



	Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.	
2.	<p><b>Mr &amp; Mrs Cullingham</b>  <b>Hillside Farm, Salmons Road, Effingham, Surrey, KT24 5QJ</b></p> <p><b>23/P/00033</b> – The development proposed is single storey side extension following the demolition of existing single garage and substandard side extension. Proposed front extension (previously approved under reference 19/P/01365).</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p><b>Inspector’s Main Issues:</b>  The main issues are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• whether or not the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt;</li> <li>• the effect of the proposed development upon the openness of the Green Belt; and,</li> <li>• if the proposed development is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, and if so, would this amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.</li> </ul> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	*ALLOWED
3.	<p><b>Mr and Mrs P Risdale</b>  <b>47 Kingston Avenue, East Horsley, Surrey, KT24 6QT</b></p> <p><b>23/P/00269</b> – The development proposed is a first-floor side extension.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p><b>Inspector’s Main Issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.</li> </ul> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	*ALLOWED

<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Mr Andrew Kamm, Bourne Homes Ltd</b>  <b>Streamside, Harpers Road, Ash, Guildford, GU12 6DB</b></p> <p><b>22/P/00977</b> – The development proposed is demolition of existing house and outbuildings and erection of 22 new houses with associated parking and creation of new vehicular access.</p> <p>Planning Committee 21 June 2023  Planning Committee Decision: To Refuse  Officer Recommendation: To Approve</p> <p><b>Inspector’s Main Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the effect of the proposal on pedestrian and highway safety;</li> <li>• the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of Oakside Cottage with particular regard to privacy; and</li> <li>• the effect of the proposal on the integrity of European Sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>COSTS AGAINST GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL</b>  I find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated. Consequently, the application for a full award of costs is refused.</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p><b>*ALLOWED</b></p> <p><b>REFUSED</b></p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Claremont Vinesse Group</b>  <b>Orchard Walls, Beech Avenue, Effingham, Surrey, KT24 5PG</b></p> <p><b>22/P/02045</b> – The development proposed is development of 1 no. single storey 2-bed dwelling house with access from The Crossroads.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p><b>Inspector’s Main Issues:</b>  Based on the statement submitted by the Council, and my observations on site, the main issues are whether the proposal would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide suitable measures for sustainability;</li> </ul>	<p><b>DISMISSED</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• make suitable provision towards affordable housing; and the effect of the proposal on:</li> <li>• the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the effect that it would have on the wider allocated Orchard Walls development which is currently under construction;</li> <li>• the character and appearance of the local area with particular regard to the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Effingham Conservation Area (the CA) and the effect on a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA); and</li> <li>• the living conditions of the future occupiers of Plot 8 of the Orchard Walls development, with particular reference to outlook.</li> </ul> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Mr Gareth Voss</b>  <b>Perham, Old Lane Gardens, Cobham, Surrey KT11 1NN</b></p> <p><b>23/P/00279</b> – The development proposed is an extension to front side and rear with accommodation within a redesigned roof form including front and rear gables and dormers.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p><b>Inspector’s Main Issues:</b>  The main issues are i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, street scene and the surrounding area and ii) the living conditions of No 5 Old Lane Gardens with specific regard to loss of light and outlook.</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p><b>DISMISSED</b></p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Mrs Ling Chen</b>  <b>1 Madrid Road, Guildford, GU2 7NT</b></p> <p><b>23/P/00493</b> – The development proposed is described as the re-submission of previous planning application 22/P/01864 with proposal of subdivision of land into two separate plots; and the creation of new 2-storey semi-detached 2 to 3-bedroom dwelling house with car parking in front court and bike store in rear gardens.</p>	<p><b>DISMISSED</b></p>

	<p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p><b>Inspector's Main Issues:</b> The main issues are the effects of the proposal on i) the character and appearance of the area and ii) the integrity of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA).</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>St John's Close Developments Ltd</b> <b>Land adjacent to The Chase, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 7UH</b></p> <p><b>22/P/01630</b> – The development proposed is student accommodation.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p><b>Inspector's Main Issues:</b> After the appeal was lodged the Council confirmed that if it had been in a position to determine the case still it would have been refused for 9 reasons. Having regard to these, the main issues in this case are:</p> <p>a) the effect on the character and appearance of the area, and on the significance of the Grade II* listed Cathedral Church of The Holy Spirit; b) whether the loss of open space would conflict with policy; c) the impact on living conditions of neighbours and future residents; d) whether it would harm highway safety; e) the impacts on drainage, ecology and the environment and f) whether it would have a likely significant effect, when considered alone or in combination with other plans and projects, on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (the SPA).</p> <p><b>COSTS AGAINST GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL</b> Accordingly, I conclude it has not been shown that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has occurred in relation to the appeal process in this case, and so an award of costs, whether full or partial, is not warranted.</p> <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p><b>DISMISSED</b></p> <p><b>REFUSED</b></p>

