

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2020

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/W/20/3254496

64 Gresham Avenue, Warlingham, Surrey CR6 9DJ

- 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 Nick Chelba, CNO Developments against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application, Ref. TA/2019/2158, dated 11 December 2019 was refused by notice dated 6 May 2020
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing detached garage, side extension and rear conservatory, and erection of new single storey rear extension to existing dwelling, and erection of a detached new dwelling in the side garden. Alteration to existing dropped kerb and front parking area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application description refers to the 'erection of a detached new dwelling', whereas the proposed house is shown as connecting to No.64 by a single storey extension accommodating an entrance hall and WC for the existing property.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dwelling on the character and appearance of the area, in particular the street scene of Farm Road.

Reasons

4. I saw on my visit that between the main flank elevation of No. 64 and the side curtilage boundary to Farm Road there is a pitched roof single storey attached building comprising a kitchen, utility room and WC. A garden gate and passage to the rear garden separates this building from a detached garage.
 5. There is a similar single storey addition to the property on the opposite side of Gresham Road, No. 63, but in this case no garage. Other than these two single storey buildings the north western side of Farm Road has an open character between the road edge on the one hand and on the other the flanks of the two corner properties together with the house frontages or lock up garages between Nos. 2 and 24 Farm Road. This gives a spacious character and appearance to the locality which makes a significant and positive contribution to the street scene and the overall character and appearance of the area.
-

6. The appeal scheme would introduce a two storey building on one of the corners of the Gresham Road / Farm Road junction and appear as an incongruous visual intrusion into the views along Farm Road between. The difference in visual impact and on the perception of openness of the Farm Road street scene between the existing single storey buildings and a two storey dwelling is significant.
7. The Council's approval of a two storey dwelling on the site under reference 2019/203 shows that it has reached a very different planning judgement to mine. However, the situation is what it is and this is the effective starting point for my determination of this appeal. The salient point now is the difference between the approved scheme and the current appeal proposal as regards the design of the roof.
8. In my view, the proposed building's inclusion of second floor accommodation, necessitating a large dormer extending over almost all the rear roof plane, would materially exacerbate the adverse effect of a building in this position. In terms of perception from the part of Farm Road west of the site, the dormer would be of a size that would be tantamount to the development of a three storey building, even allowing for the similar ridge height to that of the existing dwelling. And the additional bulk at a high level would be of a poor design that would give the building an inelegant, bulky and top heavy appearance in these eastward views along Farm Road.
9. For the appellant it is argued that the Council's approach is inconsistent with its decision to allow an application at No. 36 Blanchmans Road. However, the Council has pointed out that there are some differences in site context in that case. And I have also seen from the appellant's statement that there is a more restrained dormer element in that scheme. In any event I consider the decision in this appeal needs to reflect the actual impact on the street scene and I have explained why I consider this would be unacceptably harmful.
10. Taken overall, the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, in particular the street scene of Farm Road. This would be in conflict with Policies DP7 & DP8 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014; Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008, and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
11. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR