
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08/12/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/20/3248887

23 Broadhurst Gardens, Reigate, RH2 8AW

- 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 Terry Stuckey against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02260/HHOLD, dated 10 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as *"Loft conversion with rear dormer, changing roofscape from hip to gable. 2No. roof lights in front elevation existing roof. Removal of the internal spine wall and infilling some existing openings"*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 23 Broadhurst Gardens and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one half of a semi-detached pair of bungalows located within a row of similar properties at the end of a residential cul-de-sac comprising principally a mix of two-storey and single-storey semi-detached dwellings. There is a striking symmetry to the pattern of development along Broadhurst Gardens at this point, not only in terms of the buildings' appearances, but also their arrangement encircling a large central area of open space around which the road loops. I saw that the significant majority maintain their original hipped roof form which reinforces the distinctive character of the area.
4. The appeal proposal is to alter the hipped roof form of No 23 to create a new end gable and to construct a flat-roof, box dormer across the full width of the property to the rear.
5. The Council's *Supplementary Planning Guidance Householder Extensions & Alterations* – March 2004 (SPG) provides guidance to achieve the highest design standards for residential extensions. In dealing with the issue of

appearance, the SPG advises at section 4.1 that changing between hips and gables on one half of a pair of semis is unacceptable given that an extension in the street scene can be influential on important features that make up the appearance of an area.

6. In this instance the hipped roof form of No 23 plays a role in maintaining the uniformity and character of the area. Furthermore, the roof profile of the building is openly seen in the vista looking west in the approach along the south side of Broadhurst Gardens. The proposed change would directly conflict with the guidance within the SPG and, more importantly, would stand out as a prominent and incongruous addition that would unbalance the semi-detached pair.
7. The dormer would occupy virtually the entire rear roof slope, including the added portion created to form the new end gable. It would be barely set down from the ridge, up from the eaves, or in from the sides of the property. Regardless of whether the materials used would match the existing tiles, it would entirely remodel the shape of the building's roof in a dominant form that would show little respect for the modest scale and proportions of the dwelling. In so doing it would fail to display any of the key design issues that are set out at Figure 28 of the SPG, which have the intention to improve the appearance of any particular roof alteration. Although the dormer would not be seen from any public vantage point in Broadhurst Gardens, its unsympathetic scale and appearance would not be unnoticed when viewed from neighbouring gardens.
8. Overall, I find that the proposed roof alterations would appear unsympathetic and harmful to the character and appearance of No 23. In turn this would detract from the harmonious character of Broadhurst Gardens. The proposal would fail to make a positive contribution to its surroundings or display the quality of design required to promote and reinforce the distinctive characteristics of the area. As such, there would be conflict with Policy DES1: *Design of new development* of the Reigate & Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan (September 2019).
9. The appellant has alluded to the attached neighbour's plans to make similar changes to their property as permitted development and that, as a consequence, the pair would maintain a balance, albeit in an altered form. However, there is no evidence before me to support this claim. It is not for me to determine, as part of this appeal, the lawful nature of any alterations that may be proposed by adjoining occupiers. Neither could there be any certainty that such works would be implemented. The facts remain that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of 23 Broadhurst Gardens and the wider area.
10. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR