



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by C Shearing BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/21/3277908

7 West Street, Dormansland RH7 6QP

- 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 James Stevenson against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2021/187, dated 5 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'extension over porch and bay window'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the appeal the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. There are no substantive changes relevant to the appeal before me and therefore no interested parties would be prejudiced by my consideration of the 2021 version of the Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is close to the eastern edge of the rural village of Dormansland where the surrounding buildings are predominantly residential. The properties on the eastern side of West Street vary in their scale, design and appearance.
5. The appeal property is the northern half of a semi detached pair of dwellings. Due to the bend in the road at this part of West Street, the front elevations of this pair are relatively close to the road and prominent in views when travelling along West Street. There is little symmetry existing within this pair due to the difference in their width, differing roof forms, porch designs and window details. Despite this, the main front building line of this semi detached pair is largely consistent with that of the neighbouring properties and their front porches share a similar projection, appearing as subordinate additions to the front of the properties.
6. The proposed first floor extension, by reason of its raised position and projection, would extend beyond the established building line at this level and, together with its gable roof form, would create a prominent design feature on the front elevation of the property. This would be at odds with the modest

character of the existing property and would also further unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair. In turn, due to its prominent position, this would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street. Similarly the proposed bay window, in combination with the proposed extension, would create a cramped appearance to the front elevation and further emphasise the imbalance of the semi-detached pair.

7. I note that the appellant has provided amended drawings which remove the bay window from the proposals. However for the reasons described above I find the first floor extension, even in isolation, would cause visual harm. I have noted other extensions and alterations to other properties in the vicinity of the site but find that, based on the evidence available, there are none directly comparable to the circumstances of the appeal scheme.
8. The proposals would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As such, it would conflict with the aims of Policies CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 and DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014, insofar as they require new development to be of a high standard of design that reinforces local distinctiveness. It also follows there is Policy DP12 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2, as the development is not in character with the village.

Conclusion

9. Overall the development would be contrary to the development plan as a whole. This conflict is not outweighed by other material considerations in this instance and the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

C Shearing

INSPECTOR