

## Planning Committee

6 January 2021

### Planning Appeal Decisions

The following appeal decisions are submitted for the Committee's information and consideration. These decisions are helpful in understanding the manner in which the Planning Inspectorate views the implementation of local policies with regard to the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015 - 2034 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012 and other advice. They should be borne in mind in the determination of applications within the Borough. If Councillors wish to have a copy of a decision letter, they should contact

Sophie Butcher (Tel: 01483 444056)

1.	<p><b>Mr Ian Milne</b> <b>Bramcombe, Flexford Road, Normandy, Guildford, Surrey, GU3 2EF</b></p> <p><b>19/P/01865</b> – The development proposed is erection of two dwellings and associated works following demolition of existing outbuildings.</p> <p>Officer Recommendation: To Refuse Planning Committee: 29 January 2020 Decision: Refused</p> <p><b>Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area;</li><li>• The effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of future occupiers and those of 1 and 2 Laureldene, with particular regards to overlooking and overbearing; and the effect of the proposed development upon the integrity of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA).</li><li>• The appeal site comprises the substantial rear garden of a large detached, two storey property. The site is generally open, with the exception of a number of single storey residential outbuildings.</li><li>• Surrounding developments comprise a mix of single and one and a half storey dwellings. Buildings are generally detached properties, sitting within relatively generous, linear plots, with reasonable spaces between the dwellings.</li><li>• In the immediate area, development generally faces onto the surrounding main estate roads. An exception to this is Laureldene, which is a development of four bungalows, adjacent to the east of the appeal site, located to the rear on Flexford Road.</li><li>• The proposed dwellings would sit within their own plots, the size of which would be comparable to surrounding development.</li><li>• The plot size of the host dwelling, whilst considerably reduced from its existing size, would also be in keeping with those around it.</li><li>• The footprints of the proposed dwellings would be generally similar to those of the surrounding.</li><li>• Existing boundary treatments would be retained and supplemented through additional planting, which would maintain the verdant character of the area.</li><li>• The layout of the proposed dwellings would ensure that the proposal respects the overall grain of surrounding development and would therefore, not represent a cramped or overly contrived form of development.</li></ul>	<p><b>*ALLOWED</b></p>
----	--	------------------------

- In this respect, the proposal would not be out of keeping with the general pattern of surrounding development.
- The orientation of the dwellings would be at odds with the layout of the general pattern of surrounding development.
- However, due to their position at the rear of Bramcombe and the screening provided by other existing properties and surrounding landscape, with the exception of limited views along the new access road, the dwellings would not be readily visible when viewed from surrounding public viewpoints.
- Therefore, in the context of the location and nature of the site and the presence of surrounding development, on its own, this would not amount to a justifiable reason to withhold planning permission.
- The access to the appeal site would be via a relatively long and, in places, narrow road, which would run between the host property and Little Orchard. Whilst the introduction of the access would create a new feature that would be visible within the streetscene, due to the design approach and the proposed landscaping, it would maintain the open aspect across the front, and therefore would not significantly effect the character and appearance of the area.
- I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not significantly effect the character and appearance of the area, and in this respect, is in accordance with policy G5 of the Local Plan 2003, Policy D1 of the adopted Local Plan 2019, and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
- Due to the position of the proposed dwellings within their plots, and the size of the gardens of the neighbouring properties at 1 and 2 Laureldene, the proposed dwellings would be in excess of 20m away from the nearby existing buildings.
- Given the distance and despite the proposed properties being taller than the neighbouring dwellings, the proposal would not result in any significant overbearing effect upon surrounding residential properties.
- The proposed buildings would be located sufficient distance away from neighbouring dwellings to ensure that there would be no adverse loss of light to neighbouring properties.
- In terms of privacy, due to the orientation of the proposed dwellings and the positioning of the first-floor windows, there would be little direct overlooking of the adjoining neighbouring properties. Furthermore, existing boundary landscaping would be retained, which would provide further screening.
- With regards to noise from additional traffic movements, information has been provided by the appellant in the form of a noise assessment and a revised plan showing the provision of an acoustic fence along a portion of the western boundary. The delivery of appropriate acoustic mitigation can be controlled via a planning condition.
- Turning to the living conditions of future residents, due to the position of the dwellings on the site, the rear of plot 1 would face towards the front elevation of plot 2. However, the properties are positioned at angles within their plots and are offset, so as not to be directly facing each other, with a distance of about 19m between them. As a result, it is considered that the relationship between the proposed properties would not result in any material impact upon the living conditions of future residents.
- I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not materially effect the living conditions of surrounding or future residents and, in this regard, accords with Saved Policy G1(3) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 and the Framework.
- The proposed development would not harm the integrity of the SPA and, in

	<p>this respect in accordance with policy P5 of the Guildford Borough Council Local Plan Strategy and Sites 2015-2034 and saved policy NRM6 of the South East Plan and the Framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions.</li> </ul>	
2.	<p><b>Appeal A</b>  <b>Ms Sarah Conte</b></p> <p><b>Appeal B</b>  <b>Mr James Gosney</b>  <b>4 West End Cottages, High Street, Ripley, Woking, GU23 6AD</b></p> <p>Appeal A is made by Ms Sarah Conte and Appeal B is made by Mr James Gosney, both against an enforcement notice issued by Guildford Borough Council.</p> <p>Appealed against an enforcement notice issued on 25 June 2020. The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission the carrying out of operational development comprising the erection of a timber building on the land in the approximate location shown on the plan. The requirements of the notice are i) demolition of unauthorised building in its entirety and ii) remove the resultant materials and waste from the land.</p> <p><b>Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main issues are whether the building amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ripley Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Policy P2 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Sites and Strategy 2019 says that construction of new buildings in the Green Belt will constitute inappropriate development, unless the buildings fall within the list of exceptions identified by the National Planning Policy Framework. Those exceptions include limited infilling in villages.</li> <li>• There is a continuously built-up frontage for much of the southern side of the High Street. However, between the pair of semi-detached houses at Inchcape and Abbotsford and those at Grandis Cottages, the continuity is interrupted by an access road which serves 1-6 West End Cottages, the frontages of which face that road, and thus here there is not a continuous built-up frontage.</li> <li>• However, the second limb of the definition also includes 'infilling of small gaps within built development' and I consider that this applies here. The building lies within the small gap between the terrace on the west side of West End Cottages and the dwelling at 1 Grandis Cottages, and thus I consider that it infills a gap within built development. Accordingly, the building does not constitute inappropriate development.</li> <li>• As the development is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it is unnecessary to consider the effect on openness, as it is implicit in its inclusion as an exception to inappropriateness that such a building will have some effect on openness and possibly the other purposes for including land within the Green Belt. I also find no conflict with LP Policy P2.</li> <li>• The site lies within, and on the edge of, the Ripley Conservation Area. I consider that the building appears as an incongruous structure, which is starkly at odds with the character and appearance of the conservation area and that it fails to preserve or enhance these qualities. Although on its own it is a well-designed building, it fails to respect its context and local</li> </ul>	<p><b>*APPEAL A  ALLOWED/  APPEAL B  NOT  CONSIDERED</b></p>

	<p>character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It therefore conflicts with LP policies D1 and D3 which respectively deal with place-shaping and the historic environment. It also conflicts with Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 policies HE7 and G5(2), which in turn deal with development in conservation areas and the scale, proportion and form of new development.</li> <li>• The harm that I have found to the significance of the conservation area is less than substantial and that harm has to be weighed against any public benefits of the development. However, in this case there are no public benefits which have been identified by the appellants, and none are apparent to me.</li> <li>• On balance, I find that the route of granting planning permission subject to conditions in respect of colour and the retention of planting would be clearly preferable to the carrying out of what could be a larger building under permitted development provisions, without the ability to address colour or landscaping. This is a material consideration of great weight, which outweighs the conflict I have found with the development plan. I shall therefore grant permission and impose conditions.</li> <li>• Appeal B and the grounds f) and g) on Appeal A do not therefore fall to be considered.</li> </ul>	
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Mr Paul Davies</b>  <b>Old Oak Cottages, Surrey Gardens, Effingham, Surrey, KT24 5HH</b></p> <p><b>20/P/00407</b> – The development is a new garden room.</p> <p>Delegated Decision – To Refuse</p> <p><b>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the garden room on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and local area.</li> <li>• The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling on a long but relatively narrow plot, in a predominantly residential area with woodland to the rear. The garden room is sited towards the rear of the plot and is a single storey building under a pitched roof, with raised decking in front.</li> <li>• The outbuilding is sizable, particularly in terms of its length and width and therefore overall footprint. However, given its siting towards the rear of the plot, with a generous amount of garden area in between the main house and the outbuilding, it appears as a domestic outbuilding. The height of the garden room together with the timber cladding also re-inforce its appearance as a domestic outbuilding. Given all these factors relating to siting, height and materials it does not in my view compete with the scale and form of the main dwelling and does not appear visually over prominent or out of proportion in relation to the existing dwelling on its plot.</li> <li>• Given my findings both with regard to the relationship of the garden room with the existing dwelling and plot, as well as being compatible with the general pattern of development in the surrounding area, I am also satisfied that it does not harm the character and appearance of the local area.</li> <li>• I therefore conclude there is no harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and local area from the garden room, as built.</li> <li>• There is no conflict with policies G1 and G5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 and the National Planning Policy Framework, especially Section 12, all of which, seek for new development to respect the local context.</li> <li>• Although not referenced in the Council’s refusal notice, the Council has</li> </ul>	<p><b>*ALLOWED</b></p>

	<p>referred to policy EH-H7 of the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan 2018, although it appears that the policy primarily relates to the development of new dwellings, which is not relevant in this case. Nonetheless I see no conflict with the East Horsley Design Code in so far as it is relevant to this development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I do not agree with the concerns raised that the new garden room could become an independent dwelling. The rear access referred to is via woodland and did not appear to me, at the time of my site visit to offer a means of independent access to the building, sufficient to serve a separate dwelling. Moreover, this issue can be addressed by means of the imposition of an appropriate condition to require the building to remain in use incidental to the main dwelling.</li> <li>• As the garden room is already in place, the standard conditions do not apply. However, in view of the concerns raised, I shall impose a condition to require the use of the garden room to remain incidental to the main dwelling.</li> <li>• I therefore conclude that the appeal shall be allowed.</li> </ul>	
4.	<p><b>Mr Simon Chambers</b>  <b>Lynsted, Clandon Road, West Clandon, GU4 7UW</b></p> <p><b>20/P/00837</b> – The development proposed is erection of detached garage/carport.</p> <p>Delegated Decision – To Refuse</p> <p><b>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main issue is whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any other relevant development plan policies.</li> <li>• The appeal property comprises a large, detached two storey dwelling which forms part of a loose-knit line of dwellings on the west side of Clandon Road. It lies outside of any defined settlement boundary and within the Green Belt. The proposal is a detached timber-framed garage/carport, which would be sited on an area of grass to the front of the house.</li> <li>• The Council considers that the proposal is a new structure separate from the main dwelling, and that outbuildings are not considered to comprise an extension to the main dwelling for the purposes of the Green Belt policy and should be treated as entirely new buildings.</li> <li>• Neither national or local policy make any specific reference to outbuildings or other ancillary domestic buildings as not being inappropriate development within the Green Belt.</li> <li>• However, the appellant claims that a detached domestic outbuilding could be regarded as part of the dwelling, and that for the purposes of planning policy, garages or domestic outbuildings are to be considered as an extension to the dwelling.</li> <li>• I concur with the appellant in respect of this matter, since the proposed building would be sited within the existing residential curtilage of the property, and would be positioned close to the house and an existing on-site parking area, and would be directly associated with both in terms of its use. It would also be accessed via the existing site vehicular access.</li> <li>• Taking account of its function, the immediate proximity to Lynsted and the clear and direct relationship with the main house, the proposed garage/carport can reasonably be treated as an extension when applying</li> </ul>	* <b>ALLOWED</b>

	<p>Green Belt policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evidence before me is that the original dwelling has been extended by virtue of a part single and part two storey addition, following demolition of a garage and outbuildings, that resulted in a 22% increase in floorspace, under planning application 11/P/02215 which was allowed at appeal. The appeal Inspector considered that this did not represent a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling.</li> <li>• Based on the appellant's calculations, the proposed garage/carport would have a floor area of about 28sq m, which would amount to a 29% increase in the floorspace of the original dwelling. Based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to dispute these figures.</li> <li>• The building would have a pitched roof, but its scale would be modest when compared to the form, bulk and height of the large main house. Taking these factors together, I find that the proposal would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling.</li> <li>• I conclude that the proposal would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt, having regard to Policy P2 of the LPSS and the Framework.</li> </ul>	
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>EE Ltd</b>  <b>Thornet Wood Stables, Lower Farm Road, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5JG</b></p> <p><b>20/P/00480</b> – The development proposed is the installation of 1No. 27.5m high Swann 30H lattice tower, with 3No. antennae's, 2No. 0.6m dishes, 2No. ground-based equipment cabinets, and ancillary development thereto. Installed on a 10.0m x 10.0m compound within 1.8m high chain-link fence.</p> <p>Delegated Decision – To Refuse</p> <p><b>Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main issues are whether or not the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the NPPF 2019 and any relevant development plan policies.</li> <li>• The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt;</li> <li>• The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and</li> <li>• If the proposal would be inappropriate development, whether any 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.</li> <li>• The appeal site is distinctly separate from the closest areas of built residential development and from the railway line. It is set within a context of open countryside comprising fields with boundary trees and hedging.</li> <li>• The proposal would result in the loss of spatial openness through the introduction of a mast and associated equipment cabinets and a compound, which would cover currently undeveloped grassland with built development.</li> <li>• Although the proposal would be sited close to a landscaped boundary comprising hedging and several trees, this would only partially screen the development. The height of the proposed lattice tower means that it would markedly project above the boundary landscaping and adjacent open fields.</li> <li>• The proposal would lead to a loss of spatial and visual openness. As such it would fail to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, one of the five purposes of the Green Belt, and would not comply with the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.</li> </ul>	<p><b>DISMISSED</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The visually prominent and utilitarian appearance of the lattice tower would detract from the rural context of the site and its immediate surroundings of open fields, trees and hedges.</li> <li>• It would represent a stark and incongruous intrusion of built development of a height and scale which would be noticeably greater than those of the closest trees.</li> <li>• I am not persuaded that the visual impact is sufficiently minimised by the light permeable lattice design, since the structure would nonetheless be bulky in appearance, and this would be compounded by the antennae and dishes at the top.</li> <li>• I am not persuaded that the visual impacts arising from the design, height and siting of the structure could be overcome by using a zinc galvanised or other colour finish.</li> <li>• I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Local Plan Policy D1, which requires new development to achieve a high-quality design that responds to the distinctive local character of the area in which it is set.</li> <li>• The appeal scheme represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt as defined by the Framework, which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.</li> <li>• I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.</li> </ul>	
6.	<p><b>EE Ltd</b>  <b>Land South East of Ripley Road, East Clandon, Guildford, GU4 7SH</b></p> <p><b>20/P/00247</b> – The development proposed is described as the installation of a 30m high telecommunications Swann Lattice mast with three antennae's, two 0.6 dishes, two ground-based equipment cabinets, six Remote Radio Units and ancillary development thereto to be installed within a compound with a 2.1m high palisade fence.</p> <p>Delegated Decision – To Refuse</p> <p><b>Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main issues of the appeal are whether the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt;</li> <li>• The effect on the development on the character and appearance of the area, and;</li> <li>• Whether, in the event that the development is deemed inappropriate, any other material considerations advanced in support of the development are sufficient to clearly outweigh any harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm, such as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.</li> <li>• The proposed development does not fall within any of the exceptions listed within the Framework. Consequently, in not complying with any of the listed exceptions, the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. According to paragraph 143 of the Framework this is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt, and should only be approved in very special circumstances.</li> <li>• There is conflict with Policy P2 of the Local Plan which amongst other things seeks to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development. The proposed development would also be contrary to the Framework, which also seeks to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development,</li> </ul>	<b>DISMISSED</b>

	<p>preserve its openness and permanence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development includes a 30m lattice tower set against the backdrop of mature trees of a lower height.</li> <li>• I have carefully considered the development and found that because of the scale, design and locational backdrop, the inherent spatial and visual effects arising from the development would moderately harm the overriding sense of openness.</li> <li>• The proposal would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt and would introduce an incongruous feature into the rural area causing harm to the character and appearance of the area.</li> <li>• There would be conflict with policy D1 of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure developments respond to local landscape character. There is also conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to the landscape setting.</li> <li>• The appeal scheme would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is harmful by definition. It would also result in harm to the openness of the Green Belt, and to the character and appearance of the area. According to the Framework, substantial weight has to be given to any harm to the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist, and the proposal would conflict with the Framework and Policy P2 of the Local Plan.</li> </ul>	
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>Ms T Sayers</b>  <b>High Noon, Burpham Lane, Guildford, GU4 7LZ</b></p> <p><b>20/P/00592</b> – The development proposed is erection of 2 no 3-bed semi-detached dwellings on land adjacent to the site of High Noon, Burpham Lane.</p> <p>Delegated Decision – To Refuse</p> <p><b>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.</li> <li>• The appeal site is located at the far end of Burpham Lane, a cul-de-sac of mixed character including a primary school, day nursery and a row of four houses.</li> <li>• The proposal would retain the host property and construct a pair of semi-detached houses in the adjacent side garden. The proposed houses would occupy narrow plots with long, narrow rear gardens, which due to the shape of the site would taper off.</li> <li>• The plot widths would only be marginally smaller than those of the Laurels and Limone, a pair of semi-detached houses within the limited group of residential development on this section of Burpham Lane. In this context, they would not be out of keeping with the surrounding development.</li> <li>• However, due to the narrowness of the plot and the amount of development proposed, the proposed house adjacent to the north-west treed boundary would suffer from tree canopies over hanging the driveway and a significant portion of the narrow rear garden.</li> <li>• Due to the height of the trees and the extent of their canopies which would overhang approximately a third of the width of the narrow garden, they would have an enclosing effect on the garden space. This would be both overbearing and oppressive for future occupants.</li> <li>• This would be likely to lead to pressure for the removal or thinning of these</li> </ul>	<p><b>DISMISSED</b></p>



	<p>trees to provide greater separation between the trees and the proposed building and make the garden more open.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reduction in trees along this boundary would diminish their contribution to the character and appearance of the area.</li> <li>• The proposal would utilise the existing access to provide tandem parking for two cars adjacent to the treed northwest boundary of the site. The existing front lawn would be replaced by a larger area of hardstanding which would provide shared parking for five cars accessed from the existing driveway serving the host property.</li> <li>• The proposed development would improve the appearance of the area through the removal of the number of parked vehicles onsite. However, this does not outweigh the harm arising from the permanent formation of a significant area of hardstanding.</li> <li>• I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019 and Policy B-FD:1 of the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan 2016 which together seek a high-quality design and development that preserves or enhances the character of the area.</li> <li>• I conclude that the appeal shall be dismissed.</li> </ul>	
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>Ms Sarah Morales-Cortes</b>  <b>26 Gardiner Road, Guildford, GU1 4PG</b></p> <p><b>19/P/01854</b> – The development proposed is the erection of a detached two-bedroom dwelling.</p> <p>Delegated Decision – To Refuse</p> <p><b>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area;</li> <li>• The living conditions of occupiers of 26 Gardiner Road with particular regard to the outlook and sense of enclosure; and</li> <li>• The Thames Basin Heath SPA.</li> <li>• Number 26 is a small semi-detached house located on a residential cul-de-sac of similar semi-detached houses. Properties occupy narrow plots and are separated from each other by a narrow side passage.</li> <li>• Although there are some variations to properties, this stretch of Gardner Road has a distinctive and largely uniform character derived from the narrowness of properties and the symmetry of their front elevations.</li> <li>• The appeal site forms a side garden to No 26 which is an irregular shaped plot of land.</li> <li>• The proposed house would be two-storeys and occupy most of the width of this garden area and much of the depth of the plot. It would be separated from the host property by a narrow side passage and set in from its side boundary to the street by a narrow strip of garden.</li> <li>• Due to the width of the proposed house and the proximity of its full height gable end to the side boundary, it would appear bulky and overly large within the constrained plot. This would be highly visible within the streetscene due to the prominent position of the site at the end of the row of houses.</li> <li>• Its front elevation would be wider than other properties with which it would appear out of proportion. As such, it would jar with the characteristic narrowness of properties along the street.</li> </ul>	<p><b>DISMISSED</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Furthermore, the additional first floor window and entrance door within the primary elevation would appear more cluttered and out of keeping with the symmetrical and uniform appearance of the surrounding development.</li> <li>• As a consequence, the house would appear anomalous within the streetscene and poorly related to the established character and appearance of the area.</li> <li>• The appellant has subsequently obtained planning permission for a house on the site. The design of this approved scheme differs in that the main elevation of the approved house reflects the width of the neighbouring properties with a set back single-storey element. The approved scheme features a ground floor bay window and a single window at first floor level. This reinforces and responds to the distinctive character of the surrounding area, unlike the appeal scheme.</li> <li>• I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019 and Saved Policy G5 of the Guildford Local Plan 2003.</li> <li>• The proposed development would not harm the living conditions of occupants of No.26, with particular regard to outlook and sense of enclosure.</li> <li>• I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.</li> </ul>	
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>Ms Natalia Kaygoradsteve</b>  <b>Longacre, Guildford Road, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5QF</b></p> <p><b>20/P/00527</b> – The development proposed is a single-storey side extension and roof extension including dormer window to front elevation and two dormer windows to rear elevation.</p> <p>Delegated Decision – To Refuse</p> <p><b>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main issues are whether the proposal constitutes an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt for the purposes of the NPPF and development plan policy.</li> <li>• The effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt.</li> <li>• If the development was inappropriate to the Green Belt for the purposes of the Framework and development plan policy, whether the harm by reason of that inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to exist to justify the development.</li> <li>• The Council puts forward a figure of some 118% uplift for the cumulative external floor area increase of previous works to the original home when one adds the appeal scheme.</li> <li>• On the Council’s figures, which are not disputed by the Appellant and on which I have no reason to argue, the appeal scheme would take things to the 118% figure from extensions already 85% over the original scale. The appeal proposal would be an addition of about 40 square metres.</li> <li>• Even allowing for the fragmentation of the proposed extension work or the fact that one could measure volume or use other comparisons, with a change from an original home of about 120 sqm to the proposal now leading to about 262 sqm, I find it impossible to reach a view other than there would be a failure of the ‘disproportionate additions’ test.</li> <li>• I therefore conclude that this proposal would represent inappropriate</li> </ul>	<p><b>DISMISSED</b></p>

	<p>development for the purposes of the Framework and would run contrary to LP Policy P2, it would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. I attach substantial weight to the harm caused by this scheme representing inappropriate development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In this case, the proposal would involve the addition of considerable built form. The change over the existing situation would be appreciable and the scheme would make a marked difference to openness within this area.</li> <li>• I conclude that there would be conflict with a key objective of the Framework and the development plan, and I attach substantial weight to this impact upon openness of the Green Belt.</li> <li>• My overall conclusion is that the proposal would not accord with the pertinent elements of the Framework and the development plan. The appeal should therefore fail.</li> </ul>	
<p>10.</p>	<p><b>Mr and Mrs Barbour</b>  <b>Tethers End, Farley Green Road, Farley Green, Albury, Guildford, GU5 9DL</b></p> <p><b>19/P/02180</b> – The development proposed is the erection of a replacement dwelling.</p> <p>Delegated Decision – To Refuse</p> <p><b>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main issues are whether the proposal constitutes an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework and development plan policy.</li> <li>• The effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt.</li> <li>• If the development is inappropriate to the Green Belt for the purposes of the Framework and development plan policy, whether the harm by reason of that inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to exist to justify the development.</li> <li>• The Council and Appellant differ over whether to include the detached garage within the equation. Due to the nature of the garage in form, scale and construction and its almost linked proximity to the dwelling house I am satisfied that it is reasonable to include it within the overall thinking when considering the ‘materially larger’ issue.</li> <li>• In this instance, using my planning judgement, and including the garage, in terms of floor area, height and volume, I would deem the scale to be an excessive change in a Green Belt context and was therefore materially larger.</li> <li>• I therefore conclude that the proposal would represent inappropriate development for the purposes of the Framework and LP Policy P2; it would be a markedly materially larger building than the one it would replace. I attach substantial weight to the harm caused by this scheme representing inappropriate development.</li> <li>• The proposal would involve the overall addition of considerable built form. The change over the existing situation would be appreciable and the scheme would make a marked difference to openness within this area.</li> <li>• I conclude that there would be conflict with a key objective of the Framework and LP Policy P2 and I attach substantial weight to this impact upon openness of the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	<p><b>DISMISSED</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• My overall conclusion is that the proposal would not accord with the pertinent elements of the Framework and the development plan. The appeal should therefore fail.</li></ul>	
--	--	--