



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2022

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/22/3301153

37 Common Lane, Addlestone, Surrey KT15 3LJ

- 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 Steve Jones against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: RU 22/ 0145, dated 25 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2022
 - The development proposed is for 'existing detached garage roof raised following felling of tree'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for 'existing detached garage roof raised following felling of tree' at 37 Common Lane, Addlestone, Surrey KT15 3LJ in accordance with the terms of the application, ref: RU 22/0145 dated 25 January 2022 and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. The development has taken place and therefore this is a retrospective proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Common Lane is a long cul de sac of a mixture of houses and bungalows, many of which have been extended or have outbuildings to the rear. No.37 is a detached bungalow sited within a row of bungalows of the same design with a gabled frontage. These properties generally have a driveway to the side with a garage to the rear. The garages together with backland development, including a bungalow (Nos.37a and 37b) which has its access drive running along the appeal property's southern boundary, are visible through the gaps between the bungalows.
5. The detached garage has an asymmetrical pitched roof and is set back from the property. The plans indicate that the 'existing' garage (before the development took place) was the same design and that the height has been raised by just under 1m. The height is still significantly lower than that of the host property and in my opinion, it is read in the street scene as an ancillary building and reflects the general pattern of development along Common Lane.

6. The garage is large and will be visible from those properties close to the appeal site. However, the proposal, as applied for, is only for the raising of the roof and thereby there is no change to the general form of the building or its proximity to the neighbours.
7. Overall, in my view, the building maintains a subservience to the host property, and the resultant height does not have a significant overbearing or visually intrusive impact to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal complies with the general requirements of policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan which expects development to respond to the local context.

Conclusion and conditions

8. As the development has already taken place conditions relating to a timeframe for implementation and compliance with plans are not necessary. The Council has suggested a condition to ensure that the building is not used as a separate dwelling. The appellant explains that the increased roof height was to accommodate a car ramp to facilitate working from home as a mechanic during the covid lockdowns, and it is now used to work on cars as a hobby. As this proposal relates to an existing garage, I do not consider such a condition would be reasonable or is necessary given the siting and form of the building.
9. I thereby conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR