

PLANNING COMMITTEE

6 DECEMBER 2023

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)

<p>1.</p>	<p>Mr & Mrs P Lawton 37 Fairway, Guildford, Surrey, GU1 2XN</p> <p>23/P/00158 – The development proposed is the construction of a detached garage.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector's Main Issues: The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p>*ALLOWED</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Mr Nick Howe Chalk Barton, Shere Road, West Horsley, Surrey, KT24 6EW</p> <p>22/P/01770 – The development proposed is for the demolition of existing front walling and front flue, erection of ground floor infill porch, finished with open oak structure, replacement flue and alterations.</p> <p>Officer Recommendation: To Refuse Planning Committee: 29 March 2023 Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector's Main Issues: Whether the proposal would represent inappropriate development in the Metropolitan Green Belt (the Green Belt) having regard to the Framework and relevant development plan</p>	<p>*ALLOWED</p>

	<p>policies.</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>Mr Matthew Mansfield Fairholme, Flexford Road, Normandy, Surrey, GU3 2EF</p> <p>22/P/01972 – The development proposed is the erection of single storey front and rear extension, conversion of loft space to habitable accommodation, roof alterations to include raised ridge height, rear dormer, and front chalet style extensions, demolition of conservatory and changes to fenestration.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: non-determination</p> <p>Inspector’s Main Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and surroundings; and • the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of Claymore, with respect to outlook and light. <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p>*ALLOWED</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Mr Matthew Mansfield Fairholme, Flexford Road, Normandy, Surrey, GU3 2EF</p> <p>23/P/00632 – The development proposed is the erection of single storey front and rear extension, conversion of loft space to habitable accommodation, roof alterations to include raised ridge height, rear dormer and front chalet style extensions, demolition of conservatory and changes to fenestration.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector’s Main Issues:</p> <p>The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property; and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of Claymore, with respect to light.</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p>*ALLOWED</p>

<p>5.</p>	<p>Taylor Commercial Repairs Morris & Stevens Nursery, The Street, Compton GU3 1EJ</p> <p>20/P/01712 – The development proposed is described as “retention of the hard surfacing and use for parking/maintenance of vehicles.”</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector’s Main Issues: (i) whether or not the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies; (ii) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and (iii) whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p>*ALLOWED</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Mr Alexander Stewart Clark of Lasch Ltd Land known as Valentines Farm, Rose Lane, Ripley, Woking, GU23 6NE</p> <p>EN/19/00016 – The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is (i) Without a planning permission, an engineering operation consisting of the construction of a bund/raised earth platform. Without planning permission, an engineering operation comprising changes to the levels of the ground, construction of a wall and fence and the laying of materials to create a hard surfaced raised area, (iii) Without planning permission, operational development consisting of the installation of two structures, (iv) Without planning permission an engineering operation comprising construction of a track.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p>ENFORCEMENT NOTICE UPHELD AND PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED</p>

<p>7.</p>	<p>Ms Monica Malfa 71A Poyle Road, Tongham, Farnham, Surrey GU10 1DX</p> <p>22/P/01145 – The works proposed are a two storey side extension.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector’s Main Issues: The main issue is the effect of the proposed works on the special interest of the Grade II listed building ‘The Old Farmhouse’ (Ref: 1029609) and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p>DISMISSED</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Mr M Reid High Ryde, Old Lane, Mays Green, Cobham, Surrey, KT11 1NJ</p> <p>22/P/01537 – The development proposed is for a retrospective application to incorporate as-built amendments to lawful development certificate 16/P/01670, approved on 04/10/2016 and planning permission 16/P/02587, approved on 14/02/2017, proposed two storey side extension and loft conversion to habitable accommodation.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector’s Main Issues: The main issue in this appeal is: whether the proposal would represent inappropriate development in the Metropolitan Green Belt (the Green Belt), having regard to the Framework and relevant development plan policies.</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p>DISMISSED</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Appeal A Ms Clare Dyer Cheynes Cottage, Brook Lane, Albury, Surrey, GU5 9DH</p> <p>22/P/00941 – The development proposed is 2 x single storey side extensions, single/part two storey rear extension, changes to rear fenestration, and landscaping works following</p>	<p>DISMISSED</p>

<p>demolition of side and rear extensions.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: Non-determination</p> <p>Appeal B Ms Clare Dyer</p> <p>22/P/00554 – The development proposed is the erection of a car port.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: Non-determination</p> <p>Inspector's Main Issues: The main issues in both appeals are whether the proposed developments would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') and development plan policy; The effect of the proposals on the openness of the Green Belt; if the developments 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 them.</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p>DISMISSED</p>
--	-------------------------