



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 18 December 2020

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2021

Appeal A Ref: APP/L3625/W/20/3253597

Land at rear of 353 Reigate Road, Epsom KT17 3LT

- 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 Denton Homes Ltd against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01974/F, dated 3 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1 dwelling with associated access road (extension to approved access road under application 18/02548/F), parking and landscaping.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L3625/W/20/3253598

Land at rear of 353 Reigate Road, Epsom KT17 3LT

- 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 Denton Homes Ltd against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00570/F, dated 13 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1 dwelling with associated access road (extension to approved access road under application 18/02548/F), parking and landscaping.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/L3625/W/20/3253597

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B Ref: APP/L3625/W/20/3253598

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. I consider that the main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposed dwelling on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. At the time of my visit the appeal site was part of a construction site, fenced off from the rest of No 353 Reigate Road's garden, hardsurfaced and used for parking, presumably for construction workers. The topography of the area is

relevant with the appeal site being on a higher level than the houses fronting Reigate Road, including No 353. Juniper Place runs off Reigate Road and following the topography of the land also rises up from the Reigate Road to the top of the cul-de-sac. The rear of some of the houses in Juniper Place face the appeal site.

5. Development Management Plan¹ Policy DES1 sets out criteria explaining the Council's expectations for high quality design that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of its surroundings. Policy DES2 relates to development of garden land and also sets out criteria which development should comply with. Further guidance on design is provided in the Council's Local Distinctiveness Design Guide².
6. Both appeals are for one dwelling that would extend the existing row of houses under construction. The two proposals differ only in their design. Of particular relevance is that the house at Appeal B would have a lower ridge height than the house at Appeal A.
7. There is a long planning history for development to the rear of houses on Reigate Road including the site currently under construction and the appeal site. A theme that runs through those earlier decisions, including appeals, is the increasing urbanisation of the area arising as a result of further development. There are pockets of development to the rear of the frontage houses on Reigate Road; the adjacent construction site being one such development. These have resulted in breaking up the linear development along Reigate Road and truncating previous long rear gardens. Juniper Place is also representative of such development.
8. The development on-going on the adjacent site seems to have arisen as a compromise, reducing previous schemes to a linear row of seven properties. These were under construction at the time of my site visit so I have not been able to view the finished development. However, from the information and plans submitted I consider that there is a cohesion to the approved development and incrementally adding onto the end of it would compromise that cohesiveness. I accept that this is just one dwelling but the approved scheme leaves a space between the development site and Juniper Place to the south and also an undeveloped space at the other end between the development site and another development at Warren Farm Close.
9. The proposal, be it that under Appeal A or Appeal B, would leave just one long garden to the rear of No 355 Reigate Road between the proposed house and the rear boundaries of the houses on Juniper Place. Previously expressed concern about the urbanising effect of these schemes would, I consider, be justified.
10. The area generally is characterised by considerable greenery, be it established trees and less formal vegetation or more clearly defined gardens. Development seems to be gradually eroding this and I see no justification in endorsing this by allowing either of these proposals. I appreciate that the appeals would result in just one additional dwelling and attempts have been made to alter the design to lessen the impact.

¹ Reigate & Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan, Adopted September 2019.

² Reigate and Banstead Local Distinctiveness Design Guide, March 2004.

11. I have considered all matters raised including those from the appellant and third parties as well as the Council but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposed new dwelling under Appeal A or Appeal B would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and conflict with policies DES1 and DES2 and the Design Guide. The appeals therefore fail.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR