



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2020

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/20/3253930

6 Field Walk, Smallfield, Surrey RH6 9GL

- 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 Robert Kinkade against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2020/369, dated 18 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 6 Field Walk, Smallfield, Surrey RH6 9GL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TA/2020/369, dated 18 February 2020, 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: Location plan; proposed block plan; 3083/1; 3083/2; 3083/3; 3083/4; 3083/5.
 - 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the site and the street scene; and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property, with particular regard to the size of the outdoor amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2 storey dwelling, which is located within an established residential area consisting of modern housing. The dwelling occupies a corner plot and its rear elevation faces Field Walk. There is a garden area to the rear and side, and the rear boundary is curved to follow the bend in the road.

4. The proposed single storey rear extension would be of modest scale and it would appear subordinate to the dwelling. Furthermore, its simple design would integrate satisfactorily.
5. The proposed extension would maintain a distance of approximately 7 metres to the boundary with Field Walk at the southern end, which would reduce to about 3 metres as the boundary curves round. I note the Council's concerns that the proposal would be cramped on the site. Nevertheless, there would still be a usable garden to the rear and side of the dwelling, and the degree of separation to the boundary would ensure that the extension would not appear cramped.
6. The neighbouring 2 storey dwelling at No 7 is sited nearer to Field Walk than No 6 and so the proposed extension would not extend noticeably closer to the road than the neighbouring property. I also observed that the properties in Field Walk are generally sited close to the road. Taking into account the single storey height of the extension and the space maintained to the boundary, it would not appear unduly prominent in the street scene. This would be mitigated further by the mature vegetation along the boundary, which would restrict views of the proposal from the street.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the site or the street scene. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies DP7 and DP11 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014-2029 and Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008), which, amongst other things, state that new development will be required to be of a high standard of design that must reflect and respect the character, setting and local context.

Living conditions

8. Whilst the proposed rear extension would reduce the size of the garden, a usable outdoor amenity space would be retained to the rear and side which would be proportionate to the size of the dwelling. The Council has not drawn my attention to any adopted garden size standards, and there is no evidence before me that the size of the retained garden would be significantly smaller than other properties in the surrounding area.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014-2029, which, amongst other things, states that proposals should provide a satisfactory environment for the occupiers of both the existing and new development; and provide appropriate amenity and garden areas proportionate to the size of the residential units and appropriate for the intended occupiers.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the representations from local residents, which raise concerns, including: disruption and access to parking bays during construction works; storage of building materials; and loss of light.
11. Given the small-scale nature of the proposed development any disruption during construction works is likely to be limited and short lived. This is not sufficient grounds to withhold planning permission.

12. The proposal would not cause a significant loss of light to neighbouring properties due to the single storey height of the proposed extension and the separation that would be maintained to the site boundaries.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In order to maintain the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the external surfaces of the development to be finished in materials to match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

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

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR