



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/22/3295917

2 Althorne Road, Redhill, Surrey, RH1 6EF.

- 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 Marc Ashdown against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03266/HHOLD, dated 21 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with a hipped roof (and raised eaves position) to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the semi-detached pair and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 2 Althorne Road, is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling on a corner plot. The original house has previously been extended, by way of a well-mannered subservient addition to one side.
4. This residential area is characterised by a rich mix of mainly two-storey dwellings.
5. The appellant proposes the alteration of the roof over the original main house to form a new second floor addition.
6. By reason of the height of the new north east flank wall, the flat roof/pitched fascia design of the new roof, the raised eaves line, fenestration pattern and resulting utilitarian façade the proposed extension would appear as a wholly contrived, unattractive and incongruous addition.
7. Accordingly, the proposed extension would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the semi-detached pair and the character and appearance of the area.
8. To allow the development would be contrary to the aims of Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan (Adopted September

2019), Policy CS4 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Core Strategy (Adopted July 2014) and the Supplementary Planning Guidance-Householder Extensions and Alterations (Adopted March 2004) as they relate, amongst other things to the quality of development.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant requirements for the additional accommodation and the need to replace the existing roof. While I am sympathetic to these considerations, they do not outweigh the substantial harm that I have identified in this case.
10. I appreciate that matching materials are proposed, and there are no objections from neighbours to the development. However, the absence of harm and objection are neutral factors in my consideration. As such, I have given these matters very limited weight in my decision.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of similar developments, particular design details to those proposed found elsewhere in the area. Further, I note that the new extension would be of an energy efficient design. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm that I have identified in this case.
12. The appellant also suggests that the proposal would be more attractive than a possible permitted development proposal. However, as this would be subject to separate consideration and as there is limited evidence to suggest that the impacts described by the appellant would come to pass, this consideration has minimal weight in my decision.
13. I am sympathetic to the fact that the appeal proposal is a redesign, taking into account pre-application advice and issues raised during the consideration of the original scheme design by the Council. However, I can only assess the current proposal based on the design before me.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR