

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2021

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/20/3264687

27 Court Road, Caterham, CR3 5RG

- 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 Don Hutchinson against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2020/1783, dated 6 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear dormer and hip to gable side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear dormer and hip to gable side extension at 27 Court Road, Caterham, CR3 5RG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TA/2020/1783, dated 6 October 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three year from the date of this decision.
 2. 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.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: D188-03, D188-04A Rev A, D188-SK08 Rev A, D188-SK09 Rev A, block plan and site plan.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs has been made by the Appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey hipped-roof semi-detached dwelling in a suburban setting. The area is of established residential character and most of
-

the properties locally retain largely original form and the wider scene with buildings and gardens is of pleasing appearance. The adjoining semi-detached property has been significantly altered and includes a hip to gable change and a large rear box dormer. The appeal property has planning permission (ref TA/2020/235) for a hip to gable side extension and a large rear dormer located asymmetrically towards the planned gable. In the context of this permission the appeal proposals are, in effect, seeking an increase to the dormer size to serve a roof level bathroom with a dormer window rather than a roof light.

5. Given the preponderance of pleasing and subtle roof forms locally which many might hope would be protected some may find it surprising that planning permission ref TA/2020/235 was granted. I can only speculate that the Council were taking this pair of homes in isolation, not as a future benchmark for the neighbourhood, and with alterations already undertaken on one side sought to introduce some symmetry to just these two plots. There is some design justification for that. Given that the works before me which are beyond the extant consent effectively amount to only a slightly larger dormer, I am minded to adopt a pragmatic stance and endorse the appeal scheme. I would agree with the Appellant that the resultant more centrally sited dormer has increased aesthetic logic. It would be seen in the context of the larger scheme adjoining. The additional glazing would be minimal. The increased starting height above the eaves for the bathroom element relative to the main part would add some visual interest and allow the original form of the roof to still be read.
6. In these circumstances the development sought would not lead to aesthetic detriment to the appeal property and the wider locality with the context being that the approved scheme would almost certainly be implemented. I conclude that it would thus not run contrary to policies DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies and CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy which share common themes of seeking appropriate design to protect the character and appearance of buildings and their neighbourhood.

Conditions

7. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this latter condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR