



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by Rachael Pipkin, BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/20/3245519

29 St Mary's Road, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 7JH

- 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 James Seager against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/01698/HHOLD dated 28 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of the roof loft space into living accommodation by increasing the roof pitch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Number 29 St Mary's Road (No. 29) is a three-storey detached house, located on a residential street of similar sized properties in a range of ages and designs. The properties on the street have a variety of roof shapes, most with front facing roof slopes and a few, including the appeal property, with front facing gables. There is some variation in ridge heights along the road, in part due to the topography but also as several properties appear to have been extended at roof level through increasing their original ridge height.
4. No. 29 together with Numbers 31 and 33 St Mary's Road form a group of 3 detached properties which are positioned very close to each other. These properties are consistent in height and of similar proportions with front facing roof gables and collectively make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development would increase the existing roof pitch to raise the ridge and provide two large side facing dormers. The increased height of the ridge would disrupt the consistent appearance of this group of 3 properties and would appear in stark contrast when viewed in the context of these neighbouring properties. This would be widely visible from the street.
5. The proposed side dormers would be bulky and prominent additions which with pitched dormer cheeks would sit awkwardly either side of the front gable and

would fail to integrate with the shape or design of the host property. The rendered face of the proposed dormers, whilst matching the external finish of the walls of the house would draw attention to the proposed dormers and their unusual design and bulky shape atop this building. The dormers would detract from the simple appearance of the host property. Due to their large size and unusual shape, they would appear as incongruous additions which would harm the character and appearance of the both the host dwelling but also the streetscene from which they would be visible.

6. My attention has been drawn to the many properties along both sides of St Mary's Road that have been extended at roof level through raising the ridge. However, I note, with the exception of Number 32 Springfield Road (No. 32), these properties have front facing roof slopes and are not directly comparable to the scheme before me. No. 32 forms one of a pair of houses with front facing gables similar to the appeal property. It has been extended with side dormers and a raised ridge in a manner not dissimilar to the appeal proposal. I appreciate that this has been done. However, it seems to me to have unbalanced this pair of properties and does not appear to have benefitted the character and appearance of the area.
7. I have also been referred to properties on Chart Lane at the end of St Mary's Road which have been extended at roof level with similar side dormers to the appeal proposal. I have not been provided with the full details of these developments but given they are located on a different street and some distance from the appeal property, I do not find them directly comparable. In any case, having had the benefit of seeing these nearby developments, I am not persuaded that such a development would not harm the character and appearance of either the appeal property or the street scene along St Mary's Road.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. it would therefore not accord with Policy DES1 of the Reigate & Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan 2019 which seeks development of a high-quality design that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of its surroundings. It would also not comply with the advice set out in the Supplementary Planning Guidance Householder Extensions & Alterations 2004 which requires roof extensions including dormers to be well designed and not in a prominent location.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above and taking into account the appellant's need for additional accommodation, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR