

Planning Committee

27 April 2022

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 (sophie.butcher@guildford.gov.uk)

1.	<p>Mr & Mrs Jenkins Wonham Copse, Wonham Way, Peaslake, GU5 9PA</p> <p>21/P/01522 –The development proposed is partial ground floor demolition to the north one-storey block, side extension to the first floor, loft conversion, with new dormers to front and back elevations, change of fenestration to have triple glazing, new photovoltaic panels to the south roof face.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: to refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The main issues in the appeal are whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework and the development plan; and• The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.• The appeal property is a detached, two storey dwelling. The dwelling is set within a spacious plot, accessed via a long, straight driveway. It is within an area of detached dwellings also sited on large plots, although the appeal property is set much further back from Wonham Way compared to the neighbouring properties.• Although the scale and floorspace of the dwelling will increase with the addition of a first-floor side extension and loft conversion, the proposed demolition of the one-storey section of the existing dwelling will result in an overall reduction in the building's footprint. The first-floor addition will match the roof height of the existing dwelling and the proposed front and rear dormers would not overly dominate the roof. Although there will be an increase in overall bulk from the proposal, the first-floor addition would give the dwelling a more balanced appearance. I therefore do not consider that the proposed extensions would a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.• For these reasons, I find that the proposal would not comprise inappropriate development within the Green Belt as defined by the Framework and Policy P2 of the Local Plan.• The appeal site is within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). An objection to the proposal was received from the Surrey Hills AONB	<p>*ALLOWED</p>
----	---	------------------------

	<p>Planning Adviser which references the visually greater impact that will occur as a result of the proposals. However, with the exception of views along the driveway, the appeal property is well concealed from the public and neighbouring properties by trees and hedges and the alterations are considered to be proportionate to the host dwelling. On this basis, I find the effect of the proposals on the AONB and AGLV would be neutral.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On this basis I do not consider the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal property or the area and it would accord with Local Plan Policy D1 which seeks, amongst other things to ensure development achieves high quality design. It would also accord with saved Policy H8 and Policy G5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (Adopted January 2003) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure new development protects the character and appearance of buildings and the surrounding environment. It would also accord with the Framework in so far as it requires that development should add to the overall quality of an area and should be sympathetic to local character. • The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2018 seeks to ensure roof extensions are carried out sympathetically. The SPD provides guidance on the design of dormer windows, which the proposal broadly conforms with. • I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed. 	
<p>2.</p>	<p>Mr Andrew Eacott Stoke Villa, Markenfield Road, Guildford, GU1 4PF</p> <p>21/P/01692 – The development proposed is part two storey and part single storey rear extension following demolition of a conservatory.</p> <p>Delegated Decision – To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of 1 Nursery Villas with particular reference to light and visual impact. • The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, which has a ground floor conservatory extension to the side. The proposal involves the demolition of the conservatory, and its' replacement by a single-storey side extension of similar dimensions, albeit that its roof would have a steeper pitch. Alongside it, a two-storey structure is proposed, being an extension to the original two-storey protrusion at the rear of the dwelling. • The Council has no concerns as to the design or appearance of the proposals but considers that they would impact harmfully on the living conditions enjoyed by the occupants of 1 Nursery Villas. The Council's concerns reflect those contained in the representations submitted by a resident of that property. • The resident is concerned that the extensions would unacceptably reduce daylight to and harmfully impact on the outlook derived from the rear ground floor window serving her dining room. Both she and the Council consider that the proposals fail to meet the requirements of the 450-guide set out in the Council's SPD1. 	<p>*ALLOWED</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Nursery Villas is itself semi-detached and is separated from the appeal property by what is best described as an alley or walkway. I walked along the alley during the course of my visit to a point immediately adjacent to the dining room window. I saw that a high timber fence had been erected on the objector's side of the alley close to the dining room window, presumably so as to preserve privacy. • The dining room window faces northwards, so that it receives no direct sunlight. The level of natural light the dining room receives is curtailed, not only because of the presence of the appeal property, including its conservatory, but also as a result of 1 Nursery Villa's own rear protrusion and the timber fence mentioned earlier. These structures also partly impede the outlook obtained from the body of the room. • The appellant acknowledges that the 450 guide would not be wholly met, but only marginally so. I accept that to be the case. However, given the presence of the various existing structures described above and their effects on daylight and outlook from the window of concern, I do not consider that the proposals, if built, would materially alter the level of daylight currently entering the dining room, and nor would the outlook from it be significantly affected. • Accordingly, the proposals, in my opinion, would not make living conditions materially worse within the dining room for the residents of the neighbouring property. The 450 guide, as the terms implies, is a guide and there is no requirement in my view that it should be rigidly adhered to in all circumstances, especially where other factors come into play, and no material harm arises. • I conclude that the proposed extensions could be built without materially harming the living conditions currently experienced by the occupants of 1 Nursery Villas. Accordingly, no conflict arises with those provisions of saved policy G1(3) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 directed to ensuring that new development should not impair the amenities of others. 	
<p>3.</p>	<p>Mr and Mrs Kollmer Kayos Cottage, Guildford Road, Effingham, KT24 5QQ</p> <p>21/P/00497 – The development proposed is the erection of a detached, single storey ancillary outbuilding.</p> <p>Delegated Decision – To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue is whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and development plan policy. It is also necessary to consider any effects of the development on the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. • The appeal property comprises a detached dwelling set within a large plot located within the Green Belt. It is accessed via a long driveway off Guildford Road. The property has a contemporary design and is relatively well-screened from view as the site's boundaries are heavily vegetated with mature trees and shrubbery. • The proposal would comprise the erection of a detached single storey outbuilding with a slightly slanted flat roof within the driveway to the west of the main house. The Council consider that, as the outbuilding 	<p>*ALLOWED</p>

	<p>would be detached from the house, it cannot constitute an extension, would not fall into any of the other exceptions to Green Belt policy and so would be inappropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The appellant states the proposed outbuilding would have a floor area of 28 sqm, which would represent a 14% increase in floor area over the original building. The Council has not provided me with corresponding calculations. Whilst the development plan does not refer to a defined way of assessing and measuring proportionality, national guidance does give some guidance on measuring 'proportionality'. The NPPF refers to 'size' which can, in my view, refer to volume, height, external dimensions, footprint, floorspace or visual perception. In this case, the overall scale of the outbuilding would be modest, and I consider that a 14% increase in floorspace would not be disproportionate and would respect the scale and form of the main dwelling. In light of this, find that the proposal would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. • On the basis that the proposed outbuilding would meet the exception outlined in Paragraph 149(c) of the NPPF and Policy P2, as detailed above. I therefore find the proposal is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not conflict with the NPPF in this respect. • For the reasons explained above and having taken account of every matter raised in the representations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. 	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Mrs Gabrielle Davenport 25 Curling Vale, Guildford, GU2 7PJ</p> <p>21/P/01814 – The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension and changes to fenestration.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. • The appeal property is a brick-built two-storey semi-detached dwelling set within a mature residential estate comprised of a variety of dwelling types and styles, including detached dwellings and bungalows. • Its' roof is hipped, and the intention is to extend to the side, in matching materials, with the hipped treatment repeated. The extension's front wall would be slightly set back from the property's front elevation. • In the appellant's view, the extension would mirror that carried out at the neighbouring property, no 23, immediately to the north, which itself is a semi-detached property, being attached to No 21. • The Council acknowledges that the side extension to No 23 was granted planning permission several years ago but contends that it has not been built entirely in accordance with the approved plans. Principally for that reason, the Council considers that the extension's existence should not carry sufficient weight as a material consideration to justify the alleged harm caused by the appeal proposal. In the Council's view, the proposed extension now would not appear subservient to the host property, and the gap between No 23 and 25 would be reduced to an unacceptable level resulting in a terracing effect. 	<p>*ALLOWED</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No 23's extension has existed long enough to form an established part of the street scene, and it causes no visual offence. Its design is virtually repeated in the appeal proposal, albeit on a mirrored basis, and in my view is an acceptable and well-designed proposition. • While I understand the Council's concerns as to a possible terracing effect, insufficient weight has been given to the fact that the appeal property is situated on a hill and has been built at a different level to No 23. Consequently, the eaves and ridge levels of the proposed extension, if built, would be set substantially higher than those of No 23. Moreover, no 25's front elevation would be set back from that of No 23. Taken in combination, these factors would ensure that the respective dwellings would retain their individual identities and would not be perceived as forming part of a terrace. • I therefore conclude that the extension would sit acceptably in its visual context without harming the character and appearance of the host property or its surroundings. Accordingly, no conflict arises with those provisions of saved policies G5 & H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003, or Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 directed to ensuring that new development should achieve high quality design that responds to distinctive local character. 	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Mr C Luscombe 22 Scholars Walk, Guildford, GU2 7TR</p> <p>21/P/01536 – The development proposed is the conversion of loft space to habitable accommodation including a dormer window to the rear and 3 rooflights to the front elevation.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. • The host property is a detached dwelling set within a relatively modern residential estate. However, it is untypical of most other dwellings in the estate in that it is sited alone on an elongated plot. A landscaped strip with mature trees separates the plot from housing development in Guildford Park Avenue, which lies on lower land to the south and east of the appeal site. • I note from the planning history that the dwelling has been subject to previous permissions to extend, and that their implementation has resulted in the creation of a substantial dwelling. In this context, and particularly since the dormer extension would be built to the rear, the scale of the proposal would not be disproportionate to that of the host property, as extended. • The attempts made to marry the appearance of the dormer with the host property, including the pattern of fenestration, the use of tile hanging and the half-hipped roof, have in my opinion succeeded. I do not therefore consider that the effect on the host property would cause visual harm. • Two dwellings¹ served by a private drive stand to the side of the appeal property, and their occupants would have the closest, albeit oblique view of the dormer. Their residents have not objected. Given the acceptability of the design, the impact on these residents would not 	<p>*ALLOWED</p>

	<p>prove harmful. Otherwise, taking account of the screening qualities of the mature landscaping mentioned earlier, the dormer would remain unobtrusive in the wider street scene, having little effect on the surrounding area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I note that the Council does not object to the insertion of the rooflights in the front elevation, and I have no reason to either. • I conclude that the loft conversion, including the proposed dormer, would sit acceptably in its visual and spatial contexts without harming the character and appearance of the host property or its surroundings. Accordingly, no conflict arises with those provisions of saved policies G5 & H8 of the Guildford Local Plan 2003, or Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 directed to ensuring that new development should achieve high quality design that responds to distinctive local character. 	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Mr Dom Tait 8 Irwin Road, Guildford, GU2 7PP</p> <p>21/P/01824 – The development proposed is a single storey side and rear wrap around extension and rear raised decking area.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. • The host property is a detached brick-built, tile roofed dwelling set on a hill within a row of other detached dwellings of varied designs. The house is set well back in its plot and has a lengthy rear garden. It has a concrete panelled garage to the rear, which is to be demolished to make way for the proposal. • The scheme represents a wholesale revamp of the dwelling’s ground floor accommodation. The wrap around element would incorporate a new side entrance, and the proposed kitchen, dining and sitting rooms would be comprised within a sizeable open plan space. Much of the proposed ground floor accommodation would be housed within a new flat roofed extension, whose rear elevation would be almost entirely glazed. The extension would extend the full width of the original dwelling, and slightly beyond. • The Council considers the proposed extension to be disproportionately large and poorly designed with particular reference to its shape, bulk, roof type and proposed use of extensive glazing, which are said not to be reflective of the host property’s intrinsic design qualities. • I share the Council’s view that the extension’s appearance would not match that of the host property; but it doesn’t appear to me that it was meant to. Rather it is an extension of a distinctly contemporary style, which contrasts sharply with that of the host property. I do not find this design approach objectionable, particularly since the host property is not of particular architectural merit, being what I would describe as distinctly suburban in appearance. The extension is not in my view excessively large and would enable the existing and newly created space within the house to be used effectively for modern family living. • Moreover, the proposed rear extension, being very well screened from general view, would have no impact on the public realm, or on the wider surroundings. The modestly sized side extension could just be seen 	<p>*ALLOWED</p>

	<p>from the highway, but being set back, its impact would be minimal and acceptable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I share the Council's view that the proposed decking should not cause offence, and neither it nor the proposed extension would impact harmfully on neighbouring living conditions. I note that none of the closest residents objected on being consulted. • I conclude that the extension would sit acceptably in its visual context without harming the character and appearance of the host property or its surroundings. Accordingly, no conflict arises with those provisions of saved policies G5 & H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003, or Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 directed to ensuring that new development should achieve high quality design that responds to distinctive local character. 	
<p>7.</p>	<p>Mr and Mrs E Mitchinson Syderstone, 147 East Lane, West Horsley, Leatherhead, Surrey, KT24 6NY</p> <p>21/P/01236 – The development proposed is described as installation of fence along boundary of property.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character of the area. • The appeal site is located at the northern end of the built-up area of West Horsley, which borders onto woodland and pastureland. This part of the built-up area is characterised by large family dwellings which have generous sized, mature landscaped gardens. The vast majority of dwellings along this stretch of East Lane and Ockham Road North have hedges, shrubs and trees along their front boundaries. This landscaping together with the well wooded setting of the locality makes a significant contribution to the sylvan and semi-rural character and appearance of the area. • There are a few exceptions to this which include low walls and a post and rail fence, which either have planting behind them or provide views of mature planting within the gardens. There are also a number of close boarded fences in the immediate area. This includes 150 East Lane (No.150) and Cheriton, which are situated opposite and alongside Syderstone. Both properties have low fences that front onto Ockham Road North and No.150 also has a taller fence, which fronts onto part of the boundary with East Lane. These fences have hedges immediately to the rear of them and the fence at Cheriton sits behind a shallow verge. Individually and collectively these fences have a suburbanising impact on the street scene, although the impact is materially greater with the taller fence, which is more prominent due to its height, solid appearance and the sense of enclosure it creates. • The appeal property occupies a prominent position within the street scene, adjacent to the junction of East Lane and Ockham Road North and opposite the path through the wide verge and cluster of mature trees on the other side of Ockham Road North. Recently a tall vertical boarded timber fence has been erected at the appeal site along the boundaries with both roads. Along East Lane the fence adjoins the back edge of the pavement and along Ockham Road North the fence is set 	<p>DISMISSED</p>

	<p>behind a verge where there are two mature trees, some low scrub and a public bench. Due to its combined length, height and prominence the fence is visually stark and urban.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the proposal this fence would be replaced with a 1.5-metre-high fence, with Laurel hedging planted to the rear of it. This planting has already taken place. • Due to its lower height the proposed fence would cause less harm than the existing fence. However, even with the proposed planting to the rear, as a result of its combined length, height and siting the proposed fence, which would be highly prominent, would have an urbanising and solid enclosing impact on the street scene. It siting opposite the fencing around parts of No.150 would simply exacerbate the harm that would be caused, resulting in a visually hard entrance to East Lane. For these reasons the proposed fence would materially and unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. • In particular, due to its siting along the back edge of the pavement the proposed fencing along East Lane and in the vicinity of the public bench close to the road junction, the proposed fence would have a visually hard and urbanising impact on the street scene. • I acknowledge that a one-metre-high boundary fence could be erected under Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). However, the low fences in the locality are not as prominent and do not share the same hard and enclosing characteristics of the taller fences. As such, their impact on the sylvan and semi-rural character and appearance of the locality is materially less. • Finally, I have taken into account the security, safety and privacy benefits that would result from the proposal. In this instance I find that these benefits would fail to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area by the proposal. This harm is not something that could be satisfactorily dealt with by condition. • I conclude that the proposed fence would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with LP Policy G5, LPSS Policy D1, NP Policy WH2, the SPD and paragraph 130 of the Framework. 	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Mr and Mrs Gavin Cooke 2 Gwynne Court, Guildford, GU2 9LY</p> <p>21/P/01114 – The development proposed is the erection of rear dormer and loft conversion with three roof lights to the front roof slope.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. • The host property is comprised within a modestly sized terrace of dwellings within a relatively modern housing estate. The terrace is punctuated by two substantial gables front and back, which adds form and design interest, particularly to the roof. The appeal property is set alongside one of the gables. • The proposed dormer would be shaped like a box. The appellant considers that the dormer has been ‘sensitively designed’. I disagree. To my mind, the structure would appear crude in design terms and 	<p>DISMISSED</p>

	<p>incongruous set against the angled gable, damaging the appearance of the host property and the roofscape of the terrace as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the dormer would be sited in the rear roof, it would nevertheless be prominent when viewed from Railton Road, which runs alongside Gwynne Court. It would also be clearly seen from Little Road across the open land surrounding the Army Cadet centre. The harmful incongruity of the development would thus be plainly apparent from various vantage points in the public realm. • My visit took place when the trees in adjacent streets were in a defoliated state. Whilst some screening may be afforded when trees were in leaf, the dormer would nevertheless be clearly seen from several vantage points. • The appellant refers to several examples of what are claimed to be similar forms of development. During my visit, I noted that most of the roofscape in the surrounding area was free of dormer development of the type proposed here. Where dormers occurred, they appeared to me to be smaller and better designed than that proposed, and in a different visual context. The roof conversion in the same terrace, at No 4, is not comparable since it doesn't involve a dormer addition. • Other examples provided by the appellant, including that at 12 Whateley Close and 52 Forster Road¹, have also been taken into account. I note from the photographs provided that these appear to involve dormer additions not dissimilar to those proposed here. But the fact that this type of development may be acceptable elsewhere in a particular location does not, in itself, justify its acceptability everywhere since circumstances vary. Accordingly, my judgement is based on the particular circumstances of this case, and specifically on its merits, as required. • I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. Accordingly, no conflict arises with those provisions of saved policies G5 & H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003, or Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019 directed to ensuring that new development should achieve high quality design that responds to distinctive local character. 	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Mr Thomas Buckley Chestnut Cottage, 50 Portsmouth Road, Guildford, GU2 4DU</p> <p>21/P/00665 – The development proposed is the replacement of nine single glazed wood framed windows and door.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue are the effects of the proposals on the host property and whether the character or appearance of the CA would be preserved or enhanced. • The host property is situated at the junction of Portsmouth Road (A3100) and Chestnut Avenue. It forms part of what I regard as a very attractive terrace, described in the representations as displaying 'Arts & Crafts' design features. The terrace is comprised mainly of brick, with some render panelling. Its' front elevation contains several gables, with 	<p>DISMISSED</p>

tile hanging at first floor level. The terrace's chimneys appear to have all remained intact.

- The appeal property is at the end of the terrace, with its twin gabled main elevation, and its front door, facing Chestnut Avenue. This elevation contains striking feature windows at first floor level just beneath the gables with its associated decorated panelling.
- The property is virtually surrounded by a laurel hedge, and as a consequence, many of the ground floor windows and front door are at least partially hidden from view. However, there is no guarantee that the hedge will remain in place permanently. The windows on the first floor are all plainly visible from public vantage points at close quarters.
- The appellant points to several properties in the locality which have used materials other than wood in their fenestration, including uPVC. However, some of these are far more modern than the appeal property, and the use of materials other than wood is understandable in the circumstances, particularly having regard to the overall design of the buildings.
- The appellant also points to the use of uPVC windows on a property within the terrace. I saw that was the case, and to me it stood out as incongruous. There is no reason, in my view, why a similar mistake should be repeated. That others within the terrace have not replaced timber windows in their original form is unfortunate but does not justify the use of uPVC.
- I fully understand the reason why the appellant would choose to replace the windows. I saw that at least some were in poor condition and were not the original windows. Those I saw were single glazed, albeit a form of secondary glazing had been provided at the front to provide some protection from the noise of traffic using the main A road. I also appreciate the benefit of double glazing in insulation and consequent energy saving. However, no evidence has been provided as to why such benefits could not be achieved by the use of high-performance timber windows, which I have seen successfully installed in many properties within CAs. In my experience, they could more successfully replicate the originals while providing similar insulation benefits to uPVC.
- I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and to the terrace. Neither the character nor appearance of the CA would therefore be preserved. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with those provisions of saved Policy HE7 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 and policy D3 of Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019, directed to ensure that the character and appearance of the Borough's historic environment, including its conservation areas, is protected.
- The harm caused would be less than substantial and under the terms of the NPPF1 this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. I have already referred to one of the public benefits arising from the installation of modern windows, that of energy conservation. However, I am not convinced that this benefit could not be achieved by another design solution more appropriate in this CA, which on the basis of the evidence, has apparently not been considered.

<p>10.</p>	<p>Mr Geoff Atterbury of Hawksmoor Homes Ltd Land to the East of 164 The Street, West Horsley, Leatherhead, KT24 6HS</p> <p>20/P/02026 – The development proposed is erection of five dwellings and associated access and landscaping.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issues are the effect of the main development on the character and appearance of the area and protected habitat sites. • The appeal site is a rectangular plot of paddock land with a long, narrow, grassed access off Little Cranmore Lane. It is located between large residential gardens to properties fronting both The Street and Little Cranmore Lane. The site’s eastern boundary marks the edge of the defined settlement adjacent to which there is a public footpath and an open field beyond. These gardens and the appeal site provide an area of transition between the built development and the open and undeveloped countryside on this side of the village. There are many trees and shrubs along this boundary which restrict views into the site. There are several mature trees on other boundaries. • The scheme proposes a small development positioned around a central area of hardstanding. The appellant has explained that this has been designed with a hierarchy of building scales and variations in form and style to reflect the range of buildings that might be found within a farmstead courtyard. This comprises a pair of semi-detached houses designed as ‘workers’ cottages’, detached ‘barn’ style development and a ‘farmhouse’ clustered around a central ‘yard’. • Nearby development is characterised by detached properties set within spacious plots. The proposed houses would not be as spacious as these and the semi-detached properties would be at odds with development within the immediate vicinity of the site, although such housing is found elsewhere within the wider area. The proposed houses would also be positioned close to each other. In this context, the proposed development would appear at odds with the more spacious development characteristic of its surroundings. • The accommodation within each of the proposed houses would be set over 2 floors with the first-floor accommodation partially built into the roofspace. This would reduce the overall bulk of the proposed dwellings. Surrounding development is a mix of bungalows, one and a half and 2-storey properties of varying ages and heights. Within this context, the proposed buildings would not appear uncharacteristic. However, due to the relatively small size of each of the individual plots, the proposed houses would appear large within their plots compared to nearby development. This would make the proposed development appear cramped within the plot. • The farm courtyard design would go some way to explain this higher density of development. However, this does not overcome the limited size of the gardens in comparison to the proposed houses which would be uncharacteristic on the transitional village fringe where development is typically set away from the rural edge by long rear gardens. Although there are examples of properties with a closer relation to the rural edge 	<p>DISMISSED</p>
------------	---	-------------------------

of the settlement, such as Oak Tree Cottage some distance north of the appeal site, this type of development does not form the predominant character of the village edge. Whilst such development may add to the character, it seems to me that for this to be repeated too often would fundamentally alter the way the built form of the village transitions into the rural landscape beyond. It does not therefore provide justification for the scheme as proposed.

- The scheme has been designed to set the buildings away from the more sensitive settlement edge by locating the larger properties and gardens closer to this boundary. The appellant has sought to maximise the garden sizes to these plots. However, due to the extent of other development proposed on the site, they are limited in depth compared to nearby development. When compared to other domestic development along this edge of the village which includes tennis courts but few other structures, the proposed houses due to their relatively short gardens would be much closer, bulkier and more prominent. This would provide a much harder and more urban edge to the village, uncharacteristic of surrounding development.
- Even with the boundary vegetation retained, I observed that views into the site were possible. The proposed houses with their gardens and other domestic paraphernalia would therefore be visible from the adjacent public footpath with some loss of the semi-rural character along the edge of the village.
- I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019 (the LPSS) and Policy WH2 of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan 2018 which together require new developments to respond and reinforce locally distinct patterns of development, including landscape setting, to have regard to the important relationship between the built development and the surrounding landscape in villages and to provide built forms that help maintain an appropriate transitional edge to the village. It would also not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which add to the quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character.
- In the context of this appeal, the absence of details of a scheme, means that I cannot be satisfied in undertaking my duty under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, that the appeal scheme would not have an adverse impact on the SPA either alone or in combination with other projects. Therefore, in this case, based on the evidence before me, a Grampian condition would not be appropriate.
- For this reason, I find that the development would therefore fail to comply with Saved Policy NE4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003, Policy P5 of the LPSS and Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009. These policies together seek to conserve and enhance the natural environment, animals and their habitats and to secure appropriate mitigation to avoid any adverse effects on protected sites.
- For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

<p>11.</p>	<p>Mr Felix Walker 41 Down Road, Guildford, GU1 2PZ</p> <p>20/P/01755 – The application sought planning permission for change of use of existing building (unoccupied school – use class D1) to two x two-bed and one x three-bed flats (use class C3). One new two storey detached dwelling and provision of seven off street parking spaces, cycle and recycling storage; dropped kerb for access, landscaping and associated works without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 16/P/02402, dated 15 November 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The condition in dispute is No. 2 which states that: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 167(P)001/D, 002/D, 010/D, 011/D, 015/D, 016/D, 022/2, 027/2, 029/2, 031/2 received on 30 November 2016 and amended plans: 167()P025/3, 026/3, 030/3, 032/3, 003/1, 020/4, 021/4 received on 20 December 2016. • The reason given for the condition is: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in the interests of proper planning. <p>Officer Recommendation: To Approve Planning Committee: 3 March 2021 Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issues are whether the provision of six car parking spaces rather than seven spaces as approved is sufficient, with regard to local and national planning policy and guidance. • The Council’s Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2006 (SPD) establishes that seven parking spaces should be provided for the development. The SPD advises that for schemes below 15 dwellings the standard is advisory and that it provides maximum figures. It also advises that in appropriate circumstances a lower provision may be acceptable as long as it can be demonstrated that there would be no adverse impacts on the area. • Policy ID3 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2015-2034 (LP) establishes, amongst other things, that off-street parking should be provided such that the level of any resulting parking on the public highway does not adversely impact road safety or the movement of other road users. • The appeal site is located in an area with good access to local bus services that connect to large urban centres and is within walking distance of a local centre. It is therefore possible that the day to day needs of residents of the development could be met without relying on a private car. However, evidence before me suggests that at least six spaces are necessary based on local car ownership taken from the 2011 census, suggesting that the appeal site is not so well located that not owning a car is a choice that many in the area make. • I have reviewed the written representations by Evoke Transport Planning Consultants submitted with the appeal. This concludes that the study area was subject to a parking stress of 71-72% at the time of survey. I note that this was an average figure taken over the study area. Accepting this average figure over the study area would rely on residents moving from the roads to the east to Down Road through the 	<p>DISMISSED</p>
------------	---	-------------------------

unlit and narrow footpath. This path passes through gaps between buildings and does not benefit from natural surveillance or clear sight lines. I am therefore not satisfied that it is reasonable to expect residents at Down Road to rely on this footpath to access a car parked on Daryngton Drive or beyond. Thus, the figure for parking stress for Down Road is more relevant than the average level over the study area, which was higher at 76-79%.

- This figure is lower than the evidence provided by a local resident, and the strong local opinion by a number of local residents that parking availability in the area is extremely poor. I accept that the resident's data is not independent, and there is no evidence that it was carried out with reference to a recognised methodology. However, residents who live on the affected road and use it for parking on a day-to-day basis are well placed to provide comments on this matter, and I am therefore of the view that these local views should carry significant weight.
- Furthermore, I note that the appellant's parking survey was undertaken at a time when England was still subject to significant restrictions on movement as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. This cannot be considered a neutral time to undertake such a survey, which reduces the weight I should give to its findings.
- The site was previously used as a school and had no parking. It is likely that this use would have generated considerable traffic at the beginning and end of the school day. However, the parking demand for six dwellings is quite different. Dwellings create a much more significant demand for parking overnight, which would have been very low when the site was used as a school and is the time that local residents report that parking availability is very limited.
- The appellant refers to the Surrey County Council Parking Guidance. It is suggested that six spaces for the development accords with this guidance. However, I have not been provided with a copy of this document, so I am unable to review its contents, and it is not clear what status it has in the context of the Council's own development plan. Accordingly, I give this matter little weight.
- Therefore, in weighing these matters together, I am not satisfied that it can be demonstrated that a lower provision than that set out within the SPD is appropriate in this case, given the evidence before me of the extremely poor availability of parking in the area. I note that the Council expresses a particular concern about the under provision of parking in small scale schemes. In this case the under provision is likely to result in the need to accommodate an additional parked car on the road, which further exacerbates the existing situation and harms the existing residential environment. With reference to paragraph 111 of the Framework, the residual cumulative impact on the road network is severe, arising from the extremely poor availability of on street parking which has been amplified by the proposal.
- In summary, the provision of six car parking spaces is not sufficient. It would not accord with the parking standards set out in the SPD and would be contrary to Policy ID3 of the LP, which seeks to ensure amongst other things that the level of any resulting parking on the public highway does not adversely impact the movement of other road users.
- In conclusion, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

<p>12.</p>	<p>Mr and Mrs Bonds Shere Cottage, Shere Road, West Horsley, KT24 6EQ</p> <p>21/P/00326 – The development proposed is front and side extensions. Raising of the roof to provide first floor habitable accommodation including three dormer windows and two rooflights.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issues are whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and development plan policy; • The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt; • The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, with particular regard to a loss of light and privacy; • if the development would be inappropriate, whether the harm to the Green Belt by way of inappropriateness and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify it. • The appeal property comprises a detached dwelling located on the eastern side of Shere Road in an established residential area which lies within the Green Belt. The property features a pitched roof and a flat-roofed rectangular side/rear extension forming a distinctive L-shaped layout. The appeal dwelling is situated in close proximity to the neighbouring property to the north, known as Sheepleas Cottage, and sits on slightly higher ground. • Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that new development is inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it falls within the given list of exceptions. Policy P2 of the <i>Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019</i> (the ‘Local Plan’) is consistent with this in that it gives a list of forms of development that are not inappropriate. One exception is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. • On the basis that the proposed extensions would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling, I therefore find the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would conflict with Paragraph 149(c) of the NPPF, as detailed above, and policy P2 of the Local Plan which seeks to resist inappropriate development in the Green Belt. • Openness is identified in the NPPF as one of the Green Belt’s essential characteristics. The additional built form and volume as a result of the extensions would materially impact on openness in a spatial aspect. Furthermore, the increased height of the roof, plus the prominent position of the building in an elevated position, would mean the proposal would also have a greater visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt when seen from the open countryside to the east. The spatial and visual impact on openness would result in moderate harm to the Green Belt. • The proposal would therefore adversely impact on the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring property at Sheepleas Cottage 	<p>DISMISSED</p>
------------	--	-------------------------

	<p>with regards to a loss of light. It would conflict with saved policy G1(3) of the Guildford Local Plan (2003) and the NPPF which together seek to ensure new development does not negatively affect the amenity of neighbouring occupants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I consider that the development would cause harm to the Green Belt by way of its inappropriateness and to its openness, and substantial weight should be given to these harms. It also would adversely impact the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants. The combined weight of the other considerations in this case is modest and does not outweigh the substantial harm I have identified. I conclude therefore there are no very special circumstances to justify the development.	
--	--	--