



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: 04 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/W/19/3236333
71 Hillbury Road, Warlingham CR6 9TH

- 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 Hillbury Developments (Warlingham) Ltd against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2019/1141, dated 21 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached 3-bedroom bungalow in the rear garden and alterations to the rear car park to set out 2 additional car parking spaces.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and with particular regard to the proposed siting and design.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a large triangular shaped plot of land which slopes downwards from the road frontage. It accommodates a detached three-storey building comprising five flats and has a driveway leading to a large rear garden which accommodates an area for parking. The rear boundary has a number of mature trees and vegetation along its length, beyond which is Whyteleafe Recreation Ground, a public park.
4. The adjacent properties are largely two and three-storey, semi-detached dwellings on narrow plots which are at a lower level than the road. The dwellings along this part of the road display a range of designs and have front garden areas and driveways. There is a relatively consistent building line to the road. The distinctive character of this part of Hillbury Road is one of large, traditionally designed dwellings, which have long rear gardens backing onto the open space beyond.
5. By way of contrast, the appeal proposal is for a single storey detached bungalow that would be in the rear garden of the host dwelling together with the provision of two additional car parking spaces. The proposal would unacceptably introduce a dwelling into an open garden area that is free of built form and would be at odds with the distinctive pattern of development on this

part of Hillbury Road. The dwelling would be positioned at a different angle to that of the host dwelling and would appear as visually jarring and incongruous form of development by virtue of its considerable size and bulk in relation to the garden area and in relation to its setting.

6. The appellant argues that the pavilion-like architectural style would be in keeping with a back-garden setting. However, the proposed flat roof would be at odds with the traditional pitched and hipped roofs of the adjoining dwellings. The appellant also argues that there would be only limited street views and that the proposed materials, that are naturally produced, would make the dwelling less conspicuous and that the 'green' roof would help integrate it into the landscape. Whilst I am mindful that there is screening along the rear boundary, the dwelling, by reason of its excessive size and bulk, would be clearly visible from the properties of the adjoining dwellings. There would also be views of the proposed development from public vantage points.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to other developments along Hillbury Road. None of the proposals were for a detached three-bedroom bungalow and therefore the circumstances are likely to have been different. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
8. The proposed development would be a visually incongruous form of development, harmful to the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the proposed siting and design. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) and Policies DP7 and DP8 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014–2029) (July 2014), which require, amongst other things, development to be of a high standard of design that must reflect and respect the character, setting and local content, including features that contribute to local distinctiveness.

Other matters

9. I am also mindful that the dwelling would be fully accessible and would be suitable to accommodate an elderly couple or occupants with disabilities. The appellant has also stated that the proposed development would positively assist in boosting the supply of housing in the area, although the contribution from one dwelling would be limited. The proposal would also generate some short-term employment through its construction. Some further modest benefits would result from additional support to the vitality of the local community from the occupiers of the dwelling. Taken together, none of these matters either alter or outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Neil Smith

INSPECTOR