
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2023

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16TH October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/

White Cottage, 22 Oakley Road, Warlingham, Surrey CR6 9BF

- 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 Owen Flaherty against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2023/415, dated 2 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey outbuilding/home office.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this detached house which is located within a residential area. The houses within the area vary in their design and those on this side of the road (south) are generally set higher than the road, on rising ground. The house is set a generous distance from the front plot boundary, similar to some others in the locality. The appeal property has a single detached garage within its frontage.
4. The houses on the south side of the road display spacious frontages set behind open verges. Although the properties that I saw have areas for car parking, there is generally landscaping which tends to prevail and softens the appearance of the frontages. A small number of properties have garages within their frontages, but these are in the minority from what I observed.
5. The proposed building would be set to one side of the frontage and in some views, would be partly obscured from public view by existing landscaping. However, it would be readily visible in some views from the road. It would be seen in combination with the existing garage with the house on higher ground behind.
6. Whilst it has been accepted that outbuildings (in the form of garages) may be acceptable within the area, I saw no examples of more than a single building within the frontages. In my judgement, the frontage of the appeal site would

appear to be unacceptably dominated by the existing and proposed buildings. Whilst the appellant points out that 13% of the frontage would be built on, I consider that the visual effects of the combination of buildings and the size of the proposed building would be out of character and unacceptable. I saw the other garages in the area that the appellant has drawn my attention to but none of these are on properties with more than one outbuilding in the frontage.

7. The appeal submissions also indicate that the property had planning permission in the past (2006) which included the construction of a double garage but the appellant decided to construct the existing single garage in its place. Given the time that has elapsed since and the fact that it did not involve more than 1 outbuilding, this does not alter my view of the proposal.
8. I have taken all other matters into account, including the proposed use of the building and the use of matching materials. However, I find that there is nothing to outweigh the harm that I have identified. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (Adopted 2008) and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2, 2014-2029. Consequently, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR