



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2019

**by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 16 August 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/19/3229724**

**75 Buxton Lane, Caterham, CR3 5HL**

- 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 Subash Srinivasan against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
  - The application Ref TA/2019/519, dated 18 February 2109, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2019.
  - The development proposed is a rear and side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area

### Reasons

3. The host building is a three bedroom detached dwelling, located in an area of similar detached two storey dwellings, set in relatively generous plots, which provides a pleasing sense of spaciousness and openness arising from the set-back from the street, spacing between buildings and generous rear gardens.
4. The proposed side extension would require the removal of the existing flank wall and would fully integrate with the host property, replicating the architectural expression of the host building. This would make the host building appear wider from the front, but not out of proportion to itself or the dwellings in the immediate local area.
5. Although reduced in size by the proposed extension the remaining gap between the two properties would replicate that to be found elsewhere on the street and would not be out of keeping with the spacious character of the area when viewed from the front.
6. The proposed rear extension, however, would appear as two separate elements. Whilst the smaller first floor element would fully integrate with the host dwelling, replicating the existing architectural expression and roof profile, the ground floor element would extend rearwards from the existing house and the side and first floor part of the rear extension, projecting significantly into the rear garden. Its extensive shallow sloping roof profile would also give the

impression of being separate architecturally from the host building and the fully integrated proposed side and first floor extensions.

7. Notwithstanding that the ground floor element of the proposed rear extension would be screened from potential street views, it would however be apparent from views from the rear of neighbouring properties and those that back on to the appeal. In this context, the size of the proposed ground floor rear extension, exacerbated by the extent of the proposed shallow sloping roof, would result in the proposal appearing to be out of proportion to the scale of the host dwelling and its rear garden.
8. Furthermore, due to the bulk of the proposal it would be out of keeping with the scale of neighbouring dwellings. It would also encroach on the sense of spaciousness at the rear of the host property and the immediate locality, to which the existing rear garden of the appeal property makes an important contribution.
9. Due to the impact of the scale of the proposed ground floor rear extension, the proposal would appear overly dominant and incongruous in the context of the host building and the local area. The proposal would, therefore, result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the area.
10. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies, which collectively seek to ensure that developments are of an appropriate scale, do not result in overdevelopment and are in keeping with their surroundings, thereby respecting and contributing to local character.

### **Other Matters**

11. Whilst I acknowledge that there is an extant planning permission<sup>1</sup> for a side and rear extension to the appeal property that is similar to the appeal proposal, I have considered the proposed development on its own merits, which is a fundamental principle that underpins the planning system.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed

*Victor Callister*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning Ref:2016/1945