The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 May 2017

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/17/3172018
10 Nork Rise, Banstead, Surrey, SM7 1JN

- 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 Lee Hogg against the decision of Reigate & Banstead District Council.
- The application Ref 16/02636/HHOLD, dated 3 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2017.
- The development proposed is an extension of dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a sizeable, extended, semi-detached dwelling with a generous garden. The wider established residential area is characterised by a range of dwellings usually set within deep spacious plots and coming together to form a pleasing suburban scene with their mix of hipped and gabled roofs of generally steep and attractive form contributing positively to the visual ambience. The property has an existing substantial dormer to the rear which is presently set in from the outer side edge of the home and the proposal is to extend this out to the gable end hence providing improved accommodation for the existing fifth bedroom.

4. The existing dormer is a large structure and in my opinion its functional form and bulk, and the degree of pitched roof which has been replaced, means that it does not contribute positively to the character and appearance of this home. Regrettably the proposed works would unduly add to the sense of a 'top heavy' rear elevation with a further gain in bulk and additional obliteration of almost all the rear pitch of the roof at the outer edge of this home. The dominance of this enlarged box-like dormer would be excessive and I would class this as representing poor design. There would only be some glimpses available of its unsubtle edge from a stretch of the street but even though it would not be widely open to public view there is not justification for endorsing something so visually ungainly and patently out of character with the host property and its

surrounds. Furthermore it would be visible from nearby garden spaces and in this situation the appearance of rear elevations should not be ignored or their importance down-played.

5. Policies Ho9 and Ho13 of the Borough Local Plan 2005, taken together and amongst other matters, call for a suitably scaled high quality design of development sympathetic to a site's wider setting and seek to ensure protection of local distinctiveness and character generally along with the aesthetics of the host property. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with these policies, which also align with the objectives of the Council's Householder and Extensions SPG.

Other matters

6. I understand the wish of the Appellant to increase internal space and appreciate the argument put about exit arrangements should a fire arise. I note that there were no objections from neighbours. The scheme would not be unduly harmful to residential amenity. I recognise that there are rare examples of large dormers to be found locally, I do not know their planning history, but these do not set a precedent nor should they be used as a benchmark when planning policies seek good quality design. In any event I must determine this case on its own merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.

7. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR