



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2023

by B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15.11.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/23/3323696

170 Holland Road, Hurst Green, Surrey RH8 9BQ

- 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 Oliver Rimmer against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2022/1398, dated 23 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 2 storey side extension. Reduced scheme based on existing consent TA/2010/1037 (and preceding TA/2005/1147)
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the 2 storey side extension. Reduced scheme based on existing consent TA/2010/1037 (and preceding TA/2005/1147) at 170 Holland Road, Hurst Green, Surrey RH8 9BQ dated 23 October 2022 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. 1; Drawing No. 2; Drawing No. 3; Drawing No. 4; Drawing No. 5; Drawing No. 6 and site location plan.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council suggest that the extension approved under a previous planning permission (TA/2010/1037) was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans as the first floor extension has been built with a gable, rather than a hipped roof. Notwithstanding this, I am content that the drawings submitted in relation to this appeal reflect the on-site situation, and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The Council's decision notice refers to Policy CP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) (CS). Having reviewed the policies submitted in relation to this appeal, I understand this to be a typographical error, and the correct policy is CSP18 of the CS. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a modern, two storey detached house with a two storey front bay projection. It has an unconventional design, which features a mix of roof forms, and variation in brickwork across the ground and first floors. The area is residential in character, and the other properties on this stretch of the road are detached houses which are more traditional in design. As a result, the appeal property has a markedly different appearance to the nearby properties within this stretch of Holland Road.
6. The appeal property is set back noticeably further to the rear of its plot than the majority of properties on this side of the road. In addition, it is lower in height than 168 Holland Road, its immediate neighbour. Its front boundary and the front boundary of the adjoining field are marked by tall, verdant hedging. These factors considerably reduce its visibility within the streetscene and it does not have a prominent presence in views from the road.
7. I have not been directed to any policy requirement for the design of the extension to be subservient in height terms to the existing dwelling. I find that the continuation of the existing principal monopitch roof form would reflect the design characteristics of the property and would therefore be a logical design response. While the proposal would notably increase the scale and width of the property itself, it would not be prominent within the streetscene and there is no substantive evidence that the effects would amount to harm.
8. Off centre windows are a notable feature of the appeal property's existing design and are found on the front and rear elevations. As a result, the extent and layout of the fenestration within the extension's elevations would preserve the character of the host dwelling.
9. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to scale, form and design. Policy CSP18 of the CS, and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014) expect development to protect the character of the area, ensuring that development is appropriate to the surrounding area in terms of its size and scale, and that proposals reflect the variety of local building types. In view of my findings, there is no conflict with these policies.

Conditions

10. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty.
11. I have also imposed a condition requiring the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development to match those used in the existing building in order to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and accords with the development plan and the Framework. The appeal is therefore allowed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR