



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2022

**by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 12 October 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/21/3288839**

**Arden Lodge, Pastens Road, Limpsfield RH8 0RE**

- 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 and Mrs Bussenschutt against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
  - The application Ref TA/2021/886, dated 7 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 October 2021.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of existing porch and single storey side extension, and erection of two storey side extension with rear facing balcony, new porch and associated alterations.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing porch and single storey side extension, and erection of two storey side extension with rear facing balcony, new porch and associated alterations at Arden Lodge, Pastens Road, Limpsfield RH8 0RE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TA/2021/886, dated 7 May 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: 0248 01 Rev A; 0248 02 Rev A; 0248 03 Rev A; 0248 04 Rev A; 0248 05 Rev A; and 0248 06 Rev A.
  - 3) No development shall take place above ground level until details of the materials (including physical samples) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

## Procedural Matters

2. The description of development differs from that on the planning application form as the main parties agreed to remove a single storey rear extension from the proposed scheme during the application process. I also noted that the construction of a rear extension, which was subject of a certificate of lawful development, had begun.

## **Main Issue**

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area, including the Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).

## **Reasons**

4. The appeal site is located at the end of Pastens Road, a low density private residential road, just beyond the junction with Tenchley's Lane, a public footpath. Properties on the road are generally large, 2 storey and set back within spacious and maturely planted grounds. This creates a semi-rural character to the area as the front boundaries are predominantly established, tall hedges interspersed with individual gated accesses. The properties are a mix of ages and styles with their size, ratio of building to garden, and high level of screening the main factors contributing to the area's character and appearance. The appeal site is one such property.
5. The proposed side extension would replace the existing single storey part of the appeal building and be similar in width. Its ridge and eave height would be comparable to that of the existing building and the extension would be stepped in from both the front and rear elevations. A subservient rear facing gable, set back behind the main gable of the appeal property, and upper floor tile hanging would differentiate the proposed from the original whilst ensuring a cohesion of design. For these reasons I am satisfied the proposed side extension would be appropriately proportioned to the appeal property and would assimilate well. It would not dominate the existing building's form or style nor significantly intrude into the appeal site, ensuring the relationship between building and garden is retained.
6. The proposed fenestration changes are predominantly to the rear of the building making best use of the views across the garden. Again, these alterations are proportionate to the dimensions of the existing building and would not adversely alter the wall to glass ratio of the property, retaining the traditional style. A balcony is proposed to the rear of the two storey extension. Although it would be more modern than the existing building, it would be of a linear, simple form and relatively light weight. This would allow the building behind to be seen. Therefore, although not a traditional element, it would not be visually obtrusive, nor would it overwhelm the rear elevation of the building.
7. Consequently, the proposal would constitute a modern re-evaluation of the existing building and would retain its overall proportions and dimensions. It would not, therefore, harm the character and appearance of the appeal site.
8. The appeal site enjoys only limited visibility within the wider area, constrained to partial glimpses from Pastens Road, down the drive, and from Tenchley's Lane. It is more visible from a short section of public footpath, which forms part of the driveway to the adjacent property, Headlands Cottage. However, the established boundary treatments ensure the existing lack of visual intrusion would be retained. Where the proposal would be seen, it would be within the context of the driveways, adjacent dwellings, and mature hedging, so would not have a detrimental impact on the area's overall character and appearance.
9. From the wider open countryside, beyond the properties on Pastens Road, views of the appeal site are entirely screened by other residential dwellings and

the associated landscaping, mature trees, and tall boundary hedging. This, along with the similarity in footprint to the existing building, means the proposal would not remove a gap which provides views of the surrounding countryside, nor impact on any important views across or through the AGLV. Its lack of visibility within the wider area would also ensure a lack of harm to the special landscape character or scenic beauty of the AGLV.

10. The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area, including the AGLV. It would comply with Policies CSP 18 and CSP 20 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 and Policies LNP 3 and LNP 5 of the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2019 insofar as they seek to ensure high quality design and conserve landscape character.

### **Other Matters**

11. The appeal site is within the Green Belt. Paragraph 149 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out circumstances when the construction of new buildings is not inappropriate in the Green Belt. This includes the extension or alteration of a building but requires that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. From my reasoning on the main issue, I agree with the Council's position that the proposal would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
12. The distance between the appeal property and neighbouring properties, and the boundary treatment between would ensure the living conditions of neighbouring occupants are not harmed. Considering comments relating to the orientation of the existing building, the main front door is in the elevation which faces onto the driveway and would commonly be regarded as the front. I am also aware of the previous planning approval but am required to deal with the scheme before me on its own merits.
13. I note the appeal site has been nominated, with others, for consideration under the Surrey County Council Locally Listed Heritage Assets project. However, as the project has not been completed nor the appeal site designated, this does not hold bearing on my findings.

### **Conditions**

14. In addition to securing commencement within the relevant statutory timeframe, I have also imposed a condition requiring adherence to the approved plans, both of which ensure certainty. A condition requiring materials to be agreed is necessary to ensure a high quality finish and cohesion between that proposed and the existing building.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no sufficiently weighted material considerations, including the Framework, that would indicate a decision otherwise. The appeal is, therefore, allowed.

*RJ Redford*

INSPECTOR