



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2020

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02/11/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/20/3253616

1A Church Close, Fetcham KT22 9BQ

- 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 & Mrs Neil Hartley against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref MO/2020/0086/PLAH dated 15 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as demolition of rear conservatory, alteration to house including the conversion of integral garage to habitable accommodation, erect detached double garage, new front wall and gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of rear conservatory, alteration to house including the conversion of integral garage to habitable accommodation, erect detached double garage, new front wall and gates at 1A Church Close, Fetcham KT22 9BQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref MO/2020/0086/PLAH, dated 15 January 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, Drawing Nos: 1060/05, 1060/06, 1060/01, 1060/04, and 1060/03A.
 - 3) The materials used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council altered the description of development to include reference to the conversion of the existing integral garage to habitable accommodation. This is also the description used by the Appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The whole proposal is before me and I am not, therefore, restricted to dealing with only the elements which have concerned the Council, which comprises the detached double garage. Notwithstanding this I have no substantive evidence

to lead me to a different conclusion upon the other elements identified in the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The site is within a residential area comprising predominantly two storey detached properties within spacious plots, set back from the highway and with open frontages. The proposed double garage would project forward from the existing property and would introduce a built form between the property and the highway. The appeal site is a corner plot, the existing boundary fence, adjacent mature trees and landscaping screen the site to a degree.
6. The proposed development would be proportionate to the existing property and would integrate well with the existing urban form. The proposed boundary treatment and landscaping to the front of the site along with the existing screening and set back of the proposed development would sufficiently soften the appearance of the proposed development.
7. I conclude that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. There is no conflict with Policy CS14 of the Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009), and Policies ENV22 and ENV23 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (2000) which seek amongst other things to resist poor quality of design, by ensuring development respects the site, character and appearance of the locality and incorporates appropriate landscaping.
8. The Design Guidance for House Extensions, Supplementary Planning Guidance (2000) states that garages should not dominate the appearance of the house and should not generally be in the front garden as it could be given undue prominence at the expense of the character and setting of the house. As identified above I have found that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and would not be dominant or incongruous to the appeal site itself.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.
10. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development and a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have imposed a condition relating to materials.
11. The Council have suggested a condition relating to restricting the use of the garage for the parking of private motor vehicles and incidental domestic storage. Any alternative use beyond that associated with the existing dwelling would be subject to separate planning considerations via a separate planning application, therefore the proposed condition is considered unnecessary.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR