and would impact detrimentally on the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal therefore represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would be harmful by definition and would impact detrimentally on the openness of the Green Belt. No Very Special Circumstances exist which would clearly outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt by reason of the proposal's inappropriateness and loss of openness and the harm identified to the character of the area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Woking Core Strategy (2012) policy CS6 'Green Belt', Woking Development Management Policies DPD (2016) policy DM13 'Buildings Within and Adjoining the Green Belt' and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
46. Furthermore, the proposed development, by reason of the proposed basement accommodation and associated ramp, would result in an incongruous, contrived, urbanising and overly engineered form of development to the significant detriment of the character of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Woking Core Strategy (2012) policies CS21 'Design' and CS24 'Woking's Landscape and Townscape', Supplementary Planning Document 'Design' (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
47. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

### BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Site visit photographs
2. Consultation responses
3. Representations

### RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason(s):

## 8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

01. The proposed development would result in a replacement dwelling which is materially larger than the building it would replace and would impact detrimentally on the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal therefore represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would be harmful by definition and would impact detrimentally on the openness of the Green Belt. No Very Special Circumstances exist which would clearly outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt by reason of the proposal's inappropriateness, its loss of openness and the harm identified to the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Woking Core Strategy (2012) policy CS6 'Green Belt', Woking Development Management Policies DPD (2016) policy DM13 'Buildings Within and Adjoining the Green Belt' and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
02. The proposed development, by reason of the proposed basement accommodation and associated ramp, would result in an incongruous, contrived, urbanising and overly engineered form of development. to the significant detriment of the character of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Woking Core Strategy (2012) policies CS21 'Design' and CS24 'Woking's Landscape and Townscape', Supplementary Planning Document 'Design' (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

### **Informatives**

01. The plans and documents relating to the development hereby refused are listed below:

EX\_000 (Site Location Plan) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
EX\_001 (Existing Site Plan) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
EX\_002 (Existing Floor Plans) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
EX\_003 (Existing East Elevation) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
EX\_004 (Existing South Elevation) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
EX\_005 (Existing West Elevation) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
EX\_006 (Existing North Elevation) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022

PR\_001 (Proposed Site Plan) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
PR\_002 (Proposed Basement Plan) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
PR\_003 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
PR\_004 (Proposed First Floor Plan) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
PR\_005 (Proposed Roof Plan) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
PR\_006 (Proposed North Elevation) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
PR\_007 (Proposed East Elevation) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
PR\_008 (Proposed South Elevation) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
PR\_009 (Proposed West Elevation) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022  
PR\_011 (Proposed Section through basement and ramp) received by the LPA on 11.03.2022

Preliminary Roost Assessment and Bat Emergence/Re-entry Surveys and Mitigation Report dated January 2022 prepared by Darwin Ecology received by the LPA on 23.02.2022

Ground Level Tree Assessment Report dated June 2022 prepared by Darwin Ecology received by the LPA on 01.07.2022

Arboricultural Survey Implications Assessment & Arboricultural Method Statement ref: RMT613 dated 21.02.2022 prepared by RMTTree Consultancy received by the LPA on 23.02.2022

## **8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Tree Protection Plan numbered RMT613-TPP prepared my RMTree Consultancy received by the LPA on 23.02.2022

Tree Constraints Plan numbered RMT613-TCP prepared my RMTree Consultancy received by the LPA on 23.02.2022

Planning Statement ref: FCL/500/P02 dated 22.02.2022 received by the LPA on 23.02.2022

Design and Access Statement dated 22.02.2022 received by the LPA on 23.02.2022