



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2021

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/W/21/3266572

The White House, Lake Road, Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey GU16 6RD

- 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 Andrew North against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0996/FFU, dated 29 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of detached front garage/workshop.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of the proposal is taken from the Council's decision notice as the description on the application form expanded further to explain the reasons for the development. This description above accurately describes the proposed development.
4. An appeal was dismissed in June 2019 (APP/D3640/W/19/3222481) for a similar scheme. The main changes from that previous proposal are the roof form, which is now hipped, and a reduction to the height. As this is a recent appeal decision and the schemes are of a very similar nature that appeal decision is a material consideration in this case.

Reasons

5. The White House is a detached property set back from the road. It is located within a row of properties to the south of Lake Road but lies outside any identified settlement and is within the countryside. These properties are of a variety of styles, but they follow a well-defined building line with large open frontages.
6. Like the neighbouring properties the front garden area to The White House is used for driveway parking as well as containing landscaping. Along the front boundary is a brick wall which curves into the site along the edge of the

- entrance drive. Behind the wall is shrubbery and a large conifer tree which are visible in the street scene above the boundary wall.
7. From my site visit and the information provided by the parties, other than the increased height of the vegetation, there does not appear to have been any significant changes to the character of the area since the previous appeal decision. To that end I concur with the previous inspector's view that the area has an attractive open character.
 8. The proposed garage, which is designed to face the house, is to be sited in the space behind the wall. I acknowledge that amendments have been made to the proposed building to reduce its impact, although the general size and location of the garage remains the same as the previous scheme and the reduction in height is limited.
 9. Nevertheless, I accept that the change to the roof design would to some extent reduce the visual impact from the road, and that the development may not be perceivable from those travelling in vehicles. However, the amendments do not address the harm found by the previous Inspector to the character and appearance of the area by virtue of the siting of the garage.
 10. Design policy DM9 of the of Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP) requires that developments respect and enhance the local environment and is supported by guidance in the Residential Design Guide. The provision of the garage in this forward position close to the road would be out of keeping with the existing pattern of development. I have to agree that it would create an incongruous feature which would interrupt the open and spacious nature of the frontages, and in my view would be harmful to the character of the area.
 11. The garage would be taller than the boundary wall and would be visible along the edge of the driveway in views from the east. Due to the height of the existing landscaping this would provide screening in views from the west. However, on site it would appear that some level of landscape management would be necessary to accommodate the garage, and once constructed there would be limited space around the garage. As such, and as noted by the previous Inspector the existing landscape screening is not necessarily a permanent feature.
 12. My attention has been drawn to a garage opposite at Long Wood. However, that existing garage is set back from the road and the property has a different context, not forming part of the ribbon development along the south of Lake Road. There is an existing wooden shed in the front garden of a neighbouring property which was also present when the previous Inspector considered the earlier scheme. I have no details of the background to this building, nevertheless this is a smaller structure and is very much an exception to the prevailing form of development, and each proposal must be considered on its own merit.
 13. The garage in terms of materials and general design would be sympathetic to the property, and I sympathise with the appellant's position that the existing garages are of a limited size and that the new garage could facilitate other

changes to the property. Nevertheless, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified to the established character of the area.

14. In conclusion the proposed development would result in harm to the established character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with CSDMP policies DM9 and CP1 which seek to ensure development is respectful to the local environment and protects the countryside from inappropriate development which causes harm to its intrinsic character.
15. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR