
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2023

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/23/3326941

37 Fairway, Guildford, Surrey GU1 2XN

- 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 and Mrs P Lawton against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/P/00158, dated 31 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a detached garage at 37 Fairway, Guildford, Surrey GU1 2XN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/P/00158, dated 31 January 2023, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 22151 BP 02 10A; 22151 OS 02 10A; 22151 PA 02 10A; 22151 PA 10 10A.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this detached house which is set within a generously sized plot. The surrounding area contains detached properties within large and mature surrounding plots. There is no consistency in the positioning of the houses and no consistent building line to the houses.
4. The appeal property has a frontage onto Fairway. The house is positioned to the right-hand side (north) of the plot, when viewed from the road and there is a large open side garden to the left, as well as a generous rear garden. The front boundary is marked by a tall and dense hedge which offers significant screening to much of the property.

5. The proposed double garage would be sited to the left side of the plot, closer to the front boundary than the house. It would be constructed with brick elevations and a pitched, tiled roof and would measure 6.5m by 7.6m and would be 5.2m at its highest point.
6. The Council indicates that the garage would be in a prominent position, forward of the house and it would be out of character with the surrounding area. Reference is made to the Council's publication '*Residential Extensions and Alterations*' Supplementary Planning Document of 2018 (SPD). The Council points out that the SPD states that garages in highly prominent locations which sit front of the building line and/or that take up a disproportionate amount of original garden space will not be accepted.
7. The proposed position of the garage would be forward of the existing house but the area is not one where there is a consistent building line. In addition, the proposed garage would not be in a highly prominent location; on the contrary, it would be in a heavily screened part of the site which would, in all likelihood, not be seen from vantage points outside the site. Furthermore, the appellants have drawn my attention to other properties within the area that have out-buildings which are forward of the front elevation of the houses.
8. In my judgement, the proposed garage would be sited within a well-screened part of the site and would have little or no visual effect outside the site itself. It would be neither visually prominent nor out of character. As a result, I find no conflict with the policies referred to by the Council and it would be consistent with the aims of the SPD.
9. In relation to conditions, the Council has indicated that 2 conditions would be necessary if the appeal were to succeed. Firstly, the time limit for commencement should be 3 years and the second condition relates to implementation in accordance with the approved plans. For the sake of certainty and clarity, I agree that both conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR