



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2024

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/24/3341637

Manor Lodge, Upper Manor Road, Farncombe, Godalming, Surrey GU7 2HZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Ms H & M Baker against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is WA/2023/02538.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached garage building to provide a bedroom above and a lift access to main dwelling following demolition of existing detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a detached garage building to provide a bedroom above and a lift access to main dwelling following demolition of existing detached garage at Manor Lodge, Upper Manor Road, Farncombe, Godalming, Surrey GU7 2HZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WA/2023/02538, 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: 01 Rev 1, 02 Rev 02 and 03 Rev 02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as Manor Lodge, Upper Manor Road, Farncombe, Godalming, Surrey GU7 2HZ.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of development varies between documents submitted, I have used the description from the Council's decision notice as this the most accurate and has been used by the appellant for their statement.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:

- The character and appearance of the local area, and;
- The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers with reference to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is a detached two story house set away from the street on a steep hillside plot, with the exception of an existing single detached garage on the plot that is at street level and sits to the side and below the ground level of the appeal dwelling. It is immediately neighboured on the same side of the street by similarly scaled properties, although these differ in design and how far up, they are positioned on the hillside.
5. Along the street, as a whole, there is a significant variation in type and scale of housing, with semi-detached and terraced house, including mid-century three storey townhouses. This results in a high degree of variation in design and building line of properties that make up the streetscape, although this variation is significantly masked by the mature trees and shrubberies that substantially screen the appeal dwelling and its immediate neighbours in street views.
6. The proposal would replace the existing detached garage on the plot with a three storey building that would provide a garage at ground level, a single bedroom at first floor level and storage area and lift lobby at third floor level. The lift would provide access from street level to the garden terrace at the ground floor level of the appeal dwelling.
7. The proposal would be the same width as the existing garage and would be set no further forward, it would however be set further into the hillside. The third floor level of the proposal would be substantially set back from the ground and first floor levels and would be contained within the topmost part of a complex combination hipped and gabled roof form. This would variously step and slope upward, following the topography of the hillside location.
8. The front elevation of the of the proposal would align with the front elevation of Lonsdale, a detached neighbouring property that is not as high up on the hillside as Manor Lodge. However, the proposal would not have such a tall roof form as this neighbouring property and would appear to be set down from it and the appeal dwelling.
9. Due to the relatively modest scale of the proposal, its sloping and stepped roof form and position within the context of the scale of the appeal dwelling and neighbouring houses, it would read as a two storey garage annexe. The additional bulk of the proposal, over that of the existing garage on the site, would be appropriately massed by setbacks and the proposed roof form, which would respond to it being set into its hillside location. This would result in the proposal appearing as subordinate to the appeal dwelling. As such, I do not find that it would appear obtrusive within the context of views from the street, and would not, therefore detract from the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

10. Although the proposal would be the same width as the existing garage and be set no further forward, it would be significantly taller than this existing single storey flat roofed structure. It would, however, follow the hillside topography and would only appear as just over a storey tall from the Lonsdale side as it follows this topography and is set in to the hillside. The proposal would also be set well away from the boundary between the appeal dwelling and Lonsdale.
11. Given the hillside location, the scale of the proposal and distance to the boundary and the neighbouring property at Lonsdale, I do not find that when experienced from the Lonsdale side, either from the house or garden, that its height and bulk would result in an overbearing effect. The proposal would not, therefore result in a loss of outlook to the extent that it would result in any significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of Lonsdale. Rather, the proposal would appear to be substantially set back and screened by the mature planting along both sides of the boundary between the two properties and would have a minimal visual impact.
12. Given the hillside location and the distance to the garden boundary and then to the house at Lonsdale, the height and scale of the proposal would not result in any significant loss of sunlight or daylight to the ground floor living room or first floor bedroom on this side of Lonsdale at any time of day, at any time of year. Any loss of sunlight or daylight would, therefore, be marginal at worst and would not be to a degree that would be experienced as overshadowing or oppressive.

Other Matters

13. Concerns have been raised by other parties regarding the effect of overlooking from the proposed rear glazed door and windows to the lift lobby on the upper floor that would open onto the upper terrace. However, the door and windows would result in only tangential views over part of the upper garden at Lonsdale and would not result in a degree of overlooking over and above that to be found in a developed residential area of this type. As such the additional overlooking would not be to the extent that would result in any significant loss of privacy to the occupiers of Lonsdale.
14. Concerns have also been raised by other parties that the proposal could result in a separate dwelling. The proposal would, however, result in only a single bedroom that would add to the living space of the appeal dwelling, albeit within a separate annexe. The users of this bedroom would be entirely dependent on the kitchen, bathroom and other facilities provided in the main house. Any change to a self-contained dwelling would need to be the subject of a separate planning permission. A suitably worded condition can be applied to an approval to that effect.
15. For the reasons given above I do not find that the proposal would result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area, or any significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. As such, it would accord with the Waverley Borough Council Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2010) and would not conflict with Policy TD1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1) (2018), Policies DM4 and DM5 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 2) 2023 and paragraph 135 of the

National Planning Policy Framework (2023). Collectively these seek development that is of a high quality design that responds to the distinctive local character of the area in which it is located avoid harm to the amenity of occupants of existing occupants of nearby residences.

Conditions

16. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council in the event of the appeal being allowed and I have included the condition relating to the use of the permitted ancillary residential accommodation. I have also included the standard condition relating to the timing of the development. In the interests of design quality, I have also attached conditions requiring compliance with approved drawings and materials that match those of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

17. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR