



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020

by P W Clark MA(Oxon) MA(TRP) MRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/19/3242756

12 Sparrows Mead, Redhill RH1 2EJ

- 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 Pearson against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01554/HHOLD, dated 6 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is conversion of loft space to form habitable room, incorporating dormer window to the rear, 3Nº Velux roof lights to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. It is an area of late twentieth century housing built on a hillside so that from various viewpoints the roofscape is prominent. The housing has shallow pitched roofs which have been relatively unaltered because permitted development rights were removed as a condition of the original planning permission.
3. The proposal is described as incorporating a dormer window but this is misleading because the extension has few or none of the characteristics of a dormer. It would sit on the existing wallplate and would rise almost in line with the existing flank wall. Little or none of the original rear roof slope would remain. In fact it would be a second floor extension with a flat roof covering approximately one half of the footprint of the original house (about one-third of the footprint as currently extended).
4. It would therefore be uncharacteristic of the estate. There is a full-width roof extension at 1b Kingfisher Drive but that has more of the characteristics of a dormer because the window sills sit almost directly on the roof slope with no spandrel and a considerable apron of roof slope in front of them. There are also bulky second floor extensions at numbers 24 and 26 Budgen Drive which are within eyeshot of the appeal site but they appear to form part of a different estate with a different aesthetic.
5. Having said that, the location of the development proposed is at the highest point of the estate so that it is not overlooked from any public place, although it would be seen from the rear of properties in Osborne Road. Number 12

Sparrows Mead is one of a terrace of three which sits forward in the alignment of terraces in Sparrows Mead. Its rear elevation is correspondingly recessed in the alignment of rear facades so the extension would not occupy a prominent position. Consequently, its uncharacteristic design and form would cause less harm to the character and appearance of the area than would others in more prominent positions.

6. Nevertheless, even in the particular circumstances of this site, the proposal would fail to comply with Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan policy DES1 which requires new development to be of high quality, have due regard to roofscape and to respect the character of the area. Planning decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. None do in this case.

P. W. Clark

Inspector