



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2024

by H Miles BA (hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/24/3340247

Gresham Place, 9 Portley Wood Road, Whyteleafe, Surrey, CR3 0BQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Singh against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is TA/2023/1274.
 - The development proposed is new extension at ground, first and loft levels, new car parking and drive arrangement.
-

Decision

1. This appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The main parties have agreed that the proposal would not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt as defined in policies DP10 and DP13 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014-2029 (2014) (LP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and I am not provided with any detailed evidence that would lead me to conclude otherwise.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Whilst the buildings along Portley Wood Road are varied in their detailed design, the road is characterised by traditional large houses set in sizeable grounds. Gresham Place follows this character and is a large property with generous gardens. It has a traditional appearance including a prominent pitched roof. It is accessed via a driveway which runs parallel to the west elevation. The western elevation includes gable features with varied detailing at roof level. At ground floor there are small, single storey subservient flat roof projections and an open sided, flat roofed canopy feature above the front entrance.
5. The proposed development would include an extension to the southernmost gable. Adjacent to this it also includes a flat roofed three storey addition with a main front entrance. In addition, there would be a smaller extension to the northernmost gable and dormer windows inserted at roof level.
6. The three storey flat roofed element would be visually jarring against the prominent pitched roof and would undermine this traditional and characteristic feature of the dwelling. It would be set behind a parapet, nevertheless the

differing roof form would be clearly apparent. Nor would it reflect the subservient character of the existing modest flat roof projections. Due to their bulk, height and appearance the extensions, taken together, would unacceptably undermine the traditional character of the building and would be overly dominant.

7. The proposed alterations to the fenestration would result in a more ordered façade and a clear main entrance. However, the footprint would not be symmetrical, nor clearly L shaped along this elevation and the flat roof corner addition would further detract from this. As such this does not weigh strongly in favour of the development.
8. Whilst these alterations would not be visible from the road, they would nevertheless undermine the character and appearance of the property and consequently the area, even though they are not prominent or in public view.
9. I am provided with examples of historical properties where flat roof additions are included¹. However, these are not similar to the appeal property in their overall appearance and are located some distance from the site. As such, these do not form part of its context and do not alter my findings.
10. Therefore, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008, Policy DP7 of the (LP) and Policies CCW4 and CCW5 of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2018 to 2033 (2021). Together these seek high quality design that reflects the character setting and local context, amongst other things.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR

¹ March Court, Hestercombe House, Abbey House