



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2021

by H Miles BA(hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 DECEMBER 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/21/3275865

Ladram, 53 Haroldslea Drive, Horley RH6 9DT

- 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 Mohammad against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00325/HHOLD, dated 9 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single storey/part double storey rear extension, double storey side extensions (east and west side), roof extension to incorporate habitable space with 2no. feature glazed dormers and front porch.
-

Decision

1. This appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the proposed roof and trees, the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to any overbearing impact to 55 Haroldslea Drive and whether the proposed development would reduce the impact of flooding.

Reasons

Character and Appearance – roof

3. This part of Haroldslea Drive is characterised by mainly modest detached family dwellings with generous gardens. The appearance of the properties is varied, however, roofs are generally pitched, hipped with a single ridge height, albeit they differ in their detailing. Whilst there are examples of secondary side additions where the ridge is set below the main ridge line, these are uncommon and do not form an overriding part of the character of the area.
4. The alterations to the roof include an increase to the ridge height, crown roof and stepped ridge line. This would result in an awkward roof form which would be visually jarring relative to the host property and its surroundings. Furthermore, the increased height and bulk at roof level would create an oversized inappropriate addition to this property. Taken together the proposed alterations would result in an inappropriate, dominant extension of this house, harmful to the modest character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
5. Consequently, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy

CS4 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy July 2014 (the Core Strategy) and Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan September 2019 (the DMP) As well as to the advice in the Supplementary Planning Guidance Householder Extensions and Alterations March 2004. Together these seek high quality design from all new development and set out detail as to how this should be achieved.

Character and Appearance - Trees

6. Haroldslea Drive is characterised by mature trees to the front of properties, and the Oak and Horse Chestnut trees in the front garden of the appeal site make a positive contribution to the streetscene in this respect.
7. Details were submitted with this application that showed that, for a previously approved application for works on a similar footprint¹ (the previously approved scheme), protection measures could be provided which would not result in the loss or deterioration of these trees. Consequently, I am satisfied that these trees could be retained, subject to the imposition of a suitable condition. As such there would be no harm to the streetscene in this regard.
8. Therefore, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to trees. As such, in this respect, it would be in accordance with Policies NHE3 and DES1 of the DMP which require that development resulting in the loss of a protected tree should be refused, and that development should be high quality design including with reference to protecting and enhancing natural features and respecting the character of the area.

Living Conditions

9. There are ground floor and first floor rear facing windows at no 55 which are set back from the existing rear elevation of no 53. No 55 is angled slightly away from no 53, nevertheless the rear elevations broadly face the same direction.
10. The proposed development would result in a two storey elevation with pitched roof above that projects significantly beyond the windows at no.55, in close proximity to the boundary. Taking into account this size and position it would result in an overbearing effect on these windows which would be harmful to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers.
11. As such, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. In this respect the proposed development would be contrary to policy DES1 of the DMP which requires the development should not adversely impact the amenity of neighbours, amongst other things.

12. Flood Risk

13. The site is at risk of flooding, and there is no dispute that the building floor level should be a minimum of 150mm above the existing ground level in order to reduce the impact of flooding.
14. The submitted plans show a ground floor level which is slightly above the external ground level indicated, although the distance is not annotated. It is

¹ HH/01662/HHOLD and 19/01209/S73

put to me by the appellant that this is 150mm. I am not provided with detailed evidence to contradict this statement. Based on the drawings, and my observations on site, it is likely that the proposed development could be achieved with the ground level required. It would be appropriate to secure such details by condition.

15. Consequently, the proposed development would reduce the impact of flooding. As such, in this respect, it would be in accordance with Policy CCF2 of the DMP which requires that proposals should seek to secure opportunities to reduce both the cause and impact of flooding for existing and proposed development.

Other Matters

16. Planning permission has been granted for extensions to the rear, side and southwest corner of the dwelling as part of the previously approved scheme. These alterations were smaller in scale and extent and did not include the increase in ridge height proposed here. Consequently, the previously approved scheme would be less harmful than the development before me now and as such it does not justify the appeal scheme.
17. The proposed development would provide the social and economic benefits associated with an extended large family dwelling in an accessible location which incorporates methods to save energy and water. However, due to the size of the development such benefits would be limited in their scale. Any economic benefits associated with construction would be temporary and as this is an existing property any increased expenditure from future residents would be limited.
18. It appears to me that the existing property is suitable for family accommodation and therefore the appeal scheme re-provides such accommodation, albeit in a more modern layout. Nor am I persuaded that the proposed layout would notably decrease the number of journeys taken by occupants. Although I have not identified harm to trees or flood risk, this would be a neutral effect.
19. On the other hand, I have identified public and permanent environmental harm with regard to the harm to the character and appearance of the area along with harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to the development plan. These multiple notable adverse effects would outweigh the limited benefits of the proposed development.

Conclusion

20. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework July 2021, to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR