



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 November 2021

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/W/21/3273170

Penny Hatch, The Street, Dockenfield, Farnham, Surrey, GU10 4JA

- 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 Mrs Wendy McCann against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2020/1897, registered 26 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is single garage and garden/general store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a rural settlement, with its immediate setting comprising dwellinghouses set back from the road. These houses mostly have clear front gardens with front boundaries comprising walls, fences, hedgerows or a combination thereof. Garages in the street are mostly set to the sides of their houses, although there is one example on the opposite side of the road of a modest garage close to the front boundary. That garage, however, is a modest structure with a shallow pitched roof and is largely screened from view by the front boundary hedge.
4. Within this context the overall height, size and siting of the proposed garage and store building would make it a prominent and uncharacteristic feature in the street scene that would dominate the frontage of the site. While the boundary fence and hedgerow would provide some screening in the street scene, there is no guarantee that they would be retained at their present height, and the building would be taller than either boundary treatment even if not as tall as the host dwelling. In any case, the presence of screening does not provide justification for development that is unacceptable.
5. My attention has been drawn to other examples of garages and outbuildings sited towards the front of their site in the wider area, including in The Street. The site at Hunters Barn is more than a mile from the appeal site, and as planning permission was granted in 2012 it was assessed against different policies to this proposal. I have little information regarding the other buildings referred to, including when any planning permissions were granted. These

other buildings therefore carry limited weight in my determination of this appeal, and in any case such development is not characteristic of the area overall.

6. I note that the barn that previously occupied the appeal site extended close to the road. However, that building has been demolished and therefore the historic layout of the site is of little relevance to the proposed development.
7. The appeal proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies RE1 and TD1 of the Local Plan Part 1 2018 and retained Policies RD1, D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002. These policies require, amongst other considerations, that development responds to the distinctive local character of the area in which it is located and that it not harm the visual character and distinctiveness of a locality.

Other Matters

8. The Council referred to Policy RD3 of the Local Plan Part 1 2018 in its reason for refusal, but no copy of that policy has been provided. I have therefore determined this appeal in accordance with the policies identified above.

Conclusion

9. There are no material considerations that indicate that this appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
10. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR