



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2024

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/24/3340839

18 Ridley Road, Warlingham, CR6 9LR

- 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 Keith Mascarenas against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2023/1193, dated 8 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed new garage/carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed new garage/carport at 18 Ridley Road, Warlingham, CR6 9LR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. TA/2023/1193, dated 8 August 2023 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out below.
 - 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: 23/421-01, 23/421-02, 23/421-03 and 23/421-04.
 - 3) Prior to the fitting of the external cladding of the walls of the garage/carport hereby permitted full details of the colour texture and appearance of the cladding shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary matter

2. The appellant has suggested that the appeal scheme is amended by removing the solar panels; pebbledash rendering the wall facing the road; and installing up and over garage doors. As these changes would materially change the appearance of the proposed garage, I am unable to take them into consideration. This is because the changes have not been subject to public consultation or been formally considered by the council. Accordingly, for the avoidance of any doubt I confirm that this decision is based solely upon the scheme upon which the council made its decision.

Main Issues

3. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character of the street scene and the surrounding area. The second main issue is the effect of the

proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 18a Ridley Road (No.18a), with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character

4. The area in which the appeal site is located is characterised by individually designed detached family dwellings that typically occupy generous sized and mature landscaped plots. Within Ridley Road the dwellings have similar front building lines and are set back from the highway behind spacious front gardens that include a mixture of on-site parking and turning facilities, together with a combination of lawns and mature planting. The appeal property is consistent with this. It has a spacious parking area that is separated and partially screened from the highway by trees and mature planting.
5. A good proportion of the dwellings within Ridley Road, Tandridge Road and Westhall Road have integral, attached or detached garages to the side or front of the dwellings. This includes an attached garage to the front of the dwelling at No.18a; a detached garage to the side of 16 Ridley Road and a large, modern detached garage that projects into the front garden at 13 Ridley Road. During the appeal site visit I also noted a good number of detached outbuildings within front gardens along Tandridge Road and Westhall Road.
6. Overall, I found that the diverse range of garages in the area break up the building lines of the dwellings and add to the informality of the street scene and the surrounding area.
7. Together and amongst other things policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 (CS) and policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 (LP), require proposals to be designed to a high standard and integrate effectively with their surroundings. Developments should reflect and respect the character, setting and local context of the site.
8. The proposed garage/carport would be sited within the front garden and close to the boundary with No.189a. It would comprise a traditionally designed garage/carport with a clay plain tiled roof that would have a catslide feature to the rear and half hips to the sides. It would sit at right-angles to the road and would be accessed from the existing parking and turning area. The proposed garage/carport would sit comfortably within the spacious front garden area and would appear both modest in size and visually subservient to the host dwelling.
9. The proposed garage/carport would be well screened within the street scene, by the mature shrubs and trees adjacent to the front boundary of the appeal site and the trees and planting at the front of the adjacent dwellings. In close views it would be visually discrete and would blend in with the varied street scene. The design and materials of the roof would respect the materials and varied roof lines of the host dwelling.
10. The proposed solar panels would be set on the upper part of the catslide roof and would be visually subservient within the roof-slope as a whole. The application form states the proposed garage/carport would have Cedral cladding walls, although details of the colour, design and appearance of the

cladding is not stated. In principle Cedral cladding would be an appropriate modern material provided its colour, design and finish respect and blend in with the host dwelling and the soft landscaped setting of the site.

11. This is a matter that could be satisfactorily dealt with by the imposition of a materials condition. I also consider that a condition relating to adherence to the submitted drawings would be necessary in the interests of certainty. Both the appellant and the council have been consulted on the appropriateness and content of such conditions and have raised no concerns.
12. For these reasons I conclude on the first main issue that the proposed garage/carport would respect, reflect and be readily assimilated into the street scene and the surrounding area. In this respect the proposal would comply with CS Policy CSP18 and LP Policy DP7.

Living conditions

13. The proposed garage would be located one metre from the boundary with No.18a, where there is a part 1.5 and part two metre high brick wall. The garage would be 3.975 metres high, although it would have a hipped roof and its catslide roof would be hipped away from the boundary with No.18a. The eaves height of the rear elevation would sit below the existing two metre high boundary wall and just above the 1.5 metre high wall.
14. The proposed garage would be sited to the side and in excess of seven metres forward of the dwelling at No.18a. It would be partially screened from No.18a by the existing boundary wall and where it could be seen it would be against the backcloth of the mature planting within the front gardens and beyond. Due to its orientation and height the proposed garage/carport would not result in a material loss of daylight or sunlight within the dwelling or adjacent front garden area at No.18a.
15. As a result of these factors the proposed garage would not be unduly prominent or have an overbearing impact on the outlook from the dwelling and front garden area at No.18a.
16. For these reasons I conclude on the second main issue that the proposed garage/carport would not have a materially harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.18 due to its visual impact. Accordingly, in this respect it would comply with CS Policy CSP18 and LP Policy DP7, which seek to ensure that proposals do not have a significant adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

17. Having regard to the conclusions on both main issues the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Lawrence
INSPECTOR