



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 May 2023

by B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/W/22/3307223

81 Linkfield Street, Redhill, Surrey RH1 6BY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Hastings against Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01303/HHOLD dated 7 June 2022 was approved on 31 August 2022 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
 - The development permitted is a side extension, porch extension and widening of driveway.
 - The condition in dispute is No 3 which states that: *"Notwithstanding the drawings, the proposed external finishing materials and details shall be carried out using the external facing materials and details specified below and there shall be no variation without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority;*
 - a) All windows and doors to the east and north elevations shall be of white painted timber, with casements in each opening, set back behind the reveal at one brick depth to match existing and have masonry cills to match existing.*
 - b) All new arches and heads shall be of gauged brick or double header segmental arches to match existing.*
 - c) All brickwork shall be of handmade sandfaced brick with the mainwalling brick to be of brown multistock brick to match existing in Flemish bond with closers to corners and surrounds and handmade red stock quoins and arches to match existing.*
 - d) All roof tiles shall be of sandfaced plain tiles of colour to match existing with bonnet tiles to hips.*
 - e) All external joinery shall be of white painted timber with fascia boards no greater than 140mm.*
 - f) Except for the area of the proposed and hardstanding, the existing hedge, fence, garden and trees shall be retained".*
 - The reasons given for the condition is: *"To ensure that the visual amenities of the Conservation area are protected with regard to Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019, policy NHE9".*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission Ref 22/01303/HHOLD for a side extension, porch extension and widening of driveway at 81 Linkfield Street, Redhill, Surrey, RH1 6BY granted on 31 August 2022 by Reigate and Banstead Borough Council is varied by deleting condition 3 and substituting it for the following condition:
 - 1) Notwithstanding the drawings, the proposed external finishing materials and details shall be carried out using the external facing materials and details specified below and there shall be no variation without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority;

- a) All windows and doors to the east and north elevations shall be of white painted timber or white painted aluminium, with casements in each opening, set back behind the reveal at one brick depth to match existing and have masonry cills to match existing.
- b) All new arches and heads shall be of gauged brick or double header segmental arches to match existing.
- c) All brickwork shall be of handmade sandfaced brick with the mainwalling brick to be of brown multistock brick to match existing in Flemish bond with closers to corners and surrounds and handmade red stock quoins and arches to match existing.
- d) All roof tiles shall be of sandfaced plain tiles of colour to match existing with bonnet tiles to hips.
- e) All external joinery shall be of white painted timber with fascia boards no greater than 140mm.
- f) Except for the area of the proposed and hardstanding, the existing hedge, fence, garden and trees shall be retained.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

- 2. As the proposal is in a conservation area (CA), I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character, appearance and significance of that area, as set out in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
- 3. The main issue is the effect that removing condition 3 would have on the character, appearance and significance of the Linkfield Street CA.

Reasons

- 4. The appeal property is located in a residential area within the Linkfield Street CA. The CA features a mixture of historic detached, semi-detached and terraced properties of various designs. A variety of facing materials are used across the properties which including stucco painted elevations, hanging tiles and brickwork. There is also variation in the position of properties within their plots. To the north of Linkfield Street many properties have very small front gardens with minimal set back from the highway, whilst to the south properties generally have larger plots and the building line is set back further from the highway behind front driveways.
- 5. The character of this part of the Linkfield Street CA and its significance stems from, amongst other aspects, the variation of building styles and forms of the individual historic buildings. With its brick and hanging tile front elevation and bay window design the appeal site positively contributes to the character of the area.
- 6. Condition 3 stipulates the materials to be used in the construction of the extensions' north and east elevations. Whilst the approved elevation drawings show timber windows to the east elevation of the side extension, the appellant now requests discretion to use aluminium as an alternative material for the windows and doors rather than that specified.

7. The side extension is set back a significant distance from the public highway behind an area of grassed public space. A thick hedge on the site boundary effectively screens views of the ground floor of the appeal property. At the time of my site visit the extension had been largely constructed. I am satisfied that as a result of the distance and screening provided by the hedge, the window materials within the extension would not be discernible when viewed from the public highway. Even when viewed from the grass public space immediately outside the site boundary, the materials within the extension's doors and windows would be barely perceptible.
8. I note that the hedgerow is deciduous and provides less cover during winter months. Even so, given the height and thickness of the hedgerow, its branches would filter views of the extension throughout winter months, to an extent that would limit views of the windows and doors. I also note that the approved plans indicate the planting of two additional trees on the front boundary which would provide additional screening from some viewpoints to the front of the property. As a result, there would be very limited visibility of the windows and doors within the extension's northern and eastern elevations when viewed from Linkfield Street. Therefore I find that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the significance of the CA if white painted aluminium windows were to be installed on the north and east elevations rather than white painted timber.
9. In reaching the above findings, I have taken into account that irrespective of the screening afforded by the hedging and trees, the assimilation of the extension would be assisted by it being viewed against the backdrop of more prominent modern dormers and roof lights of properties at the rear. In that context, it is evident that the proposed white painted aluminium window materials would assimilate appropriately with the character of the proposed extension and would not be unduly prominent or harmful when viewed in the context of the existing properties surrounding.
10. Condition 3 in its current form is therefore not reasonable or necessary in respect of the character and appearance of the dwelling and the CA. As such it is required to be removed and replaced by a condition that includes white painted aluminium as a potential material which can be used for the windows and doors on the east and north elevations.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the use of aluminium as an alternative material for the windows and doors would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the CA, nor any harm to its overall heritage significance. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policy NHE9 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan (2019), which requires that all development proposals must be sympathetic to heritage assets and their setting by ensuring the use of appropriate high quality materials, design and detailing.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and the planning permission varied as set out in the formal decision.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR