



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/22/3290934

Compton, 3 New North Road, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8LZ.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Emma Wanbon and Theodore de Lemos against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02672/S73, dated 8 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2021.
 - The application sought planning permission for a two-storey rear/side extension. Alteration and enlargement of roof. Loft conversion. As amended on 19/11/2018 without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 18/00982/HHOLD, dated 23 November 2018.
 - The condition in dispute is No 1. which states that: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans. MH/E/01,02, 03, 04, 05 and 06, MH/P/01, 02, 03 and 04, MH/LP/01 and MH/BP/01.
 - The reason given for the condition is: To define the permission and ensure the development is carried out in accord with the approved plans and in accordance with National Planning Practice Guidance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be effect of the extension and alterations on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Background and Reasons

3. The appeal property, Compton is one half of a semi-detached pair of two-storey vernacular styled Victorian cottages. It is located in a residential area characterised by an eclectic mix of properties of various sizes and styles.
4. Planning permission was granted for an almost full width single storey flat roof rear addition and a two-storey rear extension with a new gable roof. The ridge line of the new gable roof was to be the same height as that of the host property. The first floor extension and new roof, complete with a new chimney stack would respect and reflect the design and style of the host property.

5. The appellants, while retaining the approved single storey flat roof addition, propose modifying the scheme design by raising the eaves line of the first floor addition and forming a flat roof with a pitched tiled facias to either side, thereby creating additional space within the roof at second floor level. Two new rooflights are also shown to be inserted into the front roof slope.
6. In addition, it is also proposed to reconfigure the fenestration to the rear elevation and omit the traditional expressed cills and arched heads to the windows.
7. The approved scheme would appear as well-mannered and attractive design. However, by reason of the three-dimensional form of the roof, the bland brick façade of the first/second floor addition and the poor fenestration pattern and lack of detail to the window openings, the amended scheme would, in contrast appear unattractive, and utilitarian. Furthermore, the two large landscape format roof windows to the front roof slope would be at odds with the established vertical emphasis of the design of the property and thereby appear as incongruous features. This would add significantly to harm.
8. Accordingly, therefore I conclude that the amended design would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the wider area. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the aims of Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead local Plan Development Management Plan (Adopted September 2019) and the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Supplementary Planning guidance House Holder Extensions and Alterations (Adopted March 2004), as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of design and the need to reinforce local distinctiveness while making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of its surroundings.
9. In reaching my determination I have been mindful that the proposed revised design would not impact on residential living conditions and no neighbour objections have been received. However, in this case, given the harm that I have identified, these matters are of limited weight in my deliberations.
10. Furthermore, I note, from the evidence provided, that there are a number of flat roof dormers locally. Whatever the background to those cases, the existence of a large rear dormer additions nearby is not an appropriate justification for permitting the development here.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR