

JR

Appeal Decision

Site: Young Farmers Club Hut, Reigate Road, Ewell, KT17 3DH

Proposal: Demolition and replacement of former hut, with a one bedroom dwelling.

Application Number: 16/01679/FUL

Decision: Appeal dismissed ✓

Grounds for Refusal:

- 1. The development is contrary to National Green Belt policy in the NPPF, Policy DM3 of the Development Management Policy Document 2015, and Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy 2007 insofar as it is an inappropriate development that would have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt.***

Main Issues:

- whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and whether it would have a greater effect on the openness of the Green Belt;**
- if the development is inappropriate, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.**

The Inspector stated that “new buildings are to be regarded as inappropriate development, subject to a number of express exceptions outlined in paragraph 89. One such exception is for the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces. The appellant accepts that the proposed residential use is not the same as the extant use of the building and so this exception does not apply.

Openness is epitomised by the absence of buildings and whilst the existing building on the site has an impact in this respect, the proposed increase in volume and spread of mass and bulk across the site into areas currently absent of buildings would result in a greater impact on openness. In addition to the substantial extension proposed, the plans and supporting documents indicate that a garden area would surround the building, along with a parking area for two cars and boundary fencing. All of these matters combined lead me to conclude that the development would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

The proposal would erode the wider openness of the Green Belt and this would be at odds with its essential characteristics, openness and permanence. In addition, the development would conflict with the defined purposes of the Green Belt, specifically to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.terms”.

Conclusion: Substantial weight is accorded to Green Belt harm in terms of inappropriate development and the impact on openness.