



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/24/3352270

Little Paddock, Dene Road, Ashted, Surrey, KT21 1EE.

- 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 and Mrs Williams against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref is MO/2024/0835/PLAH.
 - The development proposed is a new garage building with extended hardstanding area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new garage building with extended hardstanding area at Little Paddock, Dene Road, Ashted, Surrey, KT21 1EE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref MO/2024/0835/PLAH, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing bungalow.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings numbered: P01, E01, Site Plan 1:500 dated 28.5.24, Proposed Site Plan 1:500 dated 28.5.24 and Location Plan PP-13105301vi 1:1250 dated 28.5.24.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Little Paddock is a detached bungalow located in a relatively large garden plot. The dwelling is set well back from the plot's frontage to road. Dene Road is characterised by an eclectic mix of low density detached housing on mature verdant garden plots.
4. The appellants propose a double garage located adjacent to the northern boundary of the property and approximately half-way between the front of the house and the

- road frontage. The garage would be of a simple vernacular design and construction with a hipped roof similar to that of the bungalow.
5. The Council's Design Guidance for House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (October 2000) (SPG) is a material consideration, but it is only guidance, and it should not be applied to each and every property prescriptively to the exclusion of all other factors, including the physical circumstances and context of a site. The SPG says, amongst other things, that *a freestanding garage should be designed in sympathy with the house, be built of similar materials and have a similar roof pitch. It should not generally be in the front garden as it could be given undue prominence at the expense of the character and setting of the house.*
 6. The proposed garage has been designed to reflect the architectural style and detail of the host property. However, it would, contrary to the advice in the SPG, be located in the front garden. Nevertheless, it would reflect the vernacular form and style of the bungalow, would be partially screened by the front boundary hedge from the street scene, and due to its proposed location, the overall size of the front garden and the separation distance to the side boundary it would not appear as a cramped form of development here that would erode to any significant degree the openness of the front garden area to the detriment of the character or appearance of the locality.
 7. For the above reasons I do not consider that the proposed garage would result in an obtrusive form of development that would be out of keeping with or detract from, the spacious character and appearance of the locality. Further it would not appear unduly prominent at the expense of the character and setting of the host property. The proposal would therefore accord with the objectives of Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD (Adopted October 2009) Policy CS14, Mole Valley Local Plan (Adopted 12 October 2000) Policies ENV22 and ENV23 and Policies AS-H5 Marinating Built Character and AS-En3 Retaining Character of the Ashted Neighbourhood Development Plan as they relate to, along with other things, the requirement for new development to respect and enhance the character of the area, not comprise overdevelopment in relation to either the size of the plot and/or surrounding developments and be appropriate to the site in terms of its scale, form and appearance.

Conditions

8. The Council have indicated in its evidence that it considers that no conditions are necessary in this case. However, in light of the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance as well as in the interests of precision and enforceability, I consider the following conditions both necessary and appropriate.
9. In addition to the standard time condition, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building. In the interests of certainty, I shall also impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR