The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) PIEMA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/19/3237296
72 Hillside, Banstead SM7 1HF

- 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 Tony Clark against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
- The application Ref 19/00907/HHOLD dated 1 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2019.
- The development proposed is a loft/roof conversion.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Procedural Matters

4. Since the issuing of the Council's Decision Notice, the Reigate & Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan (September 2019) (the 'DMP') has been adopted. The policies referred to within the Council's decision (Policy Ho9, Ho13 and Ho16 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005) have been superseded. DMP Policy DES1 replaces the sections of Policy Ho9, Ho13 and Ho16 relevant to this case and the appeal has therefore been considered against Policy DES1.

5. During the appeal process, the Council have clarified that the reference in the Council's decision to the Reigate and Banstead Local Distinctiveness Design Guide (2004) is an error and the decision notice should have referred to the Supplementary Planning Guidance Householder Extensions and Alterations (March 2004) (the 'Householder Extensions and Alterations SPG'). The appeal has therefore been considered against the relevant sections of the Householder Extensions and Alterations SPG.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a large, detached chalet style bungalow, located on Hillside, opposite the junction with Burgh Wood. The properties immediately neighbouring the appeal site are also detached chalet style dwellings, but whilst both neighbouring houses are of a different design and appearance, they have a similar scale to the appeal property. The area is residential, typified by large detached one and two storey dwellings. A number of properties in the area have been altered or extended and are of different styles and designs.

7. The proposed development would increase both the ridge and the eaves height of the appeal property and feature four large dormer windows at the front and rear. The dwelling is in a highly visible location, featuring prominently in views when travelling downhill along Burgh Wood and the increase in bulk and massing from the change to the roof and the addition of the large dormer windows would result in the dwelling appearing disproportionate and top heavy.

8. The appeal property is set on a sloping site and it is acknowledged that the neighbouring property to the south has a slightly higher roof height, but this appears to be due to its location on higher ground. The neighbouring property to the north also has a slightly higher ridge height, but not significantly so and this is commensurate with its individual design. It does not justify the substantial increase in height and bulk of the appeal property that is proposed. The additional height and massing of the appeal property at roof level would result in the appeal property appearing dominant in the street scene and out of keeping in terms of scale with the existing dwelling and the neighbouring properties. As a result a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area would occur.

9. The appellant has provided examples of other properties in the vicinity of the appeal property that have been subject to alterations and extensions and it is acknowledged that the area features a variety of dwelling styles. However, none of the examples are directly comparable to the proposal before me.

10. On this basis, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DES1 of the DMP which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure development respects the character of the surrounding area, the visual appearance of the immediate street scene, and has due regard to scale, massing, height and roofscapes of the surrounding area and the relationship to neighbouring buildings. The proposed development is also contrary to the Householder Extensions and Alterations SPG which seeks to ensure extensions and alterations respect the appearance and character of the existing property. The SPG also seeks to ensure that dormer windows are carefully designed and do not stick out as an unacceptable feature in the street scene.

Other Matters

11. The appellant's wish to add additional living space to the appeal property, and to remove the existing rear dormer are understood, however these considerations do not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR