



# **EWHURST PARISH COUNCIL**

## **WITH ELLENS GREEN**

Clerk of the Council: Joanna Cadman

Tel: 01483 268627

email: [clerk@ewhurstellensgreen-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@ewhurstellensgreen-pc.gov.uk)

### *Responses to Planning Applications since 21<sup>st</sup> April 2020*

#### **WA/2020/0453 Longmeadow Barn, 25 Hermongers Lane**

*Certificate of Lawfulness under Section 192 for rear porch ground floor extension with roof light and alterations to existing single dwelling*

Although the Parish Council cannot formally comment, WBC have been alerted to the following concerns:

- these extensions bring the total extensions very close to the permitted 40%
- the design is poor
- it is not clear what has happened to the donor building (in comments in respect of WA/2019/1030 which was withdrawn)
- the reason for a 'dummy door' is not clear
- the status of the mobile home is not clear

#### **WA/2020/0507 Inchdrewer, 3 Williams Place**

*Certificate of Lawfulness under Section 192 for erection of extensions including dormer windows*

No objection

It was noted that the dwellings in Williams close appear not to have been extended since their construction and as such are an important element of small sized dwelling in Ewhursts housing stock.

#### **WA/2929/0518 Farmers Cottage, Shere Road**

*Erection of extension following demolition of existing extension*

No objection

#### **WA/2020/0511 Rosewood, Gransden Close**

*Erection of extension following demolition of existing*

no objection

#### **Hoyle Cottage, The Street**

*Ewhurst Conservation area works to trees*

No objection, noting the safety aspect of this work

#### **WA/2020/0581 Marylands Pitch Hill**

*Erection of new entrance gates*

No objection

Request that, if reclaimed bricks are not used, then consideration be given to sandstone being used in the pillars' construction, either completely or as a dressing to hide the brickwork.

#### **WA/2020/0396 Marylands Pitch Hill**

*Erection of outbuilding following demolition of existing*

Design statement now received, the lack of which we had raised in our previous response. Our previous comments apply:

*Ewhurst Parish Council objects to this application on the following grounds:*

- *There is very little information with this application, making it very hard to take a reasoned view on its merits or otherwise.*

- *There is no Design and Access statement, which we would expect.*
- *We would also expect a biodiversity report by an independent biodiversity consultant, given the age and situation of the building to be demolished. There should, at the minimum, have been an appropriately timed bat survey.*

*We also note that there have been a considerable number of applications for this property.*

*If it is decided to approve this application, we would ask for a condition to ensure that the building cannot be used as a separate dwelling.*

**WA/2020/0599 Hurtwood House School Radnor Road**

*installation of a sewage treatment plant and associated worked and decommissioning of the existing sewage treatment plant and reinstatement as car parking*

Happy to support

**WA/2020/0607 Land at Gadbridge Lane**

*Erection of a dwelling and associated vehicular access*

Object.

This site is located in open Countryside beyond the Green Belt and outside of the defined settlement of Ewhurst. There was an Appeal on this site in 1990 (and again for 20 units in 2016/17) where the Inspector's view was that this land was part of the open Countryside surrounding Ewhurst. He found that; 'There is a substantial difference between the east side of Gadbridge Lane, which is residential in character, and the west side where the character is predominantly rural.' He dismissed that appeal because of the impact upon the character of the Countryside. Policy has altered since 1990 but the NPPF and the Waverley Local Plan still support these principles. That judgement, having been made by a higher authority, in 1990 has not changed.

The Parish Council should seek to protect against development in 'The Countryside' since this is the predominant designation in the Parish as a whole. A lapse here would create a precedent that would diminish future objection on sites such as 'Pennings' (which we successfully resisted in the past) and so many other, so called, infill sites that will inevitably come forward.

**WA/2020/0638 Lowser Orchard House, Coneyhurst Lane**

*Erection of detached stable building*

No objection

**WA/2020/06750 Rumbeams Barn, Rumbeams Farm**

*Erection of single storey link extension*

Concerns:

1. Existing floor plans submitted with this application do not match those submitted in 2017. In particular, a large extension on the east side of the barn is shown as existing.
2. no mention is made of materials, other than that they will be sympathetic.
3. This is a heritage building and has special status interest. The roof tiles were removed last October, most of the wall cladding and some of the frame has been removed, the building is vulnerable.

**WA/2020/0697 Maple Stud Equestrian Centre**

*Change of use and alterations including part demolition of existing storage building to provide a dwelling; change of use and alterations of part of another building to provide additional residential floor space to an existing dwelling; use of land to provide private amenity areas to new and existing dwellings, car parking, landscaping and erection of boundary wall (revision of WA/2019/1538)*

*Comments from Ian Davis:*

The correct test for this proposal would, in my view, be a prior approval application for the conversion of a farm building. Waverley may have guided the applicant away from this approach because the use is more 'horsiculture' than agriculture and this may rule-out that analysis. It may be worth asking.

I know that some Councillors found this a well contained development and well presented. Both of these points are correct. That said, consistency again rears its head and there have been, in principle, other similar residential developments on farms and smallholdings which have been resisted by the PC. Lemans Farm and Yard Farm are notable examples.

In principle, I would object as this is residential development in the Countryside. I do, however, note the previous support and the earlier debate. If it is supported by the PC I would make it clear why this site is an exception. One approach could be that it is entirely surrounded by other residential uses, it is well thought-out and environmentally responsible. That said, I would exercise caution for fear of precedent and future conflict with other similar proposals.

Object:

Over-development

Concern about potential spread of development on that site, which is part of the buffer zone between Ewhurst and Cranleigh.

Concern about access, inadequate to deal with potential volume of traffic.

Concern about adequacy of infrastructure.