



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 April 2023

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/23/3314853

24 The Crescent, Reigate, RH2 0PB.

- 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 Luca Boscolo against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02092/HHOLD dated 20 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey rear extension with a hipped to flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension with a hipped to flat roof at 24 The Crescent Reigate, RH2 0PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/02092/HHOLD dated 20 September 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, so far as relevant to the development hereby permitted: 2207-Crescent-01, 2207-Crescent – 02 and 2207-Crescent-03.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the single storey front and side extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 22 The Crescent (No.22), with particular regard to visual impact, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a small crescent comprising six two storey houses with staggered front and rear building lines. The Appeal dwelling comprises one of the only pair of semi-detached houses within The Crescent. They are uniformly designed and occupy generous sized south facing plots.
4. The attached dwelling on the western side of the appeal dwelling (No.22) has no rear extensions, whereas the appeal dwelling currently has a 4.95 metre

deep conservatory extension located close to the boundary with No.22. This conservatory has a solid flank wall facing No.22, with a small area of glazing above the wall, together with a pitched roof with a front facing gable. The eaves height of the conservatory is in excess of two metres in height. Its ridge line sits a short distance below the existing first floor window and is some 3.71 metres above the external ground level.

5. Whilst the existing conservatory roof is fully glazed, it is fitted with opaque internal roof blinds which give it a more solid appearance and reduces the amount of daylight and sunlight within the conservatory and which can filter through into the adjacent garden at No.22.
6. On the opposite side of the appeal dwelling is a single storey side extension that wraps around part of the rear elevation. Whilst it is the same height as the conservatory, its eaves height is slightly and its roof pitch is less steep.
7. Amongst other things Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan 2019 (DMP), states that new development should not have an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of existing nearby buildings. Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework), seeks to ensure that proposals create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users
8. The Reigate and Banstead Supplementary Planning Guidance – Householder Extensions and Alterations 2004 (SPG), is consistent with this. It advises that extensions should not appear overbearing when viewed from neighbouring properties, or result in a material loss of daylight/sunlight.
9. The proposed extension would adhere to the same western side and rear building lines as the existing conservatory. However, its eaves height, roof pitch and hipped design would match that of the existing rear extension, to which it would be attached. As a result, the proposed extension would be very slightly lower than the existing conservatory and its ridge would be very slightly further away from the boundary with No.22 than the ridge of the existing conservatory. In addition, due to its hipped roof design the outer part of the roof of the proposed extension would be materially lower than that of the existing conservatory roof, when viewed from the dwelling and immediately adjacent garden area at No.22.
10. For these reasons, the proposed extension would not be more visually bulky or have a greater enclosing impact than the existing conservatory, when viewed from the adjacent rear facing window and sitting out area at No.22. Whilst daylight and sunlight would not filter through the roof and walls of the proposed extension, the reduced outer bulk of the proposed hipped roof would readily compensate for this.
11. Overall, I find that the proposed extension would not be visually overbearing or oppressive for the occupiers of No.22, or result in a material loss of daylight or sunlight. The occupiers of No.22 would continue to benefit from a large rear garden with spacious and favourable southerly and westerly views.
12. The single storey rear conservatory at 24a The Crescent (Villa Maria), projects further into the rear garden environment than the proposed extension and the properties are separated from each other by a mature hedge. Due to this and the distance between the proposed extension and the side wall of the dwelling

at Villa Maria, the proposal would not have a materially harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of that property due to visual impact or loss of daylight/sunlight.

13. I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would not materially harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.22 due to visual impact or loss of daylight/sunlight. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with DMP Policy DES1, paragraph 130 of the Framework and the relevant advice set out in the SPG.

Other matters

14. The proposed extension would be modest in form and appearance and would respect the uncluttered lines of the host dwelling. Its crown roof would be hidden behind the pitched roof around it and the external materials would match those of the existing dwelling. For these reasons the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would be readily assimilated into the rear garden environment.
15. As suggested by the council conditions could be imposed which require the extension to be constructed in accordance with the submitted plans and that the external materials used shall match those of the host dwelling. I agree that these conditions are necessary to ensure the extension respects the host dwelling and in the interests of certainty.
16. Finally, whilst the appeal site is located close to the northern boundary of the Chart Lane Conservation Area the proposed extension would not be visible from the street scene or in views into or out of the conservation area. Accordingly, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Chart Lane conservation area and would not impact on its significance.

Conclusion

17. Having regard to the conclusion on the main issue and on all other matters the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR