The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/D/23/3326759
Eastwood, Church Road, Windlesham, Surrey GU20 6BT

- 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 R Ward against the decision of the Surrey Heath Borough Council.
- The application Ref 23/0531/FFU, dated 18 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2023.
- The development proposed is a freestanding open carport.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Eastwood is located within a row of properties along the south-western side of Church Lane. The design, scale, and siting of the properties vary, and the residential area becomes more rural as Church Lane extends to the north-west.

4. The detached property is set some distance back from the road with the frontage used for parking and is enclosed by fencing. It has an existing forward projection which accommodates garaging and extends to just behind the front elevation of the neighbouring property, Brendons. The proposed carport to be sited adjacent to the garage would project significantly beyond, leaving a limited setback from the road. Whilst the building line along Church Lane varies this would be a notable projection. Together with the garage, which was also an addition, there would be a significant elongation of built form which would both be disproportionate to the property and out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development.

5. Compared to other properties along the street which have more open frontages, Eastwood is more enclosed. Nonetheless, landscaping is not permanent and should not be relied upon to screen development. Due to its height and proximity to the road, the pitched roofed carport would be a prominent and incongruous addition to the street scene. Whilst the structure is relatively modest with open sides this would not be overly apparent from the road or minimise the impact of the development.

6. The appellant has referred to a number of other properties within the surrounding area which have structures towards the front of the plot. The planning history of these is not before me, nonetheless, I accept that there is variety in the position and relationship of buildings to the road. This is, however, part of the varied character of the area and therefore it is difficult to draw comparisons between individual properties, and each case is to be considered on its own merits.

7. Overall, I find that the siting and form of the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and the host property. It would therefore fail to accord with policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document, the Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan and Residential Design Guide SPD which promote high-quality design which respects local character, separation between buildings and boundaries, and enhances the roadside landscape.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR