



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2022

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/22/3299119

29 Granville Road, Limpsfield, RH8 0BX

- 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 & Mrs Davies against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2021/2209, dated 22 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Demolition of existing garage location to rear of the site and erection of new outbuilding incorporating games room / family space ancillary to the main dwelling and garden storage area.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling, located in a large, well landscaped plot. The surrounding area is residential in character and comprises mainly of large, detached houses set in substantial plots. The rear gardens of surrounding dwellings are similarly well landscaped and collectively contribute significantly to the spacious, verdant character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposed outbuilding would replace an existing single storey garage located at the rear of the site, alongside the boundary with 27 Granville Road. The replacement building would be arranged over two floors and would be located in a similar position to that of the existing building but would have a significantly larger footprint. The proposed building would also have a higher eaves height and a ridge height of about 6.8m.
5. In my view, a building of the size, scale and height proposed, would stand out as an incongruous feature within its suburban garden setting. I reach this conclusion largely due to the high eaves and ridge height together with the fully glazed gable which, in my view, would not be akin to a domestic outbuilding and would dominate the rear garden of the dwelling. Whilst other nearby dwellings benefit from outbuildings within their rear gardens, none of these appear to be of the same scale and height as the proposed building.

6. Furthermore, views of the proposed outbuilding would be obtained from rear windows and the rear garden of the adjacent dwellings, Nos 27 and 31 Granville Road. Glimpses of the building would also be obtained from the rear of properties in Bluehouse Lane, due to its overall height and positioning adjacent to the rear boundary of those dwellings. Whilst views of the building from neighbouring dwellings would be filtered by trees and other landscape features and would be at a distance, the proposed building would nonetheless be apparent and would appear starkly out of keeping with the surrounding garden environment.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. Thus, it would be contrary to Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (adopted 15 October 2008), Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 – 2029 (adopted July 2014) and Policy LNP3 of the 'Made' Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan (2019). These policies (amongst other things) expect new development to be of a high-quality design and to reflect and respect the existing character, setting and local context.

Other Matters

8. I appreciate that the proposed development would provide flexible additional living and valued work space for the appellants and their family. I also note that the appellants state that the proposed building would enable their adult children to stay at home longer, thus reducing stress on local housing needs. I also acknowledge that the building could potentially be used in the future as accommodation for an elderly relative. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR