



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2019 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) PIEMA

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/19/3237542

La Ruana, Lynx Hill, East Horsley KT24 5AX

- 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 Marcus Gray against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/P/00825, dated 9 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension to provide single garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension to provide single garage at La Ruana, Lynx Hill, East Horsley KT24 5AX in accordance with the application Ref 19/P/00825, dated 9 May 2019 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: 1857_001 Rev p1, 1857_010, 1857_020, 1857_021, 1857_022 and 1857_023.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the main dwelling.
 - 4) No development shall commence until all trees and hedges on the development site, or any trees whose canopies overhang the site, have been protected by strong fencing, of which details of its location and type have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The fencing shall be erected in accordance with the approved details before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed within any fenced area, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a large detached two storey dwelling located on a private residential road. The properties along Lynx Hill are all large detached properties, set back from the road with substantial front gardens and driveways giving the residential area an open and spacious character and appearance.
5. The proposed garage would be located to the front of the property on an area of existing hard standing, but its location to one side of the appeal property means it would not be in a prominent position and in any case would be largely screened from views from Lynx Hill by an existing front wall and substantial vegetation.
6. There is concern that due to its location at the front of the property it would project beyond a building line on Lynx Road. Whilst the proposed garage would project forward of the host property and immediate neighbouring properties, I saw on my site visit that a building line is not readily perceived due to the vegetation and spaces between the houses. I acknowledge houses are generally well set back from the road, but this set back varies and there is development at Little Orchard, opposite the appeal site, and at Oak Lodge, which is also located on the southern side of Lynx Hill, which are a similar distance back from the road to that which the proposal would be, and are close enough to the appeal site to influence the character and appearance of the site's setting. Whilst these spacious areas to the front of the properties are clearly an important feature of the area, a sufficient set back from the road would be maintained that is not out of keeping with other properties on the road. Furthermore, the area at the front of the appeal property is large enough to accommodate the proposal without resulting in a cluttered appearance.
7. The modest height and width of the garage means it would not appear dominant in the context of the host property, in particular, as the floor level of the garage would be set lower than that of the host dwelling. The resultant difference in eaves level also does not detract from the overall character of the dwelling.
8. Concerns have been raised from a neighbour and the Council that the development would change the ground floor window arrangement of the host property, disrupting the current symmetry. Whilst it is acknowledged the appearance will change, I do not consider the loss of a window or the addition of the proposed garage would unacceptably change the character or appearance of the host property.
9. On the basis of the above, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and so would comply with Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015 -2034 (April 2019) and the

National Planning Policy Framework. These seek, amongst other things, to ensure new development reflects local character. The proposal would also comply with the Residential Extensions and Alterations Guildford Borough Council Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2018 which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure house extensions and alterations are appropriate to the character and appearance of the existing property and street scene.

10. Policy EH-H7 of the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan (2017 – 2033) Referendum Version states that garages are normally positioned to the sides of dwellings, not in the front, in order not to clutter frontages. As the proposed garage does not result in a cluttered frontage given the ample room available at the front of the property, it would not conflict with the aims of this policy.

Other Matters

11. Concern has been raised that a greater extension to the driveway would be required to allow cars to manoeuvre. However, I have no evidence before me to demonstrate a larger drive would be necessary and have therefore not considered this matter further.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. Where necessary, and in the interests of clarity and precision, I have slightly altered the conditions to better reflect the advice in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.
13. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of the development and the approved plans, in the interest of certainty. I have also included the condition requiring the materials match those of the main dwelling in order to maintain the character and appearance of the area. In respect of tree protection measures, a condition is necessary to ensure no harm occurs, and it requires compliance before the commencement of development to achieve its aim of protecting the trees.
14. I have not included the Council's suggested additional condition relating to a site meeting. Compliance with the included condition is sufficient to ensure the protection of the trees on the site and so this additional condition is unnecessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR