



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2021

by Baljit K Muston BA(Hons) PGDip MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/21/3278419

Mandalay, 4 Bunbury Way, Epsom Downs KT17 4JP

- 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 Ben Burford against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00455/HHOLD, dated 23 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is on a small housing estate, comprising detached two storey houses constructed in the late 20th century. No 4 is built in a 'neo Georgian' style, and is located on the inside of a bend in Bunbury Way. It is a very prominent dwelling on the road, with the south-west facing side elevation being particularly so, as it is clearly visible when turning the corner into the main section of Bunbury Way.
4. The proposed porch has been reduced in size since the application was first submitted. However, it would still be over 3 metres deep in total, with over 2 metres of that depth being enclosed. In this location, a porch of this depth would appear as an incongruous and unduly prominent feature. No 4's front garden is relatively shallow, and the proposed porch would project nearly halfway to the back edge of the pavement. Its depth would make it appear as out of scale with No 4, whilst its location in a prominent position on a corner would cause it to harm the character and appearance of this part of the estate.
5. The appellant has drawn my attention to other large porches in the Borough. However, none of them share the combination of excessive depth and prominent location on a corner that exists at the appeal site. Each case must be determined on its own merits, and the existence of these other porches does not alter my view of the appeal proposal.

6. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy CS4 of the Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy (2014) and Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan (2019). These policies seek, amongst other things, development that takes direction from the existing character of the area, and that has due regard to the layout of the surrounding area. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice contained in the Council's Householder Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004), which advises that porches should reflect the appearance of the existing property, including in its style and proportions.

Baljit K Muston

INSPECTOR