

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2017

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/17/3178740

29 Doods Park Road, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 0PZ

- 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 Philip Lau against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00117/HHOLD, dated 6 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 1 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor extension over existing single storey garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension over existing single storey garage at 29 Doods Park Road, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 0PZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00117/HHOLD, dated 6 February 2017, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 200(P)025, 200(P)026, 200(P)027, 200(P)028, 200(P)001, 200(P)002, 200(P)010, 200(P)011, , 200(P)012, 200(P)015, 200(P)016, 200(P)020, 200(P)021, 200(P)022, 141046/TCP and 141046/TPP.
 - 3) Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority the external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall comprise those specified in the application.
 - 4) No development shall commence including ground works preparation and demolition until all related arboricultural matters, including arboricultural supervision, monitoring and tree protection measures are implemented in strict accordance with the approved details contained in the Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement compiled by Connick Tree Care dated 27 March 2017, reference 14/1046/TPP and PRO.
-

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality.

Reasons

3. Doods Park Road and the locality includes a varied range of detached and semi-detached family dwellings typically occupying generous sized and mature landscaped plots. The informal building lines and gaps between dwellings provide views through to the mature landscaped rear garden environment and add to the verdant character and appearance of the locality.
4. Together and amongst other things policies Ho9, Ho13 and Ho16 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005 (Local Plan) seek to ensure that domestic developments make best use of sites and their physical characteristics; promote and reinforce local distinctiveness; and respect the general pattern of development in the area. Consistent with this the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that new development should respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surroundings, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. Whilst decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
5. The Appeal dwelling is located at the end of a row of uniformly designed pairs of semi-detached houses set behind large mature landscaped front gardens. Together with the adjoining dwelling at 27 Doods Park Road (No.27) the Appeal dwelling has been modernised with replacement aluminium windows and smooth rendered walls. This distinguishes them from the rest of the row of semi-detached dwellings. To the east of the Appeal site is a detached family dwelling, which is largely hidden from the street scene and the Appeal site by mature boundary planting.
6. The Appeal dwelling is set back from the street by in excess of 30 metres and is extremely well screened in views from the east and southeast by mature boundary planting. From the west it is seen at a distance, set back from the rest of the row of semi-detached houses and against a backcloth of soft planting along the eastern boundary of the site.
7. The proposed first floor extension is contemporary in design with an asymmetrical roof design and large expanses of glazing to the front and rear. In these respects the proposed extension is distinct from the host dwelling. However, the roof pitch and materials of the extension would match those of the host dwelling and the proposed windows would respect the detailing of the existing windows. At the same time the walls of the proposed extension would be timber clad, which would blend in with the trees and shrubs along the eastern side of the dwelling.
8. The proposed extension would be set back from the front building line of the host dwelling and would be located between the flank wall of the dwelling and the mature planting along the eastern boundary of the site. To the rear the proposed extension would project beyond the rear building line of the host dwelling and would comprise a visually separate element to the dwelling. Being located adjacent to the eastern boundary and at the end of the row of

- semi-detached houses, it would not be unduly prominent within this back garden environment where there is a diverse range of rear extensions.
9. The roof pitch and materials of the extension would match those of the host dwelling and the proposed windows would respect the detailing of the existing windows. At the same time the walls of the proposed extension would be timber clad, which would blend in with the trees and shrubs along the eastern side of the dwelling.
 10. As a consequence, the proposed extension would respect the host dwelling and would be visually subservient and discrete when viewed from the street scene. To the rear it would simply add to the varied building form, whilst being visually quite separate to the host dwelling.
 11. There are a number of trees within the Appeal site that are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. Subject to the protection measure set out in the submitted Arboricultural Statement and on the Tree Protection Plan, the health of these trees should not be adversely affected by the proposed development. Whilst it would be necessary to selectively cut back some of the branches of Tree No.4, this should not have a material impact on its long term health.
 12. Finally, the Council has suggested the imposition of conditions relating to external materials, various tree protection measures and adherence to the submitted plans. These conditions are necessary to ensure the development respects the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene and in the interests of certainty.
 13. I conclude that the proposed extension would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality. It would therefore comply with policies Ho9, Ho13 and Ho16 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR