



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2020

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/20/3258471

21 Great Tattenhams, Epsom Downs, Surrey KT18 5RF

- 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 B Hockings against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01164/HHOLD, dated 9 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is: Single storey rear addition. Garage extension and increase in garage roof height. Front roof dormer. Loft conversion. Side extension. Alteration to bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is typical of the detached bungalows which characterise this stretch of Great Tattenhams. The single-storey dwelling has modest side extensions but the shape of the original building remains legible, distinguished by its pyramidal roof and hipped roof projections to the front and rear.
4. The proposal would include significant alterations to the roof of the bungalow to create an upper storey of accommodation. These would feature a complex arrangement of different roof pitches which would combine to produce an unusually deep rear box dormer. The resultant crown roof would not be read by the casual observer in the street. However, the design would be awkward and incongruous and it would fail to respect the form and mass of the original roof.
5. The appellant refers me to permitted schemes at 38 Great Tattenhams¹ and 78 Shawley Way. However, neither case is directly comparable to the appeal proposal; they are far simpler and have sought to match the original roof pitch as closely as possible. The Shawley Way example is similar in many respects to 23 Great Tattenhams – the bungalow immediately adjacent to the appeal site – which has undergone a sympathetic hip to gable enlargement with a box dormer to the rear.

¹ Ref 16/01500/HHOLD & Ref APP/L3625/D/17/3184861

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Householder Extensions and Alterations (2004) (SPG) predates current development plan policy, but its advice remains material to the policy objective of securing high quality design. Paragraph 4.1 of the SPG explains that an appropriate roof design is an important factor in achieving an acceptable appearance. It recommends that pitched roofs are designed to integrate with the existing. The roof alterations proposed in this case would be out of character with the host dwelling and they would not comply with this guidance. I appreciate that parts of the development to the rear of the property would be concealed from public view, but this is not reason to consider the overall design acceptable.
7. Particular concerns are raised in relation to a dormer which is proposed for the principal elevation but I note that various other bungalows in Great Tattenhams have traditional style dormers at a high level in the front roof slope. The principle of an appropriately detailed dormer is therefore not objectionable. However, I consider that the proposed dormer would be unattractive due to its wide cheeks, shallow roof pitch and chunky fascia boards. This weighs against a grant of permission.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal constitutes poor design which would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and area. There is conflict with Policies DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 and Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy 2014 insofar as these seek to secure development which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of its surroundings. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR