

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2023

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/23/3322261
29 Stanstead Road, Caterham, CR3 6AD

- 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 Bin He against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application, Ref TA/2022/759, dated 31 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, front porch extension, first floor side extension and installation of a terrace on the ground floor flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. I note that the Council did not object to the single storey ground floor extension. A full assessment of this aspect of the proposal is provided in the officer report. I have no reason to disagree with the views expressed in the officer report or the conclusions reached on this aspect.
3. I also note that some of the works proposed to the roof have been the subject of a Certificate of Lawfulness on the basis that they comprised permitted development. Thus, the works could be carried out independently irrespective of the outcome of this appeal.
4. Building works were in progress when I visited.

Main issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property, a detached dwelling, is set within a residential area of good quality and of diverse designs. The dwelling stands on a corner, at the junction of Stanstead Road and Woodside Close. It is a substantial dwelling constructed in brick on the ground floor with white painted render above, it has a tiled roof.
7. Although not listed, it is a distinguished looking building. One of its main and distinctive characteristics, which sets it apart from other dwellings in the locality, is the catslide roof which overlooks the corner. This is a prominent and unusual feature which, to my mind, adds substantial interest and

distinction to the appearance of the dwelling and the character of the locality. The feature also creates a sense of spaciousness at the junction.

8. The proposed design of this corner of the dwelling would, in effect, obliterate the catslide feature which would be replaced in part by a vertical wall. I share the Council's view that a significant amount of mass would be added, being far less appealing in its design and appearance than the feature replaced. The proposal, if built, would also materially impinge on the sense of spaciousness currently experienced at the junction.
9. Judgments of this nature are essentially subjective in nature but, to my mind, this aspect of the proposal, were it built, by reason of its poor design would prove harmful to local visual amenity. The Government attaches considerable importance to design, and the *National Planning Policy Framework* advises that '*development that is not well designed should be refused*'. I propose to follow that guidance here.
10. I conclude that the proposed first floor side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. Accordingly, a conflict arises those provisions of policies Policy CP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) & Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014) directed to development achieving high quality design and respecting local character and distinctiveness.

Other matters

11. All other matters referred to in the representations, including the references made by the appellant to several developments granted planning permission in the surrounding area, including on appeal¹. Some of these decisions, including those made on appeal, were made some time ago. Nevertheless, the developments permitted contribute to forming local character and have therefore been taken into account. However, the decisions and their effects of their implementation do not persuade me that my conclusions on the merits of this appeal should be altered.
12. No other matter is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref APP/M3645/A/05/1193435 & A/06/1197440 dated 18 July 2006