



GUILDFORD
B O R O U G H

www.guildford.gov.uk

Tom Horwood
Joint Chief Executive of Guildford and
Waverley Borough Councils

Dear Councillor

PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 18TH MAY, 2022

Please find attached the following:

Agenda No Item

9. **Late Sheets (Pages 1 - 4)**

Yours sincerely

Carrie Anderson, Senior Democratic Services Officer
01483 444078

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

18 May 2022

Late Representations

Since the last date for the submission of views on applications/matters before the Committee this evening, representations in respect of the under mentioned applications/matters have been received. The letters, copies of which will be available for inspection by councillors at the meeting, are summarised below.

Item 5 – Planning Applications

There are no late representations.

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

18 May 2022

Update/Amendment/Correction/List

Item 6 – Planning Appeal Decisions

Item 3: Greystones, Hogs Back Seale includes an allowed Costs decision. This is the incorrect appeal reference, the costs decision relates to the following appeal decision, date of decision 6 May 2022:

Mr T Shea

Land Rear of Christmas Hill and Crossways, Chinthurst Lane, Shalford, Surrey, GU4 8JS

20/P/02222 – The development proposed is for the erection of two detached dwellings with detached garages/outbuildings together with associated landscaping.

Appeal Dismissed – Delegated Decision – To Refuse

Summary of Inspectors Conclusions:

- the proposal would be in a residential area. Hence, the principle of development is accepted. However, whether the scheme is correctly described as a ‘cul-de-sac’ development or not, the proposal would be to the rear of the severed host garden and appear as a ‘backland’ type development. I noticed at my site visit that this arrangement would be at odds with the surrounding area which is predominantly typified by dwellings facing the main highway, including those facing towards ‘The Common’, for example, ‘Rusham End’. Indeed, House 1 of the proposal would not face the proposed access road but would be orientated towards the host dwelling. Moreover, irrespective of the materials used, the access road would extend some way into the garden plot which in my view would be incongruous with the mostly unfettered garden spaces nearby
- the bulky and extensive proposal would erode the spacious character of the garden space and the immediate surrounding area, including the fields to the south-east. Overall, the scheme would jar with the surrounding pattern of development that is predominantly characterised by individual road-facing properties on ample and leafy plots.
- I acknowledge that the appellant has relatively recently planted a number of trees on the site as part of an overarching landscape strategy. However, even if the longevity of the landscaping could be assured over time, while the landscaping would soften the dominant appearance of the proposed development to some extent, and reduce views into the site as emphasised in a previous appeal³, my firm position is that it would not be sufficient mitigation to outweigh the harm I have found above.

- The main parties agree that the appeal site is located in a 'less sensitive' part of the AGLV and is inset from the Green Belt boundary. At my site visit I followed the course of footpath 262 which is found to the south-east of the host garden and noted that verdant spring foliage does in part shield the site. However, the Cypress-type trees to the rear boundary of the site would be likely to bring the urban appearance and domestic paraphernalia of the proposed development more readily to the attention of walkers, particularly that of House 2 which extends the entire width of the site. What is more, the proposal is likely to be more visible in less leafy times of the year.
- Therefore, notwithstanding the findings of the appellants' Landscape Visual Appraisal, the voluminous scheme would erode the spaciousness of the site which in its current form helps the transition from the nearby built environment into the fields beyond. As set out above, on-site and other landscaping would soften the built form to some extent. Nevertheless, I cannot be certain if landscaping would be retained in perpetuity as overshadowing trees could come under threat by future occupiers, and some trees lining the site are in the ownership of third parties.