

Planning appeals monitoring follow up report

2019 Overturns table

Application number	Site address and brief description of development	Officer recommendation	Committee decision	Appeal decision	Costs sought	Costs awarded Yes/No
18/P/1595	Land East of St Johns Close (fencing)	Approve	Refused	Appeal allowed	Yes	No
18/P/01982	Yaldens Cottage, Tongham (1 wall mounted sign)	Approve	Refused	No appeal		
18/P/1642	Land at Tilthams Garage (12 houses)	Approve	Refused	No appeal		
18/P/2387	Boxgrove, 144 London Rd (6 flats)	Approve	Refused	Appeal allowed	No	
19/P/00178	Burchatts Farm (change of use to D1 use)	Approve	Refused	Appeal allowed	Yes	No
19/P/00179	Burchatts Farm (change of use to D1 use)	Approve	Refused	Appeal allowed	Yes	No
18/P/2011	Land North of Harewood Rd (5 dwellings)	Approve	Refused	Appeal dismissed	Yes	No
18/P/01950	Land East of White Lane (59 dwellings)	Approve	Refused	Appeal allowed	No	
19/P/00362	Holy Trinity Church (windows)	Refuse	Approved	No appeal		
18/P/02240	Land rear of Christmas Hill, Shalford (3 dwellings)	Approve	Refused	Appeal dismissed	No	
19/P/00566	Sherwood, East Horsley (2 dwellings)	Approve	Refused	Appeal dismissed	No	
19/P/1039	14A Tangier Road, Guildford (householder extension)	Approve	Refused	Appeal allowed	No	

Application number	Site address and brief description of development	Officer recommendation	Committee decision	Appeal decision	Costs sought	Costs awarded Yes/No
19/P/01234	Land South of Champney (5 dwellings)	Approve	Refused	Appeal allowed	No	
19/P/1429	Whistlers Farm, Guildford (House holder extension)	Refuse	Approved	No appeal		
19/P/1796	17 Romans Close, Guildford (change of use of land to garden)	Approve	Refused	Appeal allowed		

Commentary:

11 overturn decisions were appealed; of those 8 were allowed, three were dismissed. This represents almost 73% being allowed with 27% dismissed. Of note was an application for 59 dwellings refused on housing mix grounds. The inspector disagreed that this represented a failure to comply with policy H1 of the Local Plan. In addition, two smaller residential schemes were allowed, the first with concerns over parking provision and effect on character not upheld, the second raised concerns over rural edge of a village, cramped appearance, and housing mix. Again, these matters were not upheld. Of those dismissed it is noted that in respect of 18/P/02240 the inspector upheld concerns over the impact on character but did NOT agree with the housing mix argument put forward. In terms of 19/P/0566, the inspector did NOT agree with the substantive argument over impact on character. The appeal was dismissed on SPA grounds which essentially can be overcome by completion of a S.106 agreement.

2019 overall appeal decisions as a comparison (note this INCLUDES the Committee overturn decisions):

Appeals determined	115
Appeals allowed	27
Appeals dismissed	79
Appeals withdrawn	7
Mixed decision	2
& dismissed	73%