

Mr Zac Ellwood
Head of planning and economic development

Waverley Borough Council
Council Offices, The Burys
Planning department
Godalming
GU7 1HR

Reference – WA/2021/0306

4th February 2022

Dear Mr Ellwood,

Following your email notification received on the 26th of January 2022 regarding the committee hearing on the planning application WA/2021/0306 we would like to submit further objections in relation the updated officer report issued as part of the documentation for the hearing.

Impact on the Heritage asset – The Fountain Hascombe

Our initial single-story extension was declined as it would have been visible from The Street in Hascombe and interfere with the fountain and its setting.

The double story extension proposed in the plan for 7 Mare Lane will be directly visible behind the fountain and will block current views of the woodland behind the fountain, this setting makes the fountain an idyllic and rural feature. It will significantly alter the look and feel of the fountain as when facing it you would see the 2-storey extension and the extension would block the wider views towards the woodland.

It's difficult to understand the comment in the report stating '*the property lies in a modern residential development*' as the houses on Mare Lane (7,8 Mare Lane) were built shortly after the Police House property was built in 1928. Our elderly neighbour who occupied 7 Mare Lane for her entire life moved in around 1935 when the property was built until she sadly passed away in 2020. She occupied this property with her parents and then her own family for over 80 years.

The officer also comments 'there is intervening modern development between the fountain and 7 Mare Lane marking a distinct separation'.

We are not aware of such modern development unless the officer is referring to the Police House which was built in 1928 and therefore not modern development.

The final comment mentions 'The fountain would not be unduly affected and remains appreciable as a standalone heritage asset set in a mixed, rural village setting'.

We would strongly disagree with this comment as the rural setting is reflected in the ancient woodland that can be seen over the top and behind the fountain setting – the proposed

extension would completely block this view and therefore significantly alter the setting of this heritage asset.

In addition, the Fountain is constructed out of Bargate Stone having a unique design and visual features – the proposed extension would be a modern brick extension and therefore be in complete contrast with the fountain and not blend into its features.

Design and impact on visual amenity, AONB & AGLV

The comment: the rear extension would be sited 3m from the boundary with number 6.

This is incorrect as our property, Police House, 6 Mare Lane is closer, and we believe the measurements are incorrect.

The plans show that their house is approximately 3m from the shared boundary and our house is approximately 2m from it, giving the impression that the distance between our houses is 5m. We have measured the distance from our house to the boundary and it is only 0.6m meaning that the plans are mis-leading and paint the proposals in a far more favourable light. If the measurements on the other side are to be trusted, then the proposal would not lead to a gap of 3m between our houses but half of that at 1.5m. I am concerned that other measurements could also be inaccurate. In addition, our property is oblique to 7 Mare Lane making the gap closer toward the rear of the extension.

This will lead to overbearing and loss of light over our property which is covered later, as the measurements are much smaller the loss of light will be significant to us.

Impact on residential amenity

The report mentions 'the side proposal would be sited 1m from the boundary'.

Whilst currently fencing is in place – this is our boundary, and our property would be significantly overlooked with the side extension in such close proximity. As previously mentioned by the officer on the fountain assessment, foliage should not be determining factor and should be excluded therefore our property would be overlooked.

The report mentioned: The proposal would not alter the views of No 6 Police House, the views are currently oblique, the proposal would not cross the view line, the side windows serving No 6 are secondary windows from a dual aspect room.

We disagree with this assessment – the closeness of the extension to our boundary will block our light and current views into our kitchen dining room. We have already raised concerns on the measurements and proximity of the side extension, and this will have a significant impact on loss of light into the dining room also these windows are not secondary but the main windows in our kitchen/ living area.

Estimating the amount of light that will be lost in our Kitchen/living area. At present we have a field of view to the left, above and right of their house totalling 220 degrees. The proposal would reduce this to approximately 80 degrees. This would have a significant impact on the amount of light entering our house and would block the views we currently enjoy. We would lose a beautiful view and be confronted with brick wall 1.5m away.

The block plan shows the proposal to build towards the rear of the house, it shows the extension will be roughly in line with our building and would not be visible from the fountain. However, the square part shown to the south of our house is a covered decking

area and so the proposal would extend well beyond our house by about 4m, it would block our view from our decking towards the woodland and would block the afternoon sun. The proposed windows facing towards us, particularly on the first floor will mean that they will be able to see directly into our living space from within their house. We will also lose privacy in our garden and on our decking.

Very special circumstances

With the location being in a AONB there is planning law in place to ensure development is only up to 40% unless there are very special circumstances.

The proposal reflects a 72.6% increase in footprint – the special circumstances in the officer's report relate to the *improvement of the accommodation*. If this is enough to exceed and not meet the planning laws than anyone could simply extend over and above 40% to improve their accommodation.

We have been made aware that the new owners of 7 Mare Lane are a young couple with no children and no other special circumstances other than wanting a big house.

Why not purchase a house that is bigger from the outset?

If they want to improve the accommodation the planning law and policies should support an extension of 40% only.

Simply improving accommodation is setting the precedent to ignore planning law and policy in the greenbelt.

We feel that very special circumstances have not been met and are not justifiable in this proposal and therefore it represents harm to the greenbelt.

The report mentions – the property does not have existing garage provision at site and its reasonable for some form of garage and garden storage to be provisioned. Officers are satisfied that having regard to the size proposed 'very special circumstances' have been demonstrated.

We strongly disagree that the absence of a garage or garden storage is supportive of 'very special circumstances'. The planning law and policy outlines allowing extensions up to 40% in the greenbelt, this should be considered in the overall plan of the extension and the new owners need to prioritise how the 40% extension should be applied. This is a matter of choice, and it seems the officer has decided that because of the exceptional size of the extension is also granting further expansion to support the garage plans. Surely, it's not for the officer to decide whether or not a garage is needed as part of the proposal?

We have been Waverley residents for 20 years and at the Police House for 10 years. We would like to request this reconsidered and rejected so that policy and planning can be applied accurately to protect residents, the greenbelt and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty with a historical asset in situ.

Many Thanks

Marlies Hoozeboom and Tony Kerby

Police House
6 Mare Lane
Hascombe

