



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2021

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/21/3272213

21 Heritage Lawn, Langshott, Horley, Surrey, RH6 9XH.

- 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 and Mrs Cook against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02750/HHOLD, dated 10 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension over existing single storey garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension over existing single storey garage at 21 Heritage Lawn, Langshott, Horley, Surrey, RH6 9XH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02750/HHOLD, dated 10 December 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: 331/01/0, 331/02/A and 331/03/0.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 21 Heritage Lawn, is a two-storey detached house. It is part of a larger residential estate characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached houses. Due to the form of the dwellings, the palette of external materials, the landscaping and the estate layout, with the dwellings being staggered and not regimented along the access roads, the development has an informal appearance.

4. The appellants propose a first floor extension built over the existing garage and side passage way to form a new master suite. The proposed extension, which would be built hard on the boundary to number 21, would have a pitched roof. While, maintain the existing eaves line, the ridge of proposed roof would be set down below that of the main house. Thereby making the proposed extension subservient to the host property.
5. Overall, due to the form of the extension, its location set well back from the main façade of the house, its general detailing and the choice of materials I consider that the extension, as designed would appear as a well-mannered addition to the host property.
6. The Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Supplementary Planning Guidance- Householder Extensions and Alterations (Adopted March 2004) (SPG) advises, at page 17 that in order to avoid a terracing effect the retention of a 1.0 meter gap between an extended property and the boundary of the curtilage will normally be required. In my judgement, although a 1.0 meter gap would not be achievable here, I do not believe that, given the plan form of the host property and its neighbour number 20 and having regard to the three dimensional form of each dwelling and their relationship one to another that the proposed extension, would, in this case, have either a cramped appearance or result in a harmful terracing effect between the dwellings, as might be the case in a more regimented street pattern.
7. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed addition would not appear as an incongruous or cramped form of development detrimental to either the architectural integrity of the host property or the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore accord with the objectives of Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan (Adopted September 2019) and the SPG as they seek, amongst other thing, to promote and reinforce local distinctiveness and respect the character of the surrounding area.

Conditions

8. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
9. In the interests of certainty, I shall also impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR