



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2017

by Joanna Reid BA(Hons) BArch(Hons) RIBA

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

Decision date: 13th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/W/17/3180730

Greystone House, 99 Station Road, Redhill RH1 1EB

- 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 Drs Aslett and Partners against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00232/F, dated 31 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension in brick cavity construction and tile hanging under a tiled roof to the rear of the existing surgery.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect that the proposed development would have on the living conditions of the occupiers of 7 Sandown Court and 9 Somerville Court, with regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal site slopes down from its car park by Oxford Road at the back towards Station Road at the front. On one side it adjoins the dwellings and their back gardens at 7 Sandown Court and 9 Somerville Court, the siting of which also reflects the sloping topography. The main part of the appeal building, which faces Station Road, is close to the dwelling at 7 Sandown Court but at a lower level, and except for a drive on the opposite side, it takes up much of the width of the front of the site. The existing 2-storey hipped-roofed rear wing is cut into the rising ground fairly close to the drive, so the part of the site that adjoins the dwellings includes an open partly grassed area and steps down to the existing building.
4. The scheme was amended during the application process. The Council's decision was made on the basis of the proposal that was shown on the amended plans. The proposal includes a 2-storey roughly L-plan low-pitched hipped-roofed extension that would enclose a small light well and adjoin the main building and its rear wing. It would be partly cut into the rising ground, so its eaves would align with the existing main roof eaves, but its ridges would be lower.
5. I viewed the site and its surroundings, including the dwellings and their back gardens at 9 Somerville Court and 7 Sandown Court, at my visit. Due to the

relationship of the proposal to the dwelling at 9 Somerville Court, the proposal would alter the outlook from the back of that dwelling and from the patio close by, but that change would not harm its occupiers' outlook. Whilst the proposal would be seen above the intervening fence and planting in some views from the fairly modest back garden of 9 Somerville Court, it would not be so oppressive that its occupiers' living conditions would be harmed.

6. However, due to its height, form, siting and substantial depth, which would be much greater than the depth of the back garden at 7 Sandown Court, the proposal would have an unacceptably overbearing and oppressive effect on the outlook of the occupiers of the dwelling at 7 Sandown Court, in the rooms at the back of their home and in their back garden.
7. The proposal would, amongst other things, create jobs and enable the existing healthcare facilities and services to be expanded. Even so, because the sum of its mainly social and economic benefits would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the environmental harm that it would cause to the living conditions of the occupiers of 7 Sandown Court, the proposal would not be in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
8. Therefore, I consider that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 7 Sandown Court, with regard to outlook. It would be contrary to Policy Cf2 of the *Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005* which aims for proposals for community facilities to comprise a layout and design which does not adversely affect the amenities of adjoining properties, and the *National Planning Policy Framework* which seeks a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal fails.

Joanna Reid

INSPECTOR