



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/22/3305889

37 Larchwood Close, Banstead, Surrey, SM7 1HE

- 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 and Mrs Vashist against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01198/HHOLD, dated 20 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey side/rear and front extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with a single storey garage to the side and a conservatory to the rear. It is located on a road comprising mainly detached dwellings of various designs and external appearance.
4. The proposal is for large single storey 'wrap around' extensions to the front, rear and both sides of the dwelling. The rear extension would have considerable depth and the side extensions would be close to both side boundaries of the site. The proposed front extension would be of a similar flat roof design and would extend across part of the front elevation of the dwelling.
5. The Council Supplementary Planning Guidance Householder Extensions & Alterations (2004) (SPD) whilst not statutory, provides useful design guidance for householder development. It requires extensions to respect the appearance of the property and with regard to single storey extensions, it states that the scale of the extension should be proportionate to the size of the property and garden. It advises that the set back of an extension should be proportionate to the width of the extension and that single storey front extensions are rarely acceptable. Furthermore, it advises that single storey rear extensions along a boundary of more than 3.5m for a detached dwelling are likely to conflict with Section 4 of the guidance and will not be acceptable.

6. In my view, the proposed extensions would conflict with the guidance contained in the SPD and would overwhelm and fail to respect the scale and proportions of the host dwelling due to their combined size, scale and proximity to the side boundaries of the site. The increase in the footprint of the dwelling would be disproportionate to that of the existing property and the proposed extensions would be poorly integrated as a result of their size, scale and flat roof design. As a result, I find that the proposed extensions would result in an overdevelopment of the existing property and would be harmful to its character and appearance.
7. I also noted on my site visit that views of the extensions would also be obtainable from Larchwood Close, particularly through the gap created by the access between Nos 35 and 37. I therefore find that the proposal would also be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area due to their size, scale and lack of integration and respect for the host dwelling.
8. I am aware that the appeal proposal is similar to an application for extensions to the property which was approved under LPA ref. 21/03045/HHOLD. However, the appeal proposal would further increase the floorspace of the dwelling and would infill the gap that would have existed between the extension and the side boundary of the site adjacent to the access serving 36, 36a and 36b Larchwood Close. Thus, the increase in width of the side extension, together with the front extension would further contribute to the overdevelopment of the property and would result in the side and rear extension being more prominent in the street scene.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policy CS4 of the Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy 2014, Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan 2019 and the SPD. Collectively these policies and guidance require development to be of a high quality design that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of its surroundings and promotes and reinforces local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR