



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024

by E Dade BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/24/3348364

22 Braes Mead, South Nutfield, Surrey RH1 4JR

- 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 Garry Belcher on behalf of Sixmile Construction Ltd against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is TA/2024/446.
 - The development proposed is front first floor extension over existing ground floor study and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The site is within the Green Belt where new development is typically restricted by local and national policies. However, Policy DP12 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 (LP) permits certain forms of development including extensions or alterations to existing buildings, and the Council's assessment concludes the principle of the development can be supported in this location. I have no evidence before me to suggest the proposal would be incompatible with the fundamental aims and purposes of Green Belt policy, and therefore it is not necessary to consider further the effects of the proposed development on Green Belt openness.
3. On 12 December 2024, government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The Framework's policies of relevance to the appeal proposal have not significantly changed, and therefore in this instance it was not necessary to consult the parties on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a modern, two-storey, detached dwelling. It is constructed of brick with tiles on the front elevation at first floor level. The appeal property has previously been altered through the addition of single storey projection with a hipped, tiled roof which provides a study, porch, and a bay window serving a reception room.
6. The appeal property is within a section of Braes Mead that forms a residential cul-de-sac comprising nos 18 to 25. The cul-de-sac runs broadly parallel with

Mid Street, a main route through the village, and occupies an elevated position behind an area of grassed amenity land with dense trees and shrubs. This provides separation and screens views of the appeal property from Mid Street.

7. The cul-de-sac has a modern, suburban character. Through its form, layout and appearance of dwellings, the cul-de-sac appears distinct from the western branch of Braes Mead which extends west from Mid Street and has a greater mix of dwellings and a staggered building line.
8. Within the cul-de-sac, dwellings are regularly spaced and arranged in a single row along the west side of the carriageway, set back behind modest front gardens and driveways. Dwellings are two-storey, detached with a simple pitched roof form, constructed of brick with tiles at first floor height, and with a single-storey front projection. There are differences in the depth of the front projections, with some containing integrated garages and incorporating a range of roof styles. However, the front projections are of broadly similar scale and appear subservient to their respective host dwellings.
9. Whilst there is some variation in the appearance of dwellings, such as the form of the single-storey front projections and colour of first-floor wall tiles, dwellings within the cul-de-sac have an overall similar form and appearance to the appeal property. This consistency within the cul-de-sac contributes a uniform character to the street scene in this area.
10. The proposal would include an extension at first-floor level, built above the existing single-storey front projection to enlarge the front bedroom and provide an ensuite bathroom. The first-floor extension would sit flush with the front of the existing single storey projection and would not increase the footprint of the dwelling, nor project forward of the existing building line at ground floor level.
11. However, the proposed extension would project forward a significant distance from the appeal property's main front elevation at first floor level and would exceed half its width. Whilst the ridge would be set down, the proposed extension's eaves would be at the same height as those of the host dwelling. Consequently, the proposal would contribute significant bulk and mass to the front of the dwelling at the first floor. The extension would appear excessively large in scale and would not appear subservient to the host dwelling.
12. The appeal property is generally well-screened from Mid Street and views of the proposed development would therefore be experienced principally from Braes Mead. Entering the cul-de-sac, the carriageway and row of dwellings curves slightly inward and the ground level increases in height. The proposed extension would be clearly visible, projecting forward of the building line at first floor height. Due to its prominent siting forward of the first-floor front elevation, combined with its excessive scale, mass and bulk, the proposed extension would be visually dominant within the street scene. The visual impacts would be localised, but nonetheless would be harmful.
13. The exterior of the proposed first floor extension would be finished with grey, fibre cement cladding. This material is not present on the appeal property or at nearby buildings. The cladding would be eye-catching increasing the proposed extension's visual prominence, and therefore would not enable the development to assimilate with the existing dwelling or into the street scene.

14. Whilst materials could be secured through a planning condition, I do not consider alternative material choices would overcome the adverse visual effects associated with the siting, scale, and bulk of the proposed extension.
15. The site's planning history includes single-storey front extension works, illustrating that alterations to the front of the dwelling have been deemed to be acceptable. However, none of the previous planning consents comprise a two-storey extension at the front of the building, and therefore the effects on the street scene are materially different from the appeal proposal.
16. In addition, the appellant has provided details of a consented scheme for a first-floor side and rear extension and a pitch to the front single storey projection at no 25 Braes Mead¹. The plans show the two-storey element of the extension located at the side of the dwelling and set back from the front elevation and thus less prominently sited than the appeal proposal. The form and visual impacts of the no 25 scheme are materially different from the appeal proposal and does not justify the proposed development.
17. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area.
18. The proposal would conflict with LP Policy DP7 which expects all new development be of a high-quality design, integrate effectively with its surroundings, reinforce local distinctiveness and landscape character, and its built form be in keeping with the prevailing streetscape.
19. In addition, the proposal would fail to comply with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 which requires new development be of a high standard of design that reflects and respects the character, setting and local context, including those features that contribute to local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

20. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given the appeal should be dismissed.

E Dade

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA ref: 2021/1593