



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Timothy C King BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 31/09/17

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/W/17/3169861

Little Jordans, Partridge Lane, Newdigate, RH12 4RW

- 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 Philip Harris against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref MO/2016/1527/PLAH, dated 22 September 2016 was refused by notice dated 30 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as '*extension to existing outbuilding to provide ancillary accommodation*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to an existing outbuilding to provide ancillary accommodation at Little Jordans, Partridge Lane, Newdigate, RH12 4RW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref MO/2016/1527/PLAH, dated 22 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 01, 05:A, PRR1 (Block Plan) and Site Location Plan
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as Little Jordans.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached two-storey dwellinghouse and, within its curtilage, a two-storey garage. The gable-ended garage building is positioned
-

nearer to Partridge Lane than is the main dwelling, but is set back some 3m behind a single storey outbuilding whose rear wall lies close to the site's front boundary. Save for the gated entrance to the front driveway the site, in its rural setting, is well screened from the country lane by high hedging and heavy verdure.

4. At ground floor level the building is used for storage whilst, at first floor level, via an internal staircase, there are two adjoining rooms, one of which receives natural light from a front window. It is proposed to extend the building with a side addition which would provide the building with kitchen and washing facilities at ground floor level, beyond which a door would allow passage to the staircase and the proposed habitable floorspace above comprising a bedroom and living room. This would constitute the extent of the habitable area within the building as the existing ground floor area would remain as a garage/storage area with the submitted plans indicating that the building's two separate, single width, garage doors would be kept.
5. The extension would be overlain with a gabled roof, whose central ridge would connect with the existing roof just below the main ridge height. Whilst increasing the bulk of the building, taken in the context of its existing form and design, I consider that the increase in scale would not affect the building's character. The retention of the garage doors would still give the impression of it being incidental to the main house and not as an additional self-contained dwelling. The extension would also satisfactorily integrate into the building's fabric.
6. Permitting the proposed development would effectively supersede the garage's original planning permission and its conditional restrictions but I find that the overall site arrangement along with the distance to the site's boundaries, and the substantial vegetative screening from Partridge Lane, would all go to ensure that the proposal would not affect the open character of the countryside and would represent an acceptable form of development in this context.
7. Although the appellant has indicated that the intention is to rent out the building as guest accommodation for holiday lets it is also his intention that the building remain ancillary to the main dwelling and is not used as an independent dwelling. The ground floor would remain as a garage for the parking of the appellant's cars and the appeal site would not be subject to subdivision. I consider that this can be dealt with by the imposition of an appropriately worded condition in order to ensure the building's continued ancillary status.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and there would also be no material conflict with the general aims of the policies cited by the Council. In particular, I find that the proposal would be consistent with Local Plan Policies ENV3, ENV22, ENV23 and ENV24 which, amongst other things, look to promote development appropriate in terms of scale, form and appearance with regard to setting and local character, and also Policy CS14 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy which seeks quality of design. Similarly, the proposal is in accordance with relevant advice from the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. For the above reasons and, having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal succeeds. In terms of conditions, in addition to the statutory time limitation requirement, I impose a condition stipulating the use of matching materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance. Also, in the interests of certainty a condition is imposed requiring that the development be implemented in accordance with the approved plans. Finally, a condition is attached which, in order to prevent subdivision of the existing single planning unit, would ensure that the building remains ancillary to the site's main dwelling.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR