



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/22/3301203

139 Westhall Road, Warlingham, Surrey, CR6 9HJ.

- 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 Bruce Kellaway against the decision of Tandridge District Council
 - The application Ref TA/2021/1787, dated 10 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is proposed new garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the new garage at 139 Westhall Road, Warlingham, Surrey, CR6 9HJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TA/2021/1787, dated 10 January 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing garage building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: 21/210-01, 02 and 03A.
 - 4) The building hereby approved shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling house, 139 Westhall Road.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 139 Westhall Road, is located within the urban area, characterised by mainly detached properties with large front gardens. Several of which have detached garages in their front gardens near the road.
4. There is currently a detached garage and carport positioned towards the front of the site, screened from the road by existing planting in the south-east corner of the site. The appellant proposes an extension of the garage, angled to reflect the line of the drive, to provide an additional garage and store. In terms of its design, height and form it would match the existing garage.

5. I appreciate that the garage and carport are read together and therefore, they would, as enlarged extend along the site boundary. In addition, I acknowledge that the proposal would increase the level of built form in the front garden. However, given the size of the front garden, the layout of the garages and the position of the proposed extension, the access point and the existing tree screening, the majority of which the Council's Tree Officer considers could be retained, I am not persuaded based on my observations on site that the development would have a significant impact on the street scene.
6. Further, I also appreciate that other front garden garages may not be as large as the garage/carport here if extended. However, given the above I do not consider that the development would serve to swamp neighbouring garages as suggested by the Council.
7. On balance, I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with the objectives of Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (Adopted 15 October 2008) and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part2: Detailed Policies 2014-2029 (Adopted July 2014) as they require new development to, amongst other things, respect the character of the area.

Conditions

8. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
9. I shall also control the use of the garage to ensure the accommodation remains incidental to the main use of the property as a single family dwelling.
10. In the interests of certainty, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR