



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 October 2021

by L Douglas BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/21/3279062

48 Trindles Road, South Nutfield RH1 4JN

- 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 Mrs Hannah Collins against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2021/630, dated 7 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single story rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single story rear extension at 48 Trindles Road, South Nutfield RH1 4JN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TA/2021/630, dated 7 April 2021, 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: PLN99, PLN01, PLN02, PLN03, PLN04.
 - 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 area; and (ii) the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises one half of a pair of semi-detached houses which has been extended substantially at roof level. It has a long, narrow rear garden and is typical of the residential street on which it is located, which is characterised by modest pairs of semi-detached and short rows of terraced houses. Open countryside lies to the rear of the application site, to the west, and land levels slope slightly downhill from south to north.
4. Both the appeal property and the other half of the semi-detached pair ('No.46') have existing single storey rear extensions of matching depth. The appellant

has provided details of an extant planning permission¹ at the appeal site for a single storey rear extension of similar design to that proposed, but which would be 1m shallower in depth. This is a realistic fallback position.

5. The proposed development would be seen in views from neighbouring properties, where it would appear as a significant addition to the house. Those views would also include the substantial roof extensions to the appeal property and ground floor rear extensions to neighbouring properties, including those directly either side of the appeal site. In this context, the proposed development would not appear particularly disproportionate to the existing house or out of scale with its surroundings, especially in comparison to the fallback position.
6. The useable area of the appeal site's long rear garden would be reduced, but not to such an extent that the appeal building would appear uncharacteristically unbalanced. The available garden space retained would remain proportionate to the house and typical of its surroundings, ensuring the proposal would not result in the overdevelopment of the plot.
7. The proposal would not therefore harm the character or appearance of the area, in accordance with Policy CSP18 of the Council's Core Strategy² and Policy DP7 of the Council's Local Plan³. These policies require, amongst other things, new development to respect local character and context, which should integrate effectively with its surroundings and not result in overdevelopment by reason of scale, form, bulk, height, spacing, density or design.

Living Conditions

8. Houses along Trindles Road are closely arranged. A narrow access passage along the south elevation of the appeal building leads to the rear garden, with a similar arrangement mirrored along the northern elevation of the neighbouring property at 50 Trindles Road ('No.50'). The access passage would be retained, ensuring the proposed extension would be set in from the boundary shared with No.50.
9. The proposed extension would increase the built form in close proximity to the appeal site's southern boundary, which would be appreciable from No.50. However, on account of the positions of the proposed extension and the house at No.50 in relation to the shared boundary, and the single storey height of the proposed flat roofed extension, the effect on neighbouring residents to the south would be limited. There would be an enclosing effect felt within No.50, but that effect would not be harmful to residents' living conditions. There would be no unacceptable tunnelling effect despite the narrow arrangement of plots.
10. Protruding beyond the ground floor rear extension at No.46 and at a slightly higher land level, the proposed extension would be a prominent addition directly along the appeal site's northern boundary. However, at 3m in depth along this boundary the effect on the outlook of residents of No.46 would also be limited.
11. The proposed extension would not therefore have an unacceptable effect on the outlook currently enjoyed by the occupants of neighbouring properties and

¹ TA/2019/772

² Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008)

³ Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 – 2029 (2014)

would not harm their living conditions, in accordance with Policy CSP18 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policy DP7 of the Council's Local Plan. These policies require, amongst other things, development to not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of visual intrusion, overbearing or any other adverse effect.

Conditions

12. It is necessary to attach a condition requiring the commencement of development within the relevant timeframe. Conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and finished with materials to match the existing building are also reasonable and necessary to ensure the extension would be appropriate to its location.

Conclusion

13. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Douglas

INSPECTOR