

Appeal Decisions for Area Planning Committee (Eastern)

Waverley Reference	Site Address	Officer Rec	Committee or Delegated	Appeal Decision	Summary of Inspector's comments
WA/2009/0043 & 0044	<p>Site: Barn Cottage, The Green, Shamley Green</p> <p>Development: Erection of extensions & alterations to existing detached garage & Listed Building consent for the erection of extension & alterations to existing detached garage</p> <p>Main Issues: Whether the proposal would harm the listed building.</p> <p>Whether the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p>	Refusal	Delegated	<p>Part Dismissed (single storey music room)</p> <p>Part allowed (recycling store) 9/11/2009</p>	<p>The proposed recycling store would be a small, discreet extension. Therefore if built in suitable materials it would not have an adverse effect on the listed cottage or the ancillary nature of this outbuilding. It would also preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The music room extension would constitute a notable enlargement of the garage because of its scale, its form and its design.</p> <p>The property would become dominated by the various recent developments and extensions and, as a result, the form, character and prominence of the original building would be overwhelmed. Therefore the proposed music room would harm the listed building and, by harming the listed building in this manner, it would also detract from the conservation area.</p> <p>Although the recycling store and the music room are shown on the same plans I consider that the extent of each can be clearly identified and they are physically and</p>

					functionally severable. Therefore, to my mind a split decision need not cause confusion in its implementation.
WA/2008/1741 & WA/2008/1870	<p>.Site: Tanyard Farm, Woodhill Lane, Shamley Green</p> <p>Development: Application for a Cert of Lawfulness under Section 191 for the retention of an ancillary building (08/1741)</p> <p>Retention of a linked detached two storey outbuilding to provide ancillary accommodation (08/1870)</p> <p>Main Issue: (1741) Whether the erection of the structure the subject of the application amounts to a “building operation” within the meaning of the 1990 Act, and if so, whether it has</p>	1741 (1870) Refusal	Non-determination Delegated	(1741) Allowed (1870) Dismissed 21/12/2009	<p>(1741) As a matter of fact and degree, the marquee, because of its size, its permanence and its degree of attachment to the ground, should be regarded as a building for planning purposes. It has therefore been found to be lawful and immune from enforcement action.</p> <p>(1870) The linked extension would result in an increase in floorspace over the original dwelling of around 66%. The LP acknowledges that the figure of 40% is a guideline rather than a maximum, but 66% is significantly above the guideline figure.</p> <p>The scale, mass and bulk overwhelm the host building, and that consequently the building harms the setting of the existing house and so fails to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The building would be harmful in Green Belt terms (Local Plan policy for rural extensions)</p>

	<p>become lawful because those building operations were substantially completed more than four years before the date of the application for the lawful development certificate (i.e before 26th August 2004)</p> <p>(1870) (1) Whether the residential annexe amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt and if so whether it causes any harm to the Green Belt in addition to the harm by way of inappropriateness; (2) the effect of the building on the character and appearance of the surround area, including the AONB, AGLV and Shamley Green Conservation Area; (3) if the building to be inappropriate in the GB, whether the harm by way</p>				<p>and design. The Inspector felt that there were no very special circumstances (in the form of permitted development rights or the offer to remove the marquee) that outweighed the Green Belt harm.</p> <p>The building is not particularly prominent, and in the Inspector's view does not cause material harm to the overall quality of the landscape of this part of the AONB and AGLV when seen from the public footpath.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	of inappropriateness & any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the special circumstances necessary to justify the development				
WA/2008/1806	<p>Site: Windrush, Woodlands Close, Cranleigh</p> <p>Development: Alterations & erection of new house</p> <p>Main Issue: The effect the proposal would have on the living conditions of the occupiers of Windrush with particular regard to noise & disturbance; &, on the character & appearance of the surrounding area</p>	Refusal	Delegate	Dismissed 10/12/2009	<p>The Inspector considered that the proximity of the proposed new drive to Windrush would result in a materially detrimental loss of privacy to the occupiers of that dwelling contrary to Policy D1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling and the alterations to Windrush would not integrate with or complement their surroundings and would not make a positive contribution to the appearance of the area, contrary to Policy D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan.</p>

* Appeal decisions may be viewed on the website