

### ITEM 5.3

**Application:** 2021/886

**Location:** Arden Lodge, Pastens Road, Limpsfield, Oxted, Surrey, RH8 0RE

**Proposal:** Demolition of existing porch and single storey side extension.  
Erection of single storey rear extension, two storey side extension,  
new porch and associated alterations.

**Ward:** Limpsfield

*Constraints - GB, AGLV, AWOOD within 500m, Biggin Hill Safeguarding (91.4m),  
Source Protection Zones 2 & 3*

**Decision level: Planning Committee**

This application is reported to Committee as it has been referred to the Committee by Cllr Davies.

**RECOMMENDATION: PERMIT subject to conditions**

#### Summary

1. The proposed extensions and alterations would not be considered a progressive or disproportionate addition to the original building as it stood in 1968 and it would therefore not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The nature of the proposal would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area nor would it have any undue impact upon the residential amenities of the existing occupiers. The proposal would utilise existing parking provision and no harm has been identified. It is considered that the development would accord with the appropriate policies and it is therefore recommended that planning permission is granted, subject to conditions.

#### Site Description

2. The site, Arden Lodge, comprises of a detached, 2-storey dwelling at the south eastern end of Pastens Road. The site also has a garage building located to the south east of the dwelling and a further outbuilding to the south which is the subject of this application. The site is within the Green Belt area of Limpsfield and there are trees and planting on the northern and eastern boundaries of the site.

#### Relevant History

3. 2021/1410 – Erection of single storey rear extension (Lawful Development Certificate) – Lawful Development Certificate issued but works not yet implemented
4. 2020/2206 – Internal and external alterations to existing outbuilding – Permission granted
5. PA/2020/219 – Swimming pool and plant store – Advice given
6. 2012/358 – Demolition of existing side extension and erection of two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension – Permission granted 14/05/2012

7. 93/39 - Permission was granted on 23 February 1993 for the demolition of a car port and single storey extension and for the addition of a new family room and WC, construction of a new dormer in the front roof slope and for the erection of a detached double garage.
8. 78/331 - Permission was granted on 23 May 1978 for the erection of car port and hay store.
9. GOR/2923 - Permission was granted on 3 May 1957 for the erection of a garage and internal alterations.

### **Key Issues**

10. The site is located within the Green Belt and a key consideration is whether the proposal would constitute inappropriate development and, if so, whether very special circumstances exist that would clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm. Other key considerations are the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the amenities of neighbouring residents, biodiversity, highways/parking provisions and flooding.

### **Proposal**

11. The application seeks to demolish the existing porch and single storey side extension and erect a single storey rear extension, a 2-storey side extension to the south east facing elevation, a new front entrance porch with associated alterations.

### **Development Plan Policy**

12. Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 – Policies CSP1, CSP12, CSP18, CSP20, CSP21
13. Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 – Policies DP1, DP5, DP7, DP10, DP13
14. Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – Not applicable
15. Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2019 – Policies LNP1, LNP3, LNP5
16. Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2021 – Not applicable
17. Emerging Tandridge Local Plan 2033 - Policies TLP03, TLP08, TLP18, TLP32, TLP34, TLP47

### **Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPGs) and non-statutory guidance**

18. Tandridge Parking Standards SPD (2012)
19. Tandridge Trees and Soft Landscaping SPD (2017)
20. Surrey Design Guide (2002)

## **National Advice**

21. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)
22. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
23. National Design Guide (2019)

## **Statutory Consultation Responses**

24. County Highway Authority – The County Highway Authority consider that the proposed development would not have material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highway given that any additional parking demand would be minimal.
25. Limpsfield Parish Council – Objection: Substantial extension which detracts from the openness of the Green Belt; detracts from the original character and 'arts and crafts;' styling; Parish Council recommend reduction in scale and submission of Design Statement. Development is contrary to the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

## **Non-statutory Advice Received**

26. None received

## **TDC advice**

27. No advice sought or received

## **Other Representations**

28. Third Party Comments – The main issues raised are as follows:
  - Impact upon the Green Belt [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 31-33]
  - Impact upon AGLV and would be highly visible from public vantage points [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 36]
  - Design out of character with the original building [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 37-38]
  - Modern extension out of keeping/out of proportion with original building [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 37-38]
  - Contrary to the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan (LNP) with regards to design [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 37-38]
  - Loss of valued feature to the village, contrary to LNP [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 37-38]
  - Does not 'blend' with the main building as required by LNP3 [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 37-38]
  - Contrary to AONB Policy – Core Strategy Policy CSP20 [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 36]
  - Contrary to LNP3 – removes visual gaps to the open countryside [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 37-38]
  - Tile hanging replaced by timber cladding incongruous contrary to LNP Paragraph 4 [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 38]
  - Lack of clarity over materials [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 38]

- Balcony missing from drawings (which adds bulk to the extension) [OFFICER COMMENT: The balcony is shown on the latest set of drawings]
  - No permitted development fallback position as principal elevation is to the rear [OFFICER COMMENT: The development is assessed on its own merits as no fallback position has been established as the time of writing this report]
  - Submission in 2012 adds to the volume as it is linked to the main house [OFFICER COMMENT: Not part of the considerations under this application]
  - Impact upon neighbours (overlooking/loss of privacy) [OFFICER COMMENT: Addressed in Paragraphs 40]
  - No Design Statement submitted [OFFICER COMMENT: Not a requirement under this type of application submission]
  - Impact upon the view [OFFICER COMMENT: Not a material planning consideration]
29. There is one letter of support which considers that the proposal would have a positive impact upon the living conditions of future occupiers and the modern design would not detract from the original character of the building.

## **Assessment**

### Procedural note

30. The Tandridge District Core Strategy and Detailed Local Plan Policies predate the NPPF as published in 2021. However, paragraph 213 of the NPPF (Annex 1) sets out that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of the Framework document. Instead, due weight should be given to them in accordance to the degree of consistency with the current Framework.

### Impact upon the Green Belt

31. The pertinent issues to consider in determination of the proposed development is Paragraph 147 of the NPPF which advises that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 provides that such circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Paragraph 149 of the NPPF sets out a number of exceptions with the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt being regarded as inappropriate however, under criterion c), the extension or alteration of a building may be considered acceptable provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policies DP10 and DP13 reiterate this requirement for any enlargement of a building in the Green Belt to meet this criteria in order to be considered acceptable.
32. The proposal would involve the erection of a 2-storey side extension with balcony to a property within the Green Belt. The following calculation is based on the estimated volume increase of the original property:

Estimated volume (cubic metres):	
Original	808.75m <sup>3</sup>
Proposed	335.59m <sup>3</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>41.5% increase</b>

33. The proposed additions would be of a moderate scale resulting in an increase of approximately 41.5%. Such an increase in the Green Belt would be considered mathematically acceptable although a further visual assessment of the extensions will be required to be carried out to ensure that the character of the dwelling and the surrounding area are not unduly affected and the development does not further impact upon the openness of the area by reason of the additional bulk. Having assessed the size of the extension against the size of the original building and the resulting impact on the openness of the Green Belt, the development would not add a significant amount of bulk in comparison to the original dwelling. The extension would be subservient in height and scale to the original form of the dwelling and its scale and massing would not result in a visually or mathematically progressive or disproportionate addition to a building within the Green Belt as it stood in 1968. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in significant harm to Green Belt openness and would be acceptable from a Green Belt impact perspective. The proposal would not constitute inappropriate development and would conform to the provisions of Tandridge Local Plan Policies DP10 and DP13 and the NPPF 2021.

#### Character and Appearance

34. Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy requires that new development should be of a high standard of design that must reflect and respect the character, setting and local context, including those features that contribute to local distinctiveness. Development must also have regard to the topography of the site, important trees or groups of trees and other important features that need to be retained.
35. Policy DP7 of the Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies requires development to, inter alia, respect and contribute to the distinctive character, appearance and amenity of the area in which it is located, have a complementary building design and not result in overdevelopment or unacceptable intensification by reason of scale, form, bulk, height, spacing, density and design.
36. The site is within an Area of Great Landscape Value and as such, the proposal must meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CSP20 which seeks to preserve the special landscape character, distinctiveness or sense of place of the locality. The proposed extensions would not appear unduly prominent in the skyline. The side extension is located on sloping land which is shrouded by boundary trees and is therefore less visible from public viewpoints. The extension has been designed to a high standard in the Council's view and would therefore not be detrimental to the surrounding AGLV.
37. The building in question is not within a Conservation Area nor is it protected by any statutory designation and, although it may have been designed by a popular local architect, this does not afford it any protection from being extended provided it retains the characteristics of the original dwelling. In the Council's view the proposed extensions would represent a well-designed modern addition and would allow for a more user-friendly dwelling than the existing. The resulting additions would not be unduly detrimental to its character and would not be out of keeping with the design and architectural style of the original dwelling despite it being a modern addition. It would retain the original characteristics of the 'arts and crafts' style dwelling and the extensions would clearly differentiate the original building from the proposed additions. The site would sufficiently accommodate the extensions without appearing unduly

cramped or overdeveloped and the scale and positioning of the development would ensure that there would be no undue impact upon street scene.

38. The proposal would respect and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the area, would not have a detrimental impact upon the landscape/streetscape and would not result in the overdevelopment of the site. Third party comments refer to views of the countryside being lost as a result of this development however the scale of the extensions would be proportionate to the main dwelling and would not result in significantly cramped form which would substantially restrict views of the open countryside from public vantage points to sufficiently warrant the refusal of planning permission. The materials to be used include timber boards which, although not used on the original building, could help to differentiate the proposed extension from the original building therefore retaining the original design of the existing property. As the site is outside of the Conservation Area and the building is not a statutorily Listed Building, it is not considered that the chosen materiality would be significantly harmful to the character of the building or the surrounding area and the submission of appropriate materials can be controlled by planning condition. It is considered that the proposal would therefore conform to Core Strategy Policies CSP18 and CSP21, Local Plan Policy DP7 and Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan Policies LNP3 and LNP5 from a character and appearance perspective.

#### Residential Amenity

39. Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy requires that development must not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion, noise, traffic and any adverse effect. Criteria 6 – 9 (inclusive) of Policy DP7 of the Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 seeks to safeguard amenities of neighbouring properties, including minimum distances that will be sought between existing and proposed buildings.
40. The properties to the south and south west, namely Headland Cottage and Highstead, are in excess of 22 metres from the proposed extensions. The property to the north east, namely Pastens Cottage, has a number of large trees between the proposed extension and the property itself. The separation distance from the extensions and the Pastens Cottage would again exceed 22 metres which would prevent the extension from appearing overbearing or from overshadowing this property. The additional windows at first floor level would not directly overlook either Headland Cottage or Pastens Cottage due to the boundary treatment and the window orientation which face north east and south west. The the first floor windows would face the end of the rear garden of Pastens Cottage with there being an access road between Pastens Cottage and Arden Lodge and, given the separation distances from the neighbouring properties, there would be no resulting harm to neighbouring amenity with regards to overbearing or overshadowing impact, overlooking or loss of privacy. The development would not result in significant harm to the amenities of the surrounding properties and therefore the proposal would conform to Core Strategy Policy CSP18 and Local Plan Policy DP7.

#### Parking, Access and Highway safety

41. Policy CSP12 of the Core Strategy advises that new development proposals should have regard to adopted highway design standards and vehicle/other parking standards. Criterion 3 of Policy DP7 of the Local Plan also requires

new development to have regard to adopted parking standards and Policy DP5 seeks to ensure that development does not impact highway safety.

42. The proposal would not involve any alterations to the existing vehicular access/crossover and, although the proposal seeks to provide additional living accommodation, it is not considered that this would result in a significant increase in vehicles entering or leaving the site and therefore would not have a significant impact upon the highway network. There is ample parking on site to serve the resulting dwelling and therefore the development would conform to Core Strategy Policy CSP12 and Local Plan Policy DP5.

### Trees

43. No trees are required to be felled as part of this proposal. The development would occupy an area of existing hardstanding and built form which is sufficiently distant from existing important trees to prevent adverse harm to their health and future preservation. As a result, there would be no objection raised in this regard.

### Other matters

44. Given the positioning and scale of the proposed built form, it is not considered that the development would have a significant impact upon ecology or biodiversity on the site. The site is not within an area which is at risk of surface water flooding and the scale of development proposed, given the site characteristics, is unlikely to increase of on-site or off-site flooding. The proposal would not give rise to any other impacts.

### **Conclusion**

45. The proposed extensions and alterations would not be considered a progressive or disproportionate addition to the original building as it stood in 1968 and it would therefore not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The nature of the proposal would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area nor would it have any undue impact upon the residential amenities of the existing occupiers. The proposal would utilise existing parking provision and no other impact harm has been identified. It is considered that the development would accord with the appropriate policies and it is therefore recommended that planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions outlined below.

### CIL

46. This proposal is CIL not liable as the extensions would not exceed 100 square metres.
47. All other material considerations, including comments raised by third parties, have been considered but none are considered sufficient to change the recommendation.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**PERMIT subject to the following conditions**

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall start not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. This decision refers to the drawings numbered 01 Rev A, 02 Rev A, 03 Rev A, 04 Rev A, 05 Rev A and 06 Rev A scanned in on 22 July 2021. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved drawings. There shall be no variations from these approved drawings.

Reason: To ensure that the scheme proceeds as set out in the planning application and therefore remains in accordance with the Development Plan.

3. **No development shall take place above ground level** until details of the materials (including physical samples) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwellings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over the type and colour of materials, so as to enhance the development are appropriate to the character of the building and surrounding area in accordance with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014.

#### Informatives:

1. Condition 2 refers to the drawings hereby approved. Non-material amendments can be made under the provisions of Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and you should contact the case officer to discuss whether a proposed amendment is likely to be non-material. Minor material amendments will require an application to vary condition 2 of this permission. Such an application would be made under the provisions of Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Major material amendments will require a new planning application. You should discuss whether your material amendment is minor or major with the case officer. Fees may be payable for non-material and material amendment requests. Details of the current fee can be found on the Council's web site.