



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2023

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 APRIL 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/22/3304092

Pine Lodge, Horsham Road, Bramley, Guildford, Surrey GU5 0AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Olivares against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2022/01264, dated 7 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the construction of a detached oak framed double garage with associated external works, including an extension to the existing driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a detached oak framed double garage with associated external works, including an extension to the existing driveway at Pine Lodge, Horsham Road, Bramley, Guildford, Surrey GU5 0AN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WA/2022/01264, dated 7 April 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01-01 revision PG0; 01-02 revision PG0; 01-03 revision PG0; 02-02 revision PG0; and 05-01 revision PG0.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall not be used for any other purposes than the parking of vehicles or ancillary storage for the dwelling known as Pine Lodge.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

3. Bramley is a village within the Green Belt, with a good mix of shops and services. It is broadly linear following the route of the A281 (which in part is called Horsham Road) and centralised around the junction with Snowdenham Lane and Station Road. The appeal site is a detached residential dwelling located within a row of similar sized properties along Horsham Road close to the centre of the village. They are opposite St Catherine's school and are

generally set back behind maturely hedged frontages which soften their visual impact.

4. Paragraphs 149 of the Framework set out when a new building in the Green Belt would not be inappropriate providing 7 specific exceptions. Policy RE2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1, Strategic Policies and Sites (LP) refers directly to the Framework when it sets out how to deal with development in the Green Belt. However, the Council does not consider the proposal complies with any of the 7 exceptions within Paragraph 149 of the Framework.
5. Nevertheless, as the appeal site is within a settlement which has the features and facilities necessary to be considered a village, it is appropriate to assess the proposal against Paragraph 149 e) of the Framework. This allows for limited infilling in villages.
6. The appeal dwelling is set back from the road and the proposal would be located towards the front of the site behind the existing mature hedge. There is a degree of variance in the building line along Horsham Road, including existing examples of garages located closer to the road than their host dwelling. This along with the residential dwellings on either side of the appeal site, and the proximity to the village centre means development on the site could constitute infill.
7. Taking account of the proposed location, along with the existing boundary hedge, and the form and ancillary nature of that proposed, I am satisfied this would constitute a limited form of development in terms of size and use.
8. Consequently, in this instance, the proposal would constitute limited infill in a village and thereby not constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt. It would fall under Paragraph 149 e) of the Framework and accordingly comply with LP Policy RE2.
9. As the proposal would not be inappropriate development, it is not necessary to further consider the effect of the proposal on openness (or the purposes of including land in the Green Belt), nor is it necessary to consider very special circumstances, and there is no other harm identified to weigh it against.

Other Matters

10. It is noted that a small section of the appeal site, on the opposite side of the driveway to the location of the proposal, is within the Bramley Conservation Area (CA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended, requires that I pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. However, due to the size of the proposal, its location within the appeal site and separation from the access track and CA by the existing mature hedge I am satisfied the proposal would not impact on its significance, character, appearance or setting, and there is nothing before me indicating otherwise.
11. It is noted that the Council have referred to Policy RD3 of the Local Plan 2002 within the officer report. This relates to garages and other ancillary domestic outbuildings located outside of settlements. As the appeal site is within a settlement, I have not considered this further.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested some conditions which I have considered against advice in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. The conditions securing commencements within the relevant statutory timeframe and specifying the approved plans are necessary for certainty. As is the condition limiting the use of the garage to ensure its ancillary relationship to the appeal dwelling and limited impact on its surroundings is retained.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no sufficiently weighted material considerations, including the Framework, that would indicate a decision otherwise. The appeal is, therefore, allowed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR