



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08/12/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/20/3256127

9 Greenway, Great Bookham, Leatherhead, Surrey KT23 3PA

- 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 Graham Hughes against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref: MO/2020/0462/PLAH dated 9 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2020.
 - The development is detached metal sectional garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for detached metal sectional garage at 9 Greenway, Great Bookham, Leatherhead, Surrey KT23 3PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: MO/2020/0462/PLAH dated 9 March 2020, and the plans referenced: Block Plan; Manufacturers Spec; Tree Location Plan; Location Plan and Manufacturers Spec – Elevations x2.

Preliminary Matters

2. The garage has been constructed at the appeal property. As the development had, on the basis of the information provided, been carried out before the date of the application, I shall treat the application as one made under Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for planning permission for development as carried out, namely a detached garage.
3. The description of development on the application form included additional details of the form and materials as well as the purpose of the garage. Whilst I have taken all this information into account in my decision, I have only included the form of the development on the header above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the garage on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached property with a flat roofed attached garage with its neighbour at No 11 Greenway, within a predominantly residential area. The properties are on good sized plots with generally open frontages and good sized rear gardens.

6. I agree that the outbuilding is sizeable, particularly in terms of its length and width and therefore overall footprint. I have also taken into account the existing shed within the rear garden. However, given its siting towards the rear of the plot, with a generous amount of garden area in between the main house and the outbuilding, the garage appears as a domestic outbuilding. The modest eaves and roof ridge height of the garage also re-enforce its appearance as a domestic outbuilding. Given these factors related to siting and height, it does not in my view compete with the scale and form of the main dwelling and does not appear cramped or out of proportion in relation to the existing dwelling or its plot. Although timber may be more common, metal is not, in my view, an alien material for domestic outbuildings and the green colour assists in assimilating it into the garden context.
7. Outbuildings in rear gardens are a common feature in residential areas. Although I recognise that the garage at the appeal property is larger than many outbuildings, it does not appear out of character with this general pattern of development, particularly in the context of the size of the garden at the appeal property. Given my findings both with regard to the relationship of the garage with the existing dwelling and plot, as well as being compatible with the general pattern of development in the surrounding area, I am also satisfied that it does not harm the character and appearance of the local area. Given its siting to the rear there is also be no harm to the street scene.
8. I therefore conclude that there is no harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and local area from the garage, as built. There is no conflict with Policies ENV22 and ENV32 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 and the National Planning Policy Framework, especially Section 12, all of which, amongst other things, seek for new development to respect the local context.
9. Although not included in the Council's refusal notice, the Council has made reference to the Bookham Neighbourhood Development Plan. I am satisfied that there is no conflict with Policy BKEN2 of this Plan which also seeks for good quality design which respects the character and appearance of the local area.

Other Considerations

10. I have taken into account the objections raised by surrounding neighbours. Although the garage can be seen from some neighbouring properties and rear gardens, given the size of the rear gardens and boundary treatments, I agree with the views of the Council that the garage does not materially harm the living conditions of the surrounding neighbours in terms of outlook, loss of privacy and loss of light.
11. I have noted the concerns expressed by neighbours regarding potential noise disturbance from the proposed use of the garage and accessing cars to the garage through the existing garage and via an extended driveway at the rear. However, these concerns are conjectural at this point in time, and moreover, the garage relates to an outbuilding related to the residential use of the dwelling and plot. I have no reason to consider that it would result in significant noise impacts that would be materially harmful to the amenities of the surrounding neighbours. Furthermore, there are separate legislation and controls in place should this become an issue in the future.

12. The Appellant has indicated that the garage could be adjusted in its siting to fall within permitted development rights for domestic outbuildings. However, my decision is based solely on the planning merits of the development before me.

Conditions and Conclusion

13. As the garage is already in place, the standard conditions relating to commencement of development, appropriate materials and for the scheme to be built in accordance with the approved plans are not appropriate or necessary.
14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR