



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2022

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 NOVEMBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/22/3294571

Broadway, 11 Landscape Road, Warlingham CR6 9JB

- 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 Alex Hammond against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2021/2072, dated 29 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a timber car port for 2 cars.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Landscape Road is a residential street characterised by 2 storey detached houses set within modest gardens. In general, the dwellings are set back from the road behind maturely landscaped frontages often providing off road parking. There are several examples of single storey garages or outbuildings located within these frontages and these are predominantly screened by the mature planting.
4. The appeal site has recently had its frontage landscaped and the front boundary replanted. This makes the site appear visually stark, and more open than neighbouring frontages, at odds to the general character of this part of Landscape Road. Nevertheless, as the planting matures, this will soften the frontage and provide more cohesion with its surroundings.
5. The proposed car port would be located to one side of the frontage area, set back from the road access. I am satisfied the frontage planting, as it matures, would suitably screen the proposal from the road, when viewed from the front or when approached from a westerly direction.
6. However, the appeal property has a side garden which stretches to the road behind the proposed location of the car port. The frontage planting does not appear to carry on along this part of the boundary, and so the proposal would be clearly visible across it when approaching the site from the east.
7. As there is nothing before me which would secure planting along that part of the boundary, I am not satisfied that the proposal would be suitably screened

from the road. It would therefore be obvious within the street scene, at odds to the verdant appearance of Landscape Road, and uncharacteristically visibly in comparison to other examples along the road.

8. Consequently, the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy, Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies, and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), insofar as the seek a high standard of design that reflects and respects its setting.

Conclusion

9. For the reason given above the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no sufficiently weighted material considerations, including the Framework, that would indicate a decision otherwise. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR