



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 March 2025

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 APRIL 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/24/3350187

1 The Moorings, Hindhead, Surrey GU26 6SD

- 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 Andrew Mosses against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is WA/2024/00662.
 - The development proposed is detached outbuilding with ancillary accommodation above to replace double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellants name on the application form differs in spelling from the appeal form. The appellant has clarified that the correct spelling to be used is Andrew Mosses.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling located in a residential area on the corner of Headley Road and The Moorings. The dwelling is set back on the plot which slopes from front to back, with the principal elevation facing Headley Road. Parking, sheds and a garage are located to the front of the dwelling, but their size and scale ensure they are subordinate to the dwelling and do not feature prominently in the street scene. A close boarded fence runs along the boundaries of the property with immature hedging behind. There is no uniform boundary treatment or property style within Headley Road or The Moorings and, where ancillary outbuildings exist to the front of dwellings, they are typically subservient in appearance and set back from the road frontage.
5. The proposed development seeks to replace the existing garage with a part single storey/part one and a half storey detached outbuilding with a double garage, workshops and games room on the ground floor and two studio rooms above. Visually, the detached outbuilding would have the height, mass and overall appearance of a new dwelling and it would be sited on higher ground and forward of the dwelling on the plot with a gable end directly adjacent to the front boundary with Headley Road.

6. Notwithstanding the materials to match the existing dwelling, due to its siting on the plot and excessive scale it would dominate the street scene when viewed from Headley Road and such a prominent building would appear out of character with the prevailing pattern of development. The existing boundary treatment and any proposed landscaping along the frontage of the appeal site would not adequately screen or soften the proposal and in any case such features are not permanent and may change over time. Consequently, the proposed outbuilding would be a highly prominent and visually obtrusive feature in the street scene.
7. Section 9.23 of the Waverley Borough Council Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2010 states that within built up areas, outbuildings should be set back from the front elevation of the dwellinghouse. Applications to provide such facilities forward of the front elevation are unlikely to be acceptable as they could appear unduly prominent at the expense of the character and setting of the house and street scene. The proposal does not adhere to this guidance and this weighs against the scheme.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy TD1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites (2018) and Policies DM1 and DM4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2023) and Policy H6 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032. Amongst other things, these policies seek high quality design which responds effectively to its surroundings and reinforces local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

9. I note that no objections have been received from neighbours. However, this is neutral in the planning balance. A lack of objections does not equate to an absence of harm.
10. It is acknowledged that the proposed building would be smaller than the main dwelling and an appropriate level of garden area would remain on the site, but neither of these factors outweigh the harm caused by the scale, bulk and mass of the proposal forward of the main dwelling and so prominent within the street scene.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coles

INSPECTOR