

### 3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

6e 19/0347

Ward: HE

**LOCATION:** Primrose Cottage, Bagshot Road, Woking, Surrey, GU3 3QB

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of a replacement 5 bedroom dwelling following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings (Amended Plans).

**APPLICANT:** Mr G Clarke

**OFFICER:** Barry Curran

---

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

The proposal has been called to Planning Committee at the request of Cllr Ashall as he does not consider the replacement dwelling to be materially larger.

#### **SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

The application seeks permission to demolish the existing dwelling and erect a two storey 5 bedroom dwelling.

#### **PLANNING STATUS**

- Green Belt
- Thames Basin Heaths SPA Zone B

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be REFUSED.

#### **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The application site occupies a plot located at the end of Storr's Lane, a residential cul-de-sac off Bagshot Road and within the defined Green Belt. Storr's Lane is sylvan in character with mature trees along with dense hedging lining the boundaries of each property throughout the area. The road frontage is dominated by extensive, mature trees and hedgerows which together with the wide grass verges diminish the scale of the narrow highway.

Dwellings along Storr's Lane are generally sizeable two storey buildings set on generous plots and enclosed by vegetated boundaries. A detached two storey dwellings occupies the application site and is sited close to the north-eastern boundary. The site boundaries are well screened with dense hedging with trees measuring 9-10 metres in height resulting in a secluded and confined site.

#### **PLANNING HISTORY**

DC 0026497 – 2 garage store & workshop – Permitted

### **3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

#### **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

The application seeks permission for the erection a Neo-Georgian style two storey dwelling which would cover a total width of approximately 16 metres, a depth of 13.8 metres and stand at 6.8 metres in height following removal of the existing 1960s style property along with a host of ancillary buildings surrounding the dwelling. The proposed replacement dwelling would be sited in a different orientation to the existing dwelling given its location at the terminus of a cul-de-sac with the principal elevation designed to address the highway.

#### **CONSULTATIONS**

Arboricultural Officer: Information submitted considered acceptable and should be complied with in full (27.06.19)

Highway Authority: No highway requirements (26.04.19)

#### **REPRESENTATIONS**

There has been a total of 9 third party letters of representation received in relation to the proposed development. 8 of these letters demonstrate support for the scheme while 1 letter raises concern over:

- The size and bulk of the replacement dwelling
- The architectural style of the dwelling which is considered out of character with the area

#### **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

National Planning Policy Framework 2019  
Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development  
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places  
Section 13 – Protecting Green Belt Land

Core Strategy Document 2012  
CS1 - A Spatial Strategy for Woking  
CS6 – Green Belt  
CS8 - Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area  
CS18 - Transport and accessibility  
CS21 - Design  
CS22 - Sustainable Design and Construction  
CS24 - Woking's Landscape and Townscape  
CS25 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Supplementary Planning Guidance  
Supplementary Planning Document 'Parking Standards' 2018  
Supplementary Planning Document 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight' 2008  
Supplementary Planning Document 'Design' 2015

#### **Development Management Policies DPD 2016**

DM2 – Trees and Landscaping  
DM12 - Self Build and Custom Build Houses  
DM13 – Buildings in and Adjacent to the Green Belt

Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy 2010-2015

### 3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

#### PLANNING ISSUES

1. The main issues to consider in determining this application are; the principle of development, design considerations and the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, impact on residential amenity, highways and parking implications, impact on trees, sustainability, the impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area having regard to the relevant policies of the Development Plan and local finance considerations.

#### Principle of Development/Impact on Green Belt

2. The National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS25 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 promote a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The proposal involves the replacement of a 1960s style dwelling on previously developed land and is located within an established residential area with a number of services in relatively close proximity and arterial routes to Woking and surrounding urban centres. Given this, the site's location and previous development land status is considered suitably sustainable albeit located in the defined Green Belt.
3. The Woking Core Strategy 2012 Policy CS6 seeks to prevent inappropriate development in the Green Belt and notes that its openness should not be compromised. Further to this, section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that *"The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence"* and that a Local Planning Authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

*'The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces'.*

4. The NPPF goes on to state at Paragraph 144 that *"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"*. These 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. Furthermore Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that the Green Belt serves five 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. It must therefore be considered whether the proposed replacement building is for the same use and whether the proposal results in a materially larger building than the dwelling it replaces. As existing, Primrose Cottage stands at 6.9 metres in height and includes a floorspace of 132.1 m<sup>2</sup> and volume of

### 3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

approximately 469 m<sup>3</sup>. As part of the application it is proposed to include the detached garage covering 51.3 m<sup>2</sup> and 155 m<sup>3</sup>, a detached annex building to the immediate rear of the dwelling covering 22.5 m<sup>2</sup> and 62.9m<sup>3</sup> as well as a wood store with 10.3 m<sup>2</sup> and 27 m<sup>3</sup> cumulatively equalling 216.2 m<sup>2</sup> and approximately 721 m<sup>3</sup>.

6. A summer house has also been submitted to be included as part of the buildings to be demolished, however, given the location of this summerhouse, outside of the residential curtilage, it is not considered appropriate to take this into account. In an appeal decision (ref: APP/A3655/W/16/3143089) on PLAN/2015/0895 which related to a replacement dwelling in the Green Belt, figures which included the dwelling and detached garage were used when calculating the floor area and volume percentages, as both the dwelling and garage were considered to contribute to the built form on site. In this sense, it is considered appropriate to accept the figures of the detached buildings and dwelling when calculating the built form on site.
7. The proposed dwelling would stand at 7.1 metres in height adopting a much more bulky profile and would cover a floor space of 328.3 m<sup>2</sup> including a volume of approximately 1117.3 m<sup>3</sup>. The figures are outlined in the table below for a clear indication of the increase over the original building;

|                                 |                                 |                                  |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Existing Floorspace (m2)</b> | <b>Proposed Floorspace (m2)</b> | <b>Uplift over Existing (m2)</b> |
| 216.2                           | 328.3                           | 52%                              |
| <b>Existing Volume (m3)</b>     | <b>Proposed Volume (m3)</b>     | <b>Uplift over Existing (m3)</b> |
| 721                             | 1117.3                          | 55%                              |

8. Policy DM13 of the Development Management Policies DPD 2015 indicates that as a general rule 20-40% increase will not usually be considered disproportionate, however, this approach may not be appropriate for every site. Based on the figures in the table above, the proposed replacement dwelling would result in a 52% increase in floorspace and 55% increase in volume which would clearly indicate that the proposal would be materially larger than the existing dwelling on these terms. The proposal would be considered materially larger and, as such, would amount to inappropriate development within the Green Belt contrary to provisions as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS6 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM13 of the Development Management Document DPD 2016.
9. Furthermore, whilst the proposed replacement building would be sited in the same position as the existing buildings, due to the increase in built form this would lead to a reduction in the openness of the Green Belt which would cause harm to the characteristics of the Green Belt. As discussed above, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should only be approved in very special circumstances (VSC).
10. One of the points put forward in the applicant's case for very special circumstances is that, while the dwelling would be materially larger in volumetric terms, the visual impact of a development is also a relevant consideration in terms of assessing impact on openness of the Green Belt.

### 3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

*Turner v. Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2016] EWCA Civ 466; [2017] 2 P&CR1 as well as *Samual Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster) v. North Yorkshire County Council* [2018] EWCA Civ 489 have been cited to support this argument stating that to exclude the visual impact, as a matter of principle, from a consideration of the likely effects of development on the openness of the Green Belt, would be artificial, unrealistic and wrong (in principle). This argument is supported by the case of *Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, R (on the application of) v Epping Forest District Council & Anor (Rev 1)* [2016] EWCA Civ 404 which clarifies that where development is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, effects on openness should not be considered any further. However, if development is inappropriate in the Green Belt, it is necessary to go on to consider effects on openness. Moreover, under Policy DM13, effects on openness are an integral part to assessing the inappropriateness or otherwise of replacement dwellings in the Green Belt and so must be considered.

11. It is argued that considering the location of the replacement dwelling along with its re-orientation to address the highway and the reduction in height of the ridge, the replacement dwelling would not only not harm the openness of the Green Belt but would serve to improve the openness of it. It is stated in Paragraph 17 of this supporting statement that *“the dwellinghouse will be relocated and rotated within the site to sit more centrally within the site than the existing dwellinghouse, resulting in a better relationship of the dwellinghouse to the entrance to the site than existing and creating a more appropriate rear amenity space to the dwellinghouse than existing. This will increase the perception of openness of the site”*. It is noted that the proposed dwelling would contain a lower ridge line to that of the existing but it also has to be borne in mind that a lowered ridge line can be somewhat misleading.
12. The existing dwelling is a modest sized two storey dwelling with a width of 8.5 metres at two storey level and a depth of 6 metres with single storey elements off its south-western and north-eastern elevations. Its positioning as well as the heavily vegetated boundaries lends itself to somewhat of a sheltered location and is currently indiscernible as you approach from Storr’s Lane. A Dutch barn style roof sits atop the main built element of the dwelling and tapers to a ridge width of 2.7 metres at its apex adopting the appearance of a rural farmhouse. The single storey buildings, which are proposed to be demolished as part of this application, each stand between 2 – 2.5 metres in height and demonstrate modest proportions and appear indiscernible in the context of the site considering its Sylvan setting and their proximity to the main dwelling. The dwelling, as such, is relatively small and unobtrusive with larger portions of the site open with small structures one would expect to see in a garden spread around the wider site.
13. The proposed dwelling, in contrast, adopts a rectangular form with no variations to its height or indeed much of its elevations spreading 16 metres in width and 13.8 metres in depth. The principal elevation would include a central two storey portico acting as the focal point on the building and the height of the dwelling would be 6.7 metres with no significant break or articulation to offer some relief to the built mass. Disproportionately large fenestration openings and a bulky block-like structure sited in a more central location much further back into the site, and therefore much further away from the shelter of the north-eastern vegetated boundary, combine to result in a replacement dwelling which is considered to have a significantly greater physical and visual presence that would make the site less open than it

### 3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

currently is. The re-orientation of the dwelling to face the entrance laneway and its positioning at approximately 35 metres from this entrance point is considered to be a design mechanism in an attempt to create a 'grand entrance' to the application site but rather carries with it a degree of urbanisation with large extent of hardstanding towards the front. This layout is vastly different to the current layout and fails to adhere to Policy DM13 which seeks to ensure that a new building "*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*"

14. It is considered, given the proposed replacement dwelling's re-positioning on the application site, which results in the building being much more pronounced, that the openness of the Green Belt is not improved but rather detrimentally infringed upon. The entrance to the site is via Storr's Lane to the East. The existing dwelling is orientated south-eastwards and therefore is largely not visible as you approach along this laneway. The proposed dwelling, however, is orientated eastwards to address the laneway and therefore would become apparent from much further outside the site than the current dwelling. As such, the re-positioning of the replacement dwelling does not serve to reduce the visual presence of the building as argued in the supporting statement but rather causes a significantly greater reduction to the openness due to its visual and physical presence.
15. It is argued that the dwellinghouse enjoys substantial and extensive rights under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for permitted development and that this, material consideration, can act as a Very Special Circumstance in the form of a fall-back position behind allowing the erection of a materially larger dwelling in the Green Belt covering an 52% increase in floorspace and 55% increase in volume. It is the Officer's opinion that the fall-back position does not represent that of a realistic one where it has not been demonstrated that any notional additions would realistically be implemented or whether they would provide the same level of accommodation as the replacement dwelling. Consequently, they are not considered to represent exceptional circumstances which outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt.
16. A number of comparators have also been submitted in support of the replacement dwelling which demonstrate significant uplifts in floor areas and volume. These examples, however, pre-date the Development Management Documents DPD 2016 and many pre-date the NPPF and Woking Core Strategy 2012. These examples are, therefore, afforded little weight.
17. Due regard has been given to the comments in the supporting statement relating to very special circumstances above. However, the position put forward that the building would not be materially larger, taking into account the visual impact as well as the volumetric uplift, is a subjective as well as an empirical argument and on both grounds the replacement dwelling is found to reduce the openness of the Green Belt. It should also be clarified that the Courts have also established that 'very special' is the converse of 'commonplace' (*Wychavon District Council v Secretary of State for the Communities and Local Government and Others* [2008] EWCA Civ 692) and if the argument presented in this instance is accepted, it could be argued that each property in the Green Belt with Permitted Development Rights or extant permissions could contend Very Special Circumstances regardless of

### 3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

circumstance. As such, no Very Special Circumstances have been demonstrated that would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and the extent of the replacement dwelling's height, width and depth will all combine to result in a considerably more prominent structure than the current dwelling. On this basis, the 52% increase in floor area and 55% increase in volume are considered increases which could not be supported and as such the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM13 of the Development Management Policies DPD 2016.

#### Impact on Character and Appearance of the Area

18. To comply with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012, the development should be designed so that it reflects the building lines, scale, height, proportions, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land. The host dwelling is a two storey detached dwelling dating from the late 1960s. The surrounding area is primarily populated by large detached two storey dwellings set within spacious plots. Dwellings are generally set back from the highway and on the adjacent cul-de-sac (Lawford's Hill Road) the dwellings follow a relatively linear grain of development with the principal elevations addressing this highway and dense hedging and trees contributing to the Sylvan setting. Dwellings throughout Storr's Lane and Lawford's Hill Road adhere to no built vernacular with a range of styles evident. The replacement dwelling would be re-orientated from the existing south-east facing principal elevation to a more conformist eastern facing principal elevation addressing the highway which ultimately terminates at the application site.
19. Measuring a width of 55 metres and a depth of approximately 160 metres, much of which falls outside of the residential curtilage, the application site covers an extensive plot contributing to a spacious area characterised by dense bands of trees and vegetation. The proposed scheme would result in the removal of the existing dwelling at Primrose Cottage which, while being an established part of Storr's Lane, does not hold a level of architectural merit that constitutes an exceptional building. Erection of this Neo-Georgian dwelling, although not a typical building style of the area, is considered to tie in with the varied styles evident. Standing at a height of 6.6 metres with a width of 16 metres and depth of approximately 13.8 metres, the proposal is considered to occupy a plot which can accommodate it with ease without dramatically reducing the amenity space and is seen to stand in harmony with the dwellings in the wider area conforming to the overarching theme of sizeable dwellings on spacious plots.
20. As existing, the dwelling at Primrose Cottage is positioned at a skewed angle to the highway facing south-eastwards with a number of ancillary outbuildings including an annex and garage positioned in close proximity to the dwelling. Under this application, the replacement dwelling is proposed to be re-orientated and set back from the site entrance by approximately 35 metres, a distance which is significantly further than the existing dwelling albeit there is a defined building line at the terminus of the highway. The dwelling would increase the footprint and indeed visual presence of the dwelling on site considering this re-orientation over the existing dwelling which measured approximately 17 metres in width and a modest 6 metres in depth increasing the footprint by it by 7.8 metres in depth (although the replacement dwelling also replaces the existing detached single storey garage and annex) and

### 3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

although the dwelling may be 0.3 metres lower in overall height, the adoption of recessed mansard roof behind a parapet adds significant amounts of bulk and mass to the built form which would appear much more bulky in comparison to the existing Dutch barn style roof which adopts a more slender tapered profile. Furthermore, the consolidation of development on site is perhaps misleading in this instance as the existing ancillary buildings to be removed as part of this application are all single storey in height with either shallow pitched roofs or flat roofs.

21. The replacement dwelling incorporates a Neo-Georgian style of architecture which is quite singular in the context of Storr's Lane, although one other dwelling in the vicinity adopts a Georgian appeal (Courtenay House, Lawford's Hill Road). The design of the replacement dwelling is considered to blend acceptably into the surrounding environment and although it incorporates a relatively singular design, the varied styles evident in the vicinity of the site allows for such a design without appearing alien. The square building demonstrates a classic design with symmetrical elevations contributing to its balanced composition whilst adopting features which are prevalent in the area which contribute to the character. Design elements such as multi-panned portrait windows with feature brickwork and a focal gable on the principal elevation. The overall appearance of the replacement dwelling is of a symmetrical Neo-Georgian building with mansard roof, well balanced facades which respects the characteristics of spacious sites with large amenity spaces in the vicinity.
22. This style of dwelling, whilst not an underlying characteristic of Storr's Lane, is considered to contribute to the varied styles here and is seen to stand in harmony with the neighbouring properties, particularly Courtenay House. As such, the proposal is in accordance with Policies CS21 and CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM12 of the Development Management Policies DPD 2016 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
23. While the development may be acceptable, in terms of its impact on character, this does not outweigh the in principle objection and harm the replacement dwelling would have on the openness of the Green Belt with no Very Special Circumstances advanced which are considered appropriate.

#### Impact on Residential Amenities

24. The replacement dwelling will be positioned in a more central location on the application site set away from the current position along the north-eastern boundary. As previously stated, the character of the area is of large detached dwellings set on generous plots with ample separations between dwellings and the boundaries, many of which consist of mature trees standing in excess of 10 metres in height.
25. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 advises that proposals for new development should 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 properties to the North within The Fairway are sited in excess of 120 metres from the proposed replacement dwelling and are not considered to be materially affected as a result of the development. Therefore, the main dwellings to consider in assessing the impact of the proposal on neighbouring

### 3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

amenities are; Courtenay House and Wildacre to the South along Lawford's Hill Road and The Tree House to the north-east along Storr's Lane.

26. Regarding Courtenay House and Wildacre to the South, the replacement dwelling would be set away from the southern site boundary by approximately 18 metres at its closest point. The replacement dwelling is orientated towards the East addressing the entrance point and separated from these neighbouring sites by a dense bank of mature trees standing in excess of 12 metres in height providing a natural screen to the application site. Accordingly, it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact on the residential amenities of the owner/occupiers of Ridge House.
27. In terms of The Tree House to the East of the application site along Storr's Lane, the replacement dwelling would be in excess of 110 metres from this dwelling and separated by a band of trees in excess of 12 metres in height which is considered sufficient to ensure no significant adverse impact on the amenities of the owner/occupiers of The Tree House.
28. For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the proposed dwelling is acceptable in terms of its relationship with neighbouring properties and would safeguard the outlook, amenity, privacy and daylight of existing and future occupiers of existing dwellings, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight' 2008.

#### Highways and Parking Implications

29. The Supplementary Planning Document 'Parking Standards' 2018 recommends a maximum of 3 parking spaces per dwelling of 5 or more bedrooms. A significant level of hard-standing is proposed to the front of the replacement dwelling with adequate turning and additional parking available to the front and side of the property. This proposal would utilise the existing site access and driveway on site with space to meet the minimum standards comfortably.
30. The proposal therefore accords with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012, Supplementary Planning Document 'Parking Standards' 2018 and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
31. While the development may be acceptable, in terms of its impact on neighbours, this does not outweigh the in principle objection and harm the replacement dwelling would have on the openness of the Green Belt with no Very Special Circumstances advanced which are considered appropriate.

#### Impact on Trees

32. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 requires proposals to incorporate landscaping, including the retention of any trees of amenity value and other features. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2016 sets out that the Council will not normally permit development proposals which would result in the loss of trees of amenity value. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Documents DPD 2016 states that the Local Planning Authority will "require any trees

### 3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

which are to be retained to be adequately protected to avoid damage during construction”.

33. There are mature trees within, and adjacent to, the application site and in particular in close proximity to the proposed replacement dwelling which hold significant amenity value and to contribute to the sylvan and rural character of the area. Arboricultural Information carried out by SouthOaks Arboricultural Consultancy has been submitted as part of the application. The Council's Arboricultural Officer has been consulted on this information and finds it to be acceptable and comments that it should be carried out in accordance with this info including a pre-commencement on-site meeting. Had the application otherwise been considered to be acceptable, a planning condition would have been recommended to secure this.

#### Sustainability

34. Policy CS22 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) requires all new residential development on previously developed land to meet the energy and CO<sup>2</sup> and water components of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 from 1 April 2016.
35. However on 25th March 2015 a Written Ministerial Statement titled 'Planning Update' was delivered to Parliament by the then Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. This Written Ministerial Statement has effectively repealed the Code for Sustainable Homes subject to interim arrangements; consequently, had the application otherwise been considered acceptable, an appropriately worded condition would have been recommended to address this change in circumstance and ensure the development achieved a water consumption standard of no more than 105 litres per person per day indoor water consumption and not less than a 19% CO<sub>2</sub> improvement over the 2013 Building Regulations TER Baseline (Domestic).

#### Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

36. The proposed development lies beyond the 400m threshold but within 5 kilometres of the SPA boundary which provides a protected habitat for ground nesting birds with new residential developments capable of adversely affecting the SPA. As the proposal constitutes a replacement dwelling, however, it can be determined that it will have no significant impact on the SPA.

#### Local Finance Considerations

37. CIL is a mechanism adopted by Woking Borough Council which came into force on 1st April 2015, as a primary means of securing developer contributions towards infrastructure provisions in the Borough. In this case, the proposed development results in an additional 145 sq. metres residential floor-space thus would be liable for a financial contribution under Community Infrastructure Levy. CIL is to be charged on the 'gross internal floor space' of proposed development over 100 sq. metres and given the location, scale and nature of development, this proposed development would be liable at a rate of £125 per sq. metre on 145 sq. metres. This equates to a contribution fee of £22,377.40 (including 2019 Indexation).

### **3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

38. It is noted, however, that the application is a self-build dwelling and would therefore be exempt provided they meet the criteria laid down by Regulations 42A and 42B of The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2014. A Self Build Exemption Claim form has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority with a commencement form and CIL Assumption of Liability form required prior to the commencement of development in the event of an approval.

#### **Conclusion**

39. The proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is, by, definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Furthermore, the circumstances advanced in support of allowing the materially larger replacement dwelling are not considered to amount to Very Special Circumstances and therefore do not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness and the extent of the replacement dwelling's height, width and depth will all combine to result in a considerably more prominent structure than the current dwelling.

40. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to provisions outlined in Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS6 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM13 of the Development Management Document DPD 2016 and is accordingly recommended for refusal.

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

1. Site visit photographs
2. Arboricultural Officer's response (27.06.19)
3. County Highway Authority's response (26.04.19)
4. 9 third party letters of representation

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt, which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Furthermore, the proposal would significantly harm the openness of the Green Belt. The circumstances advanced in support of allowing the materially larger replacement dwelling are not considered to amount to Very Special Circumstances and therefore do not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness and the extent of the replacement dwelling's height, width and depth which all combine to result in a considerably more prominent and bulky structure than the current dwelling. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS6 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM13 of the Development Management Policies DPD 2016 and Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

### 3 SEPTEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

#### **Informatives:**

1. The Council confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

2. The plans relating to the development hereby refused are numbered / titled:

Drawing No. 02 (Amended Plan)(Received 25.07.19)

Drawing No. 15 (Amended Plan)(Received 19.06.19)

Drawing No. 16 (Amended Plan)(Received 19.06.19)

Drawing No. 13 (Amended Plan)(Received 19.06.19)

Drawing No. 14 (Amended Plan)(Received 25.07.19)