
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/19/3228297

44 Woodside Crescent, Smallfield, Horley, Surrey, RH6 9ND.

- 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 and Mrs Collyer against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2019/80, dated 16 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 44 Woodside Crescent, Smallfield, Horley, Surrey, RH6 9ND in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TA/2019/80, dated 16 January 2019, 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 building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: 44WOO18 - PLN 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08 and 09.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 44 Woodside Crescent, is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The neighbouring property to the east is a detached two-storey house. There is a significant gap between the side walls of numbers 42 and 44 as both properties have vehicular access to the side serving a pair of garages set just behind the rear walls of the dwellings.
4. The appellants propose the erection of a first floor extension to the side of the house built off piers. It would virtually infill the gap formed by the side

- driveway. Parking would be maintained beneath along with access to the existing garage.
5. The proposed extension would be set well back from the street façade and, while retaining the established eaves line, the ridge of the extension would be set well below that of the main dwelling. Having regard to this and the extensions narrow width it would appear as a subservient addition to the host property.
 6. The Council is concerned that because of the extension's proximity to the boundary to number 42 its construction would create a terracing effect, resulting in numbers 46, 44 and 42 appearing as a terrace rather than the existing pair of semi-detached houses and one detached house.
 7. In addition to the proposed extension appearing as a subservient addition, it would be open sided at ground floor level with the the first floor element being set further in from the boundary than the ground floor. Furthermore, numbers 44 and 46 are of a simple gable roof design set parallel to the road whereas number 42 has a hipped roof and faces on to the road. For all these reasons, and while I note that the Council usually look for a 1.0 metre gap between side walls and boundaries that would not be achieved here, I am nevertheless not persuaded that what I consider to be a well mannered addition would, if built, in this case create a harmful terracing effect.
 8. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the site or the immediate area, in the way asserted by the Council. It would therefore accord with Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: – *Detailed Policies* 2014-2019 (Adopted July 2014) and Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (Adopted 15 October 2008), as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of the development and the need for it to reflect and respect the character, setting and local context, including those features that contribute to local distinctiveness.

Conditions

9. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
10. In the interests of certainty, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR