
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2019

by Neil Smith BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/19/3236131

3 Talbot Road, Lingfield RH7 6AD

- 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 Chris Hardy against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2019/255, dated 4 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey rear extension and front and rear dormer windows at 3 Talbot Road, Lingfield RH7 6AD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TA/2019/255, dated 4 February 2019, 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: PP001, PP002, PP003 Rev B, PP004 Rev B, PP005 Rev B and the red-edged site plan.
 - 3) 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.

Procedural matters

2. The description of development does not state that the proposal includes for the installation of front and rear dormers. However, the application plans clearly show these elements and I have changed the description of development to accurately reflect this.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are
 - (i) whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Lingfield Conservation Area (CA); and
 - (ii) the effect of the appeal proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 2 Talbot Road with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is in the Lingfield Conservation Area (CA), a designated heritage asset. Part of the CA encompasses the centre of the village which has a sense of space given by the unusually wide Plaistow approaches and High Street where most of the buildings are no more than two-storeys high. The present High Street developed from the middle of the 19th century, first with houses and schools and later with shops on its southern side. These buildings are of brick with slate roofs, often with two tone yellow and red brickwork. The appeal property displays these qualities and makes a positive contribution to the CA.
5. The appeal property is a three-storey terraced dwelling. It is in a row of four dwellings of similar design. The dwellings at either end of the terrace, No 1 and 4, have full width two-storey rear extensions. The adjacent property, No 2, also has a two-storey rear extension, however this extension has been set in from the boundary with the appeal property.
6. The proposal is a two-storey rear extension that would be virtually the full width of the dwelling with a pitched roof and a dormer window to the front roof slope and the replacement of the existing rear dormer window with two dormer windows. The rear extension would be of the same depth as the rear extension of No 4, however it would marginally extend beyond that of No 2. Whilst the proposed extension would not mirror the extension of the adjoining property, No 2, and there would be a narrow passageway between the dwellings, it would be of a similar scale and design to the extensions at Nos 1 and 4. The proposed materials to be used would match those used on the existing dwelling and the extension would remain in keeping with the design of the building and the terrace. For these reasons, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the CA.
7. The Council did not oppose the proposed dormer windows to the front and rear, and on the evidence before me, I have no reason to reach a different conclusion in these respects.
8. I conclude on this issue that the appeal proposal would be appropriate to the site and surrounding area and would not harm the character or appearance of the CA. Consequently, the proposal complies with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge Core Strategy (2008) (CS) and Policies DP7, DP11 and DP20 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 – 2029 (2014) (LP) which require, amongst other things, development to be of a high standard of design that must reflect and respect the character, setting and local context, including those features that contribute to local distinctiveness.

Living conditions

9. The proposed extension would be close to the boundary with the adjacent property. The rear extension of No 2 does not have any windows on its side and rear walls, however there is a doorway. Whilst the extension would be in close proximity to the neighbouring dwelling, the absence of windows combined with the shallow depth of the extension, would not have an overbearing or otherwise unneighbourly impact. Consequently, there would be no harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, No 2.

10. The proposed two storey rear extension complies with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge CS and Policy DP7 of the LP which require, amongst other things, development to provide a satisfactory environment for the occupiers of both the existing and new development.

Other matters

11. I am aware that a local resident and the Parish Council have raised concerns regarding the separation distance between the extension that was granted planning permission in 2015, at No2, and the appeal proposal. However, the circumstances have changed since that application was granted planning permission and, in any event, I have determined this application on its own merits with regard to the particular circumstances.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition would be necessary to ensure that the development would be built to accord with the submitted plans for certainty. To safeguard the appearance of the area, it is necessary to control by condition the details of external materials used.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Neil Smith

INSPECTOR