

Planning Committee

9 October 2019

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 particular decision letter, they should contact Sophie Butcher (Tel: 01483 444056)

1.	<p>Ms Karen Curl Land west of 1 Old Drive, Gomshall, Guildford, GU5 9LH</p> <p>18/P/01895 – The development proposed is described as erection of a single dwellinghouse with associated parking and landscaping following the demolition of existing outbuilding and removal of hardstanding.</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 development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; and• The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, with due regard to the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB).• The site lies within the Green Belt and consists of a piece of land which previously formed a detached part of the residential garden of 1 Old Drive.• Paragraph 145(e) of the NPPF states that limited infilling in villages is 'not appropriate' development within the Green Belt. Though the site falls just outside the defined settlement boundary of Gomshall, the Council accepts that the site is nonetheless located within the village.• The fact that the development would be 'limited' insofar as it would involve 'small scale residential development' is also agreed.• I see no reason to reach a different view in either regard. The Council's specific concern in this context is that the development would not constitute 'infill'.• Old Drive continues beyond the site to Kingswood Hanger, however this dwelling cannot be easily seen from the frontage of the site, or elsewhere within it.• The site does not appear as a gap within a continuous built-up frontage, and is clearly not therefore an existing property within such a frontage.• The site does have a strong spatial and visual relationship with existing residential development immediately to the south and east. The strength of this relationship is reinforced by the similar size of the site relative to adjacent plots, the fact that both it and they contain gardens, and by the similarly heavy definition of their outer boundaries by trees.• Together, these trees form a strong edge to the built-up area, providing an appreciable sense of containment, and clear spatial and visual distinction from the open land beyond.	<p>*ALLOWED</p>
----	---	------------------------

- The site appears as an obvious gap within the established layout of dwellings either side of Old Drive.
- Infilling would indeed square off the existing pattern without entailing any perceived extension of the existing built-up area of Gomshall. As such, I find that the appeal scheme would constitute the infilling of a small gap within built development, as defined by the supporting text of Policy P2 of the LPSS.
- I conclude that the development would be not inappropriate within the Green Belt. It would therefore comply with Policy P2 of the LPSS, and the Framework, which each seek to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development.
- The site is located within the AONB. Paragraph 172 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty within AONBs. The site additionally falls within an area identified by the Council as an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).
- The site is well related to existing development along Old Drive. It is a garden space, not a field, and it is well contained by trees. The site does not therefore form a component of the open landscape and due to its containment, there is little sense that it plays any significant or appreciable transitional role in landscape terms.
- A close board fence runs along the west of the site. This would provide screening of the development from the footpath which runs close to this boundary. It is unlikely that much other than the chimney would be visible from this path. As this would also be viewed in the context of already existing development to the south, it would not appear intrusive.
- The path skirts the edge of the adjacent Netley Park. This is apparently historic, albeit undesignated, designed landscape. There would be little scope for long views into the site from Netley Park, meaning that no undue harm would arise to the character or appearance of the Park and its setting.
- The narrow dimensions of Old Drive, and the vegetation to either side, provide the lane with a semi-rural character. Vegetation within gardens and along boundaries complements this character, but development is nonetheless suburban in type.
- In this context, the site appears as a somewhat plain garden space, whose openness makes very little contribution to the semi-rural character of the lane. As such, the development would not have an urbanising effect on its setting, or indeed undermine the semi-rural character of Old Drive.
- I conclude that the development would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the area, including to the natural landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. It would therefore comply with Policy P1 of the LPSS which seeks to conserve and enhance the AONB and the distinctive character of the AGLV; Policy G5 of the LP03 which seeks to secure high quality design; and the Framework with regards to achieving well-designed places and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
- I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

<p>2.</p>	<p>Sharaz Homes 36 South Lane, Ash, GU12 6NG</p> <p>18/P/01779 – The development proposed is described as: To construct a pair of semi-detached 3 bed houses with alterations to parking and boundary fences of approved scheme ref: 17/P/01686.</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 development on the character and appearance of the area. • The site is situated along South Lane which consists of a range of house types set within mature and reasonably spacious plots. The site itself accommodated a bungalow which I could see during my site visit had been demolished with the rear of the site being redeveloped. • The proposal relates to a pair of semi-detached 3-bedroom houses addressing South Lane along with a detached house situated at the rear. • Planning permission has been granted by the Council to demolish the existing bungalow and construct two detached houses at the site. No changes are proposed to be made to the plans, elevations or architectural style of the property at the rear. • The design of the semi-detached properties would be similar to that already approved as well as those to the rear of the site, where planning permission has been granted on appeal for 6 dwellings. • The immediate area is characterised by a mix of detached two-storey houses, including semi-detached properties, and bungalows, being distinct as they are set within good plots. • The proposal would predominantly be viewed from South Lane, although it would also be closely related to the 6 properties at the rear. The semi-detached properties would be higher than the previous bungalow but similar if not slightly lower than the approved scheme for a single dwelling on South Lane. • The semi-detached properties would be sited close to the boundary with No.34 South Lane, given their scale and the overall quantum of development proposed. No.34 itself is reasonably modest in scale, being a hipped roof bungalow. • Given the use of hipped roofs on the appeal scheme, there would be a gradual transition in height such that the height of the semi-detached properties would not result in a particularly abrupt or ad hoc increase in height within the street-scene. • However, the proximity of the boundary with No 34 would result in a space between the building of 2m, according to the Council. This would be out of character with the predominant pattern and relationship between buildings in the area, despite the distances between the roof slopes, such that the proposed built form would appear cramped in the street-scene when viewed next to No.34. • Whilst the relationship between Nos 42 and 44 has been brought to my attention, these properties are sited further from the highway which in my view reduces their prominence within the street-scene. • The number of onsite car parking spaces involves a layout incorporating tandem style car parking. The proposed layout necessitated by the number of parking spaces would in my view result in a cramped and contrived overall layout given that it would also reduce the perception of spacing 	<p>DISMISSED</p>
-----------	---	-------------------------

	<p>between buildings. This would therefore not respond to the pattern, grain or layout of the established and distinctive local character of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development would be incongruous and visually discordant when viewed in the context of properties along South Lane and would not add to the overall quality of the area. • I therefore conclude the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would fail to accord with saved policies G5(3)(4)(5) of the GBLP and Policy D1 of the LP. These policies relate to: space around buildings, street level design; layout; and requires development to be designed to reflect the distinctive local character of the area. For the same reasons, the development would not accord with the Guildford Borough Council Residential Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004 or the achieving well-designed placed objectives of the NPPF. • I have found that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and this is not outweighed by a modest increase of one home arising from the semi-detached properties. • I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed. 	
<p>3.</p>	<p>Reside Developments Ltd 64 The Street, Tongham, GU10 1DH</p> <p>18/P/01039 – The development proposed is the retention of No.64 The Street and development of 6 x 3 bedroom dwellings, new access and car parking.</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 area with specific regard to a locally listed building. • The appeal site is an enclosed parcel of land that directly abuts the back edge of The Street. It comprises mainly grassed areas surrounded by mature trees with a close boarded fence to the road boundary. • To the northern half of the site is Number 64 The Street. This is a high quality detached two storey brick cottage of traditional design and proportions. According to the evidence, the building is either late 18th or 19th century. • The cottage is certainly a rarity in the street scene which consists mainly more modern dwellings. The buildings angle relative to and positioning near the road frontage the building makes a positive contribution to the street scene. The building is locally listed. • The spaciousness of the land around the building allows clear views of it on approach to the centre of the village and a full appreciation of its design and traditional appearance as a rare example of its type. • The proposed development would site a pair of semi detached two storey dwellings immediately to the south of No 64, at right angles and facing The Street, their gardens would extend to the rear. • The appeal scheme would appear as a small but self contained estate of new housing with its own access off The Street. • Plot sizes in the area vary quite significantly and whilst I feel the layout and siting of the proposed dwellings would not sit appropriately in the area, the density of the scheme does not strike me as unacceptable. • In terms of No.64 the erection of six dwellings within such close proximity would crowd it and whilst the design of the new dwellings would pick up on traditional elements and could put to use quality materials, their scale and 	<p>DISMISSED</p>

	<p>general form would be obviously modern which would jar with the more quaint and traditional proportions and form of No.64.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The erosion of the space around it would reduce one’s ability to appreciate it unencumbered and read what the evidence points to as a rare example of its type in the village. • The reduced height of the two semis that would sit in front of No 64 would go some way to reducing the modern scale impact of them but their siting, design and placement would all but obscure the front elevation from views on the road approach into the older parts of the village centre which, in terms of reading and appreciating the history of the village is an important view. • As a locally listed building, No.64 is a non-designated heritage asset for the purposes of the Framework. • The proposed development would cause harm of a relatively small scale in the grand scheme albeit such harm that would affect the asset’s significance as a rare example of its type and one that sits within a pleasant open setting which allows clear views of it both outside the site and on the road approach to the historic village core. • The proposed development would be harmful to both the character and appearance of the area and impinge on the setting of a locally listed building. There would thus be conflict with saved policies G5 and H4 of the 2003 Local Plan and Policy D3 of the LPSS. • Whilst I have not found harm in respect of matters pertaining to the TBHSPA that would not be sufficient to reduce that which I have found to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst having regard to other matters that have been raised, which includes submissions from local residents, it is for this reason that the appeal is dismissed. 	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Mr Ben Sciberras 26 Mead Way, Burpham, Surrey, GU4 7LG</p> <p>19/P/00184 – The development proposed was originally described as an “Existing family bungalow to be extended by adding a first floor. Existing single storey garage to be extended to line up with existing rear of building. Rear conservatory to be demolished.”</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 and appearance of Mead Way. • The appeal site is currently occupied by a single-storey bungalow, linked by a garage to the neighbouring property 25 Mead Way. • The entrance to Mead Way is characterised by the side elevations and boundary fencing of 280 and 282 London Road, which are orientated towards London Road. The result being that the appeal property and No 1 serve as the visual entrance to the street scene. • Although varied in nature, the diversity of building designs within Mead Way are unified through the use of recesses to vary building facades, varied building materials, and windows to break up the visual bulk and scale of the dwellings. • This is particularly evidenced by the existing two-storey dwellings on No 1 and 2, which achieve a harmonious appearance within the street scene. Despite their comparatively large scale, their visual bulk has been reduced 	<p>DISMISSED</p>

	<p>using these design elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal deviates from this design aesthetic by duplicating the footprint of the host dwelling (excluding the garage and utility areas) for the additional storey. • This design choice, in combination with the existing width and depth of the dwelling, would result in a bulky and dominant appearance which would be detrimental to the established Mead Way character. The materials proposed at the first-floor level would further intensify this effect. The use of horizontal ‘hardiplank’ panels as shown would present a predominantly uninterrupted façade, unduly emphasising the size and bulk of the extension. • Although the proposed additional storey has merits within the context of Mead Way, the proposal does not effectively reduce the visual bulk and mass of the extra storey by using varied façade forms, varied building materials, window placement or similar methods. • The use of panelling with a feathered texture along the first-floor extent would not, in my judgement, be sufficient to create a discernible reprieve from the dominance of the horizontal panelling from the street level. • It was recommended by the appellant that conditions be imposed to overcome any character and appearance effects identified. • Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of Mead Way. It conflicts with saved Policies H8 and G5 (criterion 2, 4 and 7) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (adopted January 2003), and Policy BFD1 of the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2035 (adopted version April 2016). • The appeal is therefore dismissed. 	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Ms Sumi Wang Spinney Stables, Land to the east of Outdowns Lodge, Outdowns, Effingham, KT24 5QN</p> <p>18/P/02025 - The development proposed is described as “Planning application for the erection of 1x4 bed dwellinghouse with hard and soft landscaping and refuse storage”.</p> <p>Delegated Decision – To Refuse</p> <p>Summary of Inspector’s Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issues raised are whether or not the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and; • If the proposal is 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 the development. • The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that other than with a small number of exceptions, the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt. • The area of the compound enclosed by the hedging, within which it is proposed to locate the dwelling can in my view be considered to comply with the definition of previously developed land. • Outside of the enclosed compound, the site had a distinctly rural character, with areas of trees interspersed with small clearings. • The existing stable building is located in a corner of the site against its boundaries; given its limited height it has little effect on the openness of the site. The submitted plans assert that its floor area is 52 square metres (m²). 	<p>DISMISSED</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, the proposal would result in a substantially larger building within the site. The submitted details shows this would have a floor of 161m², considerably in excess of that of the existing stable building. Whilst the number of dwellings had been reduced from a previous appeal at the site, the spread of the building over the site would be greater than at present. • I am also conscious the scheme includes a vehicular entrance at the highway, access drive and bin store, which would add further development at this location. • There is also likely to be paraphernalia that would be associated with a residential use, which would also diminish the openness of the site. • Consequently, which I note the single storey height of the proposal and the use of green roofs, I find that the development would result in an increased quantum of development at the site and would not preserve, but would have a considerable negative effect on, the openness of the Green Belt, at this location. • The scheme would therefore comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which paragraph 143 of the Framework states is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. • The proposal would be contrary to the requirements of the Framework and would conflict with Policy P2 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) (2019) as well as Policy ENP-G1 of the Effingham Neighbourhood Plan (2018) which requires that proposals be in accordance with the Framework’s provisions. • I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed. <p>COSTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guildford Borough Council for a full award of costs against Ms Sumi Wang. • The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for a development described as “Planning application for the erection of 1x4 bed dwellinghouse with hard and soft landscaping and refuse storage”. • The Council asserts that the appellant has submitted the appeal, following a previous appeal which found that a scheme for two dwellings on the site was not acceptable. Whilst the previous scheme was found to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the appellant has advanced what are considered to be very special circumstances in order to attempt to justify the development. • The appellant has advanced arguments in support of the appeal and, whilst I have disagreed, I consider that there was no unreasonable behaviour in this respect. • The scheme that has been submitted is also sufficiently different from that which was previously considered at appeal, in that the number of dwellings has been reduced from two to one and the design has been altered. Clearly, these amendments were attempts to overcome the concerns of the previous Inspector when dismissing that appeal. Consequently, I do not consider that the appellant has been unreasonable in pursuing the appeal. • I therefore conclude that for the reasons set out, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary expense during the appeal process has not been demonstrated. An award of costs is therefore not justified. 	REFUSED
6.	<p>Mr C McKie The Glen, Mill Lane, Pirbright, Woking, GU24 0BN</p>	

18/P/02143 – The development proposed is creation of a 2m high, profiled and grass-seeded security bund around existing southern entrance to yard to form means of enclosure from fields to prevent unauthorised access and theft, including native hedge planting on outer slope.

DISMISSED

Delegated Decision: To Refuse

Summary of Inspector's Conclusions:

- The main issues are whether or not the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the effect upon the character of the area; and if the proposal were to be inappropriate development, whether or not the 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 necessary to justify the development.
- Certain forms of development, including engineering operations, are not inappropriate in the Green Belt providing they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
- The bund has been constructed at the edge of an equestrian yard that contains various equipment, containers and storage areas. On its opposing outer edges, the bund sits alongside a large grassed field.
- When viewed from various viewpoints across the field, the bund, which is approximately 2m in height, forms a visible feature. Indeed, it provides an abrupt rise in land level immediately adjacent to the natural gentle slope of the field.
- The existing grass/low-level planting, which covers much of the bunds top and slopes, assists to some extent in softening the visual appearance of the bund and in promoting that it blends in with its natural surroundings.
- It remains the case however that the bund is readily distinguishable and appears as an unnatural addition to the landscape.
- This would be the case even were the bund to be newly grass-seeded to closely replicate, in terms of its surface appearance, the adjacent grassed field.
- The appellant has referred to the bund being partly screened by new hedging to its eastern slope. However, this hedging only screens a part of the bund. In any event, landscaping cannot be relied upon to provide a solid and permanent buffer to views. This is because planting is ever evolving, is reliant on regular maintenance to retain a consistent form and may be reduced in scale or extent in the future.
- The proposal fails to preserve the Green Belt's openness and would therefore be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, in this regard, it would conflict with Policy P2 of the new Local Plan.
- The bund is also of relatively limited height and expanse. It is also when viewed across the field from southern vantage points, seen against the backdrop of an equestrian operation and associated built form.
- Notwithstanding that the bund fails to preserve the Green Belt's openness, I consider that, due to its siting and relatively modest scale and extent, it does not appear as an unduly prominent physical feature.
- It has an acceptable effect upon the character of the area and does not cause harm in this context. The proposal accords with saved Policy G5(9) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan (2003) and with Policy D1 of the new Local Plan in so far as these policies require that new development integrates into the existing townscape and landscape.
- The above contribution does not clearly outweigh the significant harm identified to the Green Belt (including harm derived from loss to openness)

	<p>so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The appeal is therefore dismissed. 	
7.	<p>Ms Andrea Larter High Brambles, Park Corner Drive, East Horsley, KT24 6SE</p> <p>19/P/00070 – The development proposed is demolition of bungalow, an erection of a pair of semi-detached houses.</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 effects of the proposal on, firstly, the character and appearance of the area, and secondly, the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. • The proposal has been revised following the refusal of a previous application that was dismissed on appeal. The appellant has attempted to address the Council’s and earlier Inspector’s concerns by reducing the width of the properties and lowering the roof height within the street. An extra storey has been created by including a lower ground floor at the rear. • Park Corner Drive is characterised by substantial dwellings in large plots. These have generous front gardens creating open frontages with limited formal boundary treatment. • These mature features break up built form and create a semi-rural, sylvan and spacious character. • There are mature trees and hedgerows within the street and a tree lined backdrop which is visible in the gaps between dwellings and at the end of the street, which slopes gently upwards. • These mature features break up the built form and create a semi-rural, sylvan and spacious character. • The buildings themselves, whilst with some variation in architectural style and scale, are two storey or lower, with horizontal emphasis of proportions reflecting the large, predominantly regular plot sizes on this side of the street. • Where there are semi-detached buildings, these are within larger plots, with substantial width frontages and similar proportions of building, maintaining the local character. • Policy D1 of the LPSS requires development to reflect the distinct local character of the area and respond to, and reinforce, locally distinct patterns of development. • Policy EH-H7 of the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan (2018) (NDP) requires that designs are in keeping with the established character of East Horsley and the styles of properties surrounding the development. • Whilst not listed in the Council’s reason for refusal, Policy Eh-H8 of the NDP is referenced in both main parties submissions and is relevant. This requires infill development to have size and massing no greater than that of surrounding properties. • The increased built form arising from the replacement of the existing bungalow with a pair of semi-detached dwellings, taken together with the subdivision of the currently open frontage and the introduction of surfaced parking areas, would have an urbanising effect that would be at odds with the prevailing open spacious character of the locality. • The proposed building would appear as two storey close to the boundary and would not follow the incremental stepping of properties within the street, 	DISMISSED

	<p>despite the lower eaves design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I note that the roof plan has been carefully considered to reduce the bulk and massing of the roof, however the scale and positioning of the building would dominate the plot and fail to respect the open and spacious character and views of the tree lined backdrop. • The proposal, whilst stepped following the slight increase in levels within the street, would have a substantial roof height, matching those of neighbouring properties. • Overall, I consider the proposal would be out of keeping with its surroundings in terms of scale and height of the proposed dwellings, and the limited separation distances to the side boundaries. • The proposal does not address the characteristics of the street scene and surroundings and as such it would represent an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such it would conflict with LPSS Policy D1, NDP policies EH-H7 and Eh-H8, and National Policy in the Framework. • The provision of one extra dwelling would add to the supply of housing in the Borough although to a very limited degree. • I have concluded that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the area. Paragraph 12 of the Framework confirms that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. • There are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework that would outweigh this conflict. Therefore, for the reasons given above and considering all other matters raised, the appeal should not succeed. 	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Mr Faheem Khan Kenley, Silkmore Lane, West Horsley, KT24 6JB</p> <p>19/P/00204 – The development proposed is demolition of existing garage to Lansdowne and erection of one detached 5-bed house with double car port to the rear of the site and new parking area to the front of Lansdowne.</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 proposals on, firstly, the character and appearance of the area, and secondly, the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. • The site is located to the rear of two dwellings which front Silkmore Lane. The lane is characterised by modest chalet bungalows and two storey dwellings fronting the street, with generous front gardens, gaps between buildings and single plot depth. • The consistent sized and proportioned rear gardens create narrow long plots. • The results in a linear form of modest dwellings set within a spacious and open character. Where there is development at depth behind existing properties, these are in pockets with vehicle access serving multiple dwellings, and set behind the established rear boundaries of the frontage dwellings. • The site is located within a settlement boundary, where development and redevelopment for new housing is acceptable in principle, subject to the 	<p>DISMISSED</p>

consideration of site specific characteristics.

- The proposal would be set to the rear of the existing dwellings, at right angles to this linear frontage pattern.
- The location within the existing rear garden would reduce the depth of the existing plot, at odds with the strong grain of built form. This would be harmfully out of character with the local spatial pattern.
- The proposed vehicle access, whilst using an existing route to the rear of Kenley, would intensify this use. This would change the character from low-key paved and grass route to a formal shared access to serve the additional dwelling, urbanising the frontage. This would be an awkward and harmful relationship, especially given the proximity to the side elevation of Kenley.
- I have had regard to the proximity of new dwellings to the rear, including development at 'Stonechat' which the appellant has identified as drawing comparison to the proposal.
- The introduction of a single dwelling, accessed from the front as proposed, would appear incongruous to the established form of development and the character of the area.
- Whilst the character is predominantly frontage detached chalet style bungalows and two storey dwellings, these are modest in scale and width.
- The proposal would be of a larger scale and taller than the existing dwelling, dominating these buildings to the front.
- The large, blank side elevation would also be visible within the streetscene in the gaps in the frontage between buildings, creating a harmful urbanising effect on the spacious open character and highlighting the uncharacteristic right-angled positioning.
- Whilst designing to create visual interest at pedestrian level, the scale and size would be disproportionate to the plot and frontage dwellings. I note that 'Stonechat' includes a larger scale of dwelling, and provided design cues for the proposal, however these are located within a different character of clustered dwellings and read materially differently to the appeal site.
- Therefore, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policy D1 of the LPSS and Policy WH2 of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2033 (2018) and chapter 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).
- I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.