

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 April 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/17/3172233

50 Fengates Road, Redhill, Surrey RH1 6AH

- 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 T Denby against the decision of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02921/HHOLD, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as a side extension to the existing roof, erection of rear dormer window and increase in the ridge height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey house. It is situated in a residential street comprising a mix of closely-spaced detached and semi-detached houses of similar age but varied design. Whilst I note that some houses have been extended at roof level, as a group they create a pleasant and characterful street scene. This is a matter to which I attach significant weight.
 4. The proposal would comprise the formation of an almost full-width dormer within the rear roof slope, the erection of 3 additional gables above the flank elevations and the raising of the ridge of part of the roof. Together these additions would significantly increase the size of the property resulting in a roof form that would be disproportionate in bulk and scale to the host property and incompatible with the appearance and scale of neighbouring properties' roofs. Whilst this would primarily be evident at the rear, the side gables would be evident from the road and, due to their size and siting, would be incongruous elements that would harm the distinctiveness of the street scene.
 5. For these reasons I conclude that, due to its size, massing, scale and siting the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the host property and the street scene. It therefore fails to comply with Policies Ho9, Ho13, Ho16 of the Reigate & Banstead Local Plan 2005 which, amongst other matters, seek to minimise
-

the effects of residential extensions on their surroundings and ensure roofscapes complement the character of an area. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's supplementary planning guidance entitled *Householder Extensions and Alterations* (2004) which advises that dormers should be in keeping with the appearance of properties.

6. I note the examples of recently constructed roof additions elsewhere in the borough put forward by the appellant. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits having regard to its particular design and local context I attribute limited weight to these schemes.

Conclusion

7. Although I note that the scheme has been revised following a previous refusal, for the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR