



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/25/3366054

Winslow, 1 Mill Lane, Peasmarsh, Guildford GU3 1NB

- 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 Kieron Smith against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/P/01114.
 - The development proposed is erection of a new detached garage at the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Appellant submitted revised plans at the appeal stage to lower the proposed height of the ridge to the garage roof from 3.5m to 3m. Although the Council and other parties have not had the opportunity to comment on the revised plans, they do not in my view represent a fundamental change to the proposal but an attempt to address the reason for refusal. I also do not consider that by taking them into account they would result in procedural unfairness to any party involved, including the Council. I am therefore prepared to take the revised plans into account.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow on the north side of Mill Lane, a private unmade lane, with vehicular access from Oakdene Road. It is one of a small number of single storey properties on the same side of Mill Lane with two storey development further to the west, which forms part of Oakdene Place. The appeal property has a fence along its frontage and a hedge to the side, with a grass verge beyond which continues in front of the other bungalows. The appeal site and surrounding properties are inset from the Green Belt, but it is located within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). There is a solid fence with tall planting on the opposite side of the lane, with commercial premises beyond. The modest scale of the properties and their generally open frontages with grass verges beyond provide a sense of openness to the street scene.

5. The proposal would be a double garage to the front and side of the appeal property. Given the triangular shaped corner of the site, and the dimensions of the proposed garage, it would be sited very tight to both the front boundary as well as to the property itself, and the rear corner would also be very close to the side boundary. It would as a result appear overly large and cramped within the plot and detract from the more open frontages to the appeal property and its neighbouring properties. The reduced ridge height of the proposed garage, as shown on the revised plans would lessen its overall impact, but it would still remain an overly large structure in relation to the scale and proportions of the existing dwelling and its plot.
6. Given its siting together with its overall size, it would be visually prominent in the street scene and detract from the more open character and appearance of the local area.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and of the local area. This would conflict with Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019, Policies D4 and H4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2023) the Residential Extensions and Alterations Guide SPD 2018 and the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Other Considerations

8. There are references to a temporary structure in the front garden at the current time, which I saw at my site visit, but that is not before me and my assessment has been directed to the planning merits of the proposal the subject of this appeal. I have taken into account that the Appellant has contended that the installation of the temporary structure indicates the pressing need for a permanent solution, but this does not override my findings in this case.
9. I have also noted the Appellant's procedural concerns with the application process, but my decision is required to be based on the planning merits of the proposal before me.
10. The Appellant has referenced a previous decision by the Council to allow a three vehicle garage at Unstead Lodge within the Green Belt under its Ref: 04/P/00336. Each proposal must be considered on its individual merits and that has been the basis of my decision in this case. I have also taken into account the outbuilding which can be seen above the fence line to the rear of one of the properties in Oakdene Place, but its much smaller scale does not compare with the proposal before me.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR