
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Lesley Coffey BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 05 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/W/16/3163043
63 Markfield Road, Caterham CR3 6RQ

- 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 Tarlochan Dhupat against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2016/1149, dated 24 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion and re-roofing to two adjoining semi-detached properties (numbers 61 and 63 Markfield Road) existing hipped roofing to be modified to have gable ends and dormer windows to front and rear of each property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion and re-roofing to two adjoining semi-detached properties (numbers 61 and 63 Markfield Road), existing hipped roofing to be modified to have gable ends and dormer windows to front and rear of each property at 61 and 63 Markfield Road, Caterham CR3 6RQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/1149 , dated 24 June 2016, 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: numbered 0001 Revision A scanned on the 01/07/2016 and 0002, 0003, 0004, 0005, 0006 scanned on 27/06/2016.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the details shown on the submitted application particulars.

Procedural Matter

2. Although the application form states that the address of the appeal site is 63 Markfield Road, it is apparent that it also includes 61 Markfield Road. I have considered the appeal accordingly and used the correct address in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal properties comprise two semi-detached, 1930's style dwellings with hipped roofs. They have two storey high projecting bay windows with a small gable end roof above to the front. The proposal would add an additional storey to the bay window. This would be linked to a dormer window which would be set back from the eaves. The rear elevation would adopt a similar design approach. The proposal would use the same palette of materials as used on the existing buildings.
5. The appeal properties are situated towards the southern end of Markfield Road, close to the junction with Newstead Rise. Both properties are set back from the road behind the mature trees to the boundary of the site. Although the surrounding area is characterised by detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings mostly dating from the 1930 and 1940s, within the vicinity of the appeal site there is a significantly greater architectural variety, including a block of flats immediately adjacent to 63 Markfield Road.
6. The proposed extensions would alter the appearance and scale of the dwellings, although the overall height and footprint would remain unchanged. The design adopts an innovative approach to a roof extension and the resultant dwellings would have a modern but unified appearance. It is intended that both properties will be extended in the same manner and at the same time.
7. Whilst the proposed extensions would not be appropriate in locations where there is a considerable uniformity between dwellings, the part of Markfield Road where the appeal dwellings are located includes flats of different periods, heights and materials. The appeal properties occupy a discrete position within the street scene, due to both the screening provided by the trees on and close to the appeal site, and the alignment of this part of Markfield Road. Consequently, the proposed extensions would not be particularly noticeable. I consider that the proposed extensions would add to the architectural variety in the locality and would respect the distinctive character of the area. I have had regard to the fact that the trees to the frontage of the property could be removed in the future, however, the proposed extensions would be well-proportioned additions to the existing dwellings, and even if the trees were removed on the future I do not consider that they would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would deliver the high standard of design sought by policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy and , policy DP7 of the *Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed policies 2014-2029*, which amongst other matters seek to reinforce local distinctiveness.
9. The Council suggest that if the appeal is allowed it would be difficult to resist proposals for similar extensions and this could be harmful to the character of the area. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the particular circumstances of the case, taking account not only the nature of the proposal, but also the context of the site. Any future proposal would need to be assessed in a similar manner and in accordance with the development plan. I therefore disagree that allowing the appeal would create an undesirable precedent.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the advice at paragraphs 203 and 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In order to ensure that the proposal has a satisfactory appearance, I agree that it should be constructed in accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans including the details of the materials submitted with the application.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Lesley Coffey

INSPECTOR