

PLANNING COMMITTEE

29 JANUARY 2025

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>The Harrow Inn, The Street, Compton, Surrey, GU3 1EG</p> <p>22/P/01999 – The development proposed is change of use of public house, together with extensions and alterations following partial demolition to provide five dwellings with associated amenity space and car parking.</p> <p>Officer Recommendation: To Approve Planning Committee: 3 January 2024 Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector's Main Issues: The appeal site lies within an area of Green Belt. The main issues in this case are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to relevant development plan policies and the provisions of the Framework;• The effect on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it;• If the proposal would be inappropriate development, whether the 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 it. <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	*ALLOWED
-----------	---	-----------------

2.	<p>White Hart Lane, Wood Street Village, Guildford, Surrey, GU3 3DZ</p> <p>23/P/01976 – The development proposed is new front porch and raising the roof to create increased habitable accommodation.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector’s Main Issues: The main issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework¹ (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies and its effect on openness; and • 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>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	* ALLOWED
3.	<p>Tollgate Farm, Guildford Road, Effingham, Surrey, KT24 5QL</p> <p>23/P/02028 - The development proposed is for the erection of a forestry barn and hardstanding.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector’s Main Issues: The main issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework and any relevant development plan policies and the effect on openness; • The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; • The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of residents of the neighbouring properties with regard to noise; and • Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any 	* ALLOWED

	<p>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>4.</p>	<p>South Cottage, Redhill Road, Cobham, KT11 1EF</p> <p>24/P/00156 – The development proposed is described as the demolition of buildings, removal of hardstanding and the erection of two detached self build dwellinghouses (to be built to the plans or specifications decided by the occupants), with landscaping, parking, and access.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector’s Main Issues</p> <p>The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposal on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, including its effect on openness, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and any relevant development plan policies;• the effect of the proposal on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area; and• if the development is inappropriate whether the 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. <p>COSTS DECISION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for the demolition of buildings, removal of hardstanding and the erection of two detached self build dwellinghouses (to be built to the plans or specifications decided by the occupants), with landscaping, parking, and access.• The applicant considered that the appellants have behaved unreasonably by appealing against a refusal of planning permission (24/P/00156) which had not materially changed from the previous application (22/P/01784) and had been refused at appeal (APP/Y3615/W/23/3323077).• It is acknowledged that both the scheme before me and 22/P/01784 proposed 2 detached dwellings in a similar	<p>DISMISSED</p> <p>REFUSED</p>

	<p>location on the appeal site. Accordingly, it is not unreasonable to assume the considerations in relation to inappropriateness in the Green Belt, and the effect on Thames Basin Special Protection Area would be similar across both schemes. Nevertheless, submitted drawing 505 shows the proposed dwellings would have a smaller footprint to those proposed in 22/P/01784, so it is reasonable that the impact on the openness of the Green Belt be reconsidered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, for this application of costs, most importantly is the difference in housing type proposed. 22/P/01784 proposed market housing, whilst the scheme before me proposed self-build housing. These housing types are considered differently both within national and local policy. Notably the development plan which has a policy specifically for self-build and custom housing, Policy H1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015 – 2034. • Consequently, although there are similarities between 22/P/01784 and the scheme before me, I am satisfied they do not constitute identical applications and there are unique points of consideration for both. As such, that the appellants sought to appeal the refusal of planning permission 24/P/00156 does not constitute unreasonable behaviour, and the costs incurred by the applicant are not unnecessary or wasted. An award of costs is not, therefore, warranted. <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Land at Cavendish Place, Guildford, GU2 8NJ</p> <p>22/P/01653 – The development proposed is development of x10 flats.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector’s Main Issues</p> <p>The main issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; • the effects of the proposal on the ecological value of the site and implications, if any, on the Broadstreet Common Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI); • whether the scheme would be provided with satisfactory means of surface water drainage; 	<p>DISMISSED</p> <p>REFUSED</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the effects of the proposal on trees within and adjoining the site; • whether the scheme would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers; • whether safe and convenient access could be provided and whether there would be any effect on the parking provision for Cavendish Place residents; and • the effects of the proposal on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA). <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Land to the south of Gole Road and west of The Willows, Gole Road, Pirbright GU24 0PZ</p> <p>22/P/01277 – The development proposed is described as SITING OF STABLES AND USE OF LAND FOR THE GRAZING OF HORSES AND RETENTION OF ASSOCIATED DRAINAGE WORKS.</p> <p>Delegated Decision: To Refuse</p> <p>Inspector’s Main Issues The main issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whether or not the development constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt and its effects upon the openness of the Green Belt; • the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area; • the effect of the development upon the living conditions of the occupiers of The Willows, with particular reference to noise and disturbance; and, • if the development would be inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. If so, would this amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the development. <p>Please view the decision letter online via the planning portal.</p>	<p>DISMISSED</p>