



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2021

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/W/20/3265769

Land adjacent to 8 Hollis Row, Common Road, Redhill, Surrey RH1 6HH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr James Meloney against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00273/RM2, dated 27 April 2020, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 2 of planning permission Ref 17/00273/OUT, granted on 28 April 2017.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 23 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is small 1 bedroom house on vacant plot of land.
 - The details for which approval is sought are the layout, scale, appearance, access and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called the "reserved matters").
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has already approved a reserved matters application under the reference 17/00273/RM1 having previously refused an earlier submission for a three storey dwelling. The approved plans show a living room and bedroom on the ground floor with a kitchen and dining area at basement level served by a front lightwell. The building would be predominantly single storey in appearance and would have a hipped pitched roof.
3. In 2007 and 2008 planning permissions were refused and dismissed on appeal for a two bedroom house and then for a one bedroom house at the site¹. Whilst local and national planning policies have since changed, these appeal decisions nonetheless remain material considerations.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area in relation to its design and scale.

Reasons

5. Hollis Row comprises a Victorian terrace of 8 three storey houses accessed only by a footpath that runs to the rear of dwellings fronting Common Road. The appeal relates to land to the side of 8 Hollis Row formerly within its curtilage.

¹ Refs: APP/L3625/A/07/2051823 and APP/L3625/A/08/2076904

6. The terrace has a shallow hipped pitched roof and uniformity of appearance in relation to window openings, painted rendered walls and chimney stacks. The centre terrace houses have adjoining half width front projections with sloping roofs rising to form a gable end above a shared boundary. The end of terrace houses differ in some details. There are large single storey front and two storey side extensions to no.1; the side extension has white painted rendered walls and a shallow hipped pitched roof to match the terrace. At no.8 there is a full width single storey front extension with a lean-to pitched roof that contrasts with the profile of the half width front projections elsewhere in the terrace. The high boundary fences to the access footpath constrain public views of the ground floors to the terrace but all floors to the front elevations would be seen in private views from the rear of dwellings fronting Common Road.
7. The proposed house would have two storeys with a single storey front element. The upper floor would align with the front and rear walls to the terrace and the single storey element would match the depth and profile to the front extension to no.8. The size and position of windows and rooflights would resemble openings at no.8 and the white painted rendered walls to the ground floor and slate to the sloping ground floor roof would also be sympathetic features. In these respects, the proposal would be subservient and complementary to the design and appearance of the adjacent terrace.
8. However, the vertical wood cladding and flat roof to the first floor would appear as contrasting and discordant design features. As the terrace's pitched roof is shallow in angle, it is the overhanging eaves line that appears most prominent in views from ground level. This feature would be absent in the proposal but has been replicated in the two storey extension to no.1 Hollis Row.
9. The siting and profile of the house and some details would be sensitive to the site's context but the roof treatment and materials to the upper floor would not be. The proposal would thereby conflict with Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan (2019) which require a high quality design that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of its surroundings, including in relation to roofscapes.
10. I acknowledge that the proposal accords with a sketch from the Council of a possible design approach, but this was issued without prejudice to examination of a future application. The Council may have encouraged a contemporary design approach in pre-application advice, and much of the detail would result in an appropriate subordinate design. But the overall design would result in a discordant appearance, particularly as the upper floor would be conspicuous.
11. I have considered representations made on the proposal. Some objections relate to the principle of a house on the site, but this has been established by the grant of outline planning permission which includes planning conditions relating to construction management and subsequent additions.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area in relation to its upper floor design. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR