



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2001

by **M T O'Rourke BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for the  
Environment, Transport and the Regions

The Planning Inspectorate  
Room 1404  
Tollgate House  
Houlton Street  
Bristol BS2 9DJ  
☎ 0117 987 8927

Date

02 MAR 2001

**Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/A/00/1054920**

**Land at Frensham Vale, Farnham**

- 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 Mr and Mrs K J Chandler against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
- The application (ref: WA00/1170), dated 29 May 2000, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2000.
- The development proposed is detached house to be used as a private dwelling.

**Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed.**

## Planning Policy

1. The development plan comprises the Surrey Structure Plan 1994 and the Waverley Borough Local Plan adopted in 1993. The Local Plan shows the site as lying outside any settlement boundaries within an area designated as rural area beyond the Green Belt. As such the site is subject to policy GB2 of the Local Plan and Structure Plan policy PE3. In accord with longstanding national policy, set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 7, these policies protect the countryside for its own sake and resist development except for uses related to the essential needs of agriculture, forestry, outdoor sport and recreation, mineral extraction, waste disposal and gypsy caravan sites. This policy is carried forward as C2 in the emerging Waverley Borough Replacement Local Plan, placed on deposit in January 1999.

## Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of an area of woodland extending to some 18ha on the south side of Frensham Vale with a narrow road frontage and access via a field gate. The surrounding area is rural with some scattered residential development on the north side of the road and to the east of the site of mainly detached houses set in extensive grounds. The proposed dwelling with the main residential accommodation on the first floor would be erected towards the rear of the site on an open land on the valley floor with trees to the sides.
4. A similar development was dismissed on appeal in 1987, the Inspector concluding, "the countryside would be changed by degrees in a way which the policies in the Structure Plan are intended to prevent". To my mind, little has changed since that decision, either on the ground or in policy terms, that would justify a different view now being reached. No special need has been argued for the development in terms of either the essential needs of agriculture or forestry. I am not persuaded that the previous use of part of the site as a

private golf course justifies the erection of a dwelling of a similar size, appearance and location to a clubhouse.

5. I find no support for the proposal in the revised PPG3 on Housing. One house would make an insignificant contribution to the local planning authority's requirement to provide sufficient housing land and make more efficient use of land. More important in this case is the Government's commitment to promoting more sustainable patterns of development and, particularly, concentrating most new housing in urban areas. The appeal proposal lies in the countryside where it is longstanding national, strategic and local policy to resist further sporadic development. That a house might be unobtrusive in this well wooded location is not a good argument for permission. It could be repeated all too often to justify development that would cumulatively change the face of the countryside as we know it and result in development in less sustainable locations, away from services and facilities and more reliant on the private car. As such, I consider that the proposal would have sufficient impact, in terms of the introduction of built development, use of the access and general activity, to change the character of what is at present an undisturbed woodland area, contrary to the objectives of the Structure Plan and Local Plan.
6. I have noted a reference in <sup>the</sup>third party letters to there being an original permission for the development of this land at a density of 2 dwellings per acre, and therefore justifying an application for only one house now. The Council has not referred to any permission being granted on the land, nor is there any reference in the 1987 decision letter. I must conclude that if there had been such permission it was granted many years ago in a different policy context and is no longer relevant.

### Conclusions

7. I appreciate the support for the appellants from the local community. However the development would remain here long after them and I am not satisfied that there are any other material circumstances in this case compelling enough to override the strong policy objections to the proposed development. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

### Formal Decision

8. In exercise of the powers transferred to me, I dismiss the appeal.

### Information

9. Particulars of the right of appeal against this decision to the High Court are enclosed for those concerned.



INSPECTOR

**S J Thwaites BSc Dip EP MRTPI**  
Borough Planning and Development Manager

TO

Mr & Mrs Chandler

14th August 2000

Frimley Designs & Surveys  
28 Youlden Drive  
Camberley  
GU15 1AL

### TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - WA00/1170

Waverley Borough Council as Local Planning Authority under the provisions of Part III of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, DO HEREBY signify their REFUSAL of planning permission for the development specified in the form of application deposited by you with the Council on 12th July 2000 and described in the First Schedule.

#### FIRST SCHEDULE

Erection of a detached dwelling.  
Land at Frensham Vale, Farnham

#### SECOND SCHEDULE

The reasons for the decision of the Council to refuse permission for the development are:-

- 1 The site lies outside a settlement in the rural area beyond the Metropolitan Green Belt but within an area subject to Policy PE3 of the Surrey Structure Plan Replacement Plan 1994 and Policy GB2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 1993. Within areas subject to these policies there is a presumption against development other than that required to meet the essential needs of agriculture or forestry. The proposed development conflicts with those policies.
- 2 The proposal comprises the undesirable introduction of residential development to the detriment of the character of this attractive rural area.
- 3 In 1986 the Secretary of State dismissed an appeal ref. T/APP/R3650/A/86/61178 relating to a similar development. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, there has been no material change in the circumstances since that time to justify a reversal of that decision.



S J Thwaites  
Borough Planning and Development Manager

PL16

WA00/1170

(PLEASE SEE NOTES ATTACHED)

