



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: 16TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/22/3294203

4 Radstock Way, Merstham, Surrey, RH1 3NG.

- 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 Keith and Catherine Lambert against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01823/HHOLD, dated 5 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is for single storey rear and double storey side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear and double storey side extensions at 4 Radstock Way, Merstham, Surrey, RH1 3NG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01823/HHOLD, dated 5 July 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 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: 11117/101/P2, 102/P1, 110/P2, 120/P3 and 140/P1.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of numbers 2 Radstock Way in terms of its potential to result in an overbearing, dominant and oppressive outlook.

Procedural Matters

3. This appeal has been determined on the basis of the drawings submitted to and considered by the Council.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 4 Radstock Way, is a two-storey semi-detached house, it is situated on a post war residential estate. The adjacent house, 2 Radstock Way, is the end property of a terrace of 6 and is located on the corner of

Radstock Way and Malmstone Avenue. The dwellings are positioned such that the flank wall of number 4 faces the rear wall of number 2.

5. The appellants propose a single storey rear and a two-storey side extension facing number 2. The roof of the proposed first floor addition would be a hipped roof to match the main dwelling, but with the ridge line set below that of the main roof. The new extension would be clad at first floor level which would serve to break up the visual mass of the new flank wall. Accordingly, the extension would appear as a well-mannered subservient addition to the main house.
6. The proposed two-storey side extension would be built hard up to the edge of the boundary to a shared right of way between the appeal site boundary and that of the rear garden of 2 Radstock Way. Accordingly, the rear elevation of number 2 would face the new flank wall of number 4.
7. Number 2 only has ground floor windows facing the appeal site. Therefore, given the separation distance between the properties, their orientation and the shape of the side extension's roof I do not consider that there would be any loss of daylight or sunlight to the rooms in number 2 served by the ground floor windows or the rear garden of number 2.
8. Furthermore, from my observations on site, given the separation distance between the properties, the shared right of way and the form of and proposed cladding to the first floor level of the addition I am not persuaded that it would appear as an overbearing, dominant and oppressive form of development.
9. I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 2 Radstock Way in terms of resulting in terms of an overbearing, dominant and oppressive outlook. The development would thereby accord with 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 seek to protect residential living conditions.

Conditions

10. 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.
11. In the interests of certainty, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR