



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/23/3321436

19 South Close Green, Merstham, REDHILL RH1 3DU

- 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 Martin Fisher & Mrs Rachel Fisher against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00376/HHOLD, dated 22 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey/first floor side extension and internal/external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted at 19 South Close Green, Merstham, Redhill RH1 3DU for a two storey/first floor side extension and internal/external alterations in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00376/HHOLD, dated 22 February 2023 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; Location Plan 533 00, Floor Plan 533 01, Roof Plan 533 02, Elevation Plan 533 03, Floor Plan 533 04, Roof Plan 533 05, Elevation Plan 533 06, Block Plan 533 07 and Block Plan 533 08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extensions hereby approved shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The detached property is located towards the end of South Close Green opposite the green. The properties vary in style but overall, the area has a spacious character. The appeal property has a mock Tudor appearance and has its entrance to the side. The proposal would extend the property to the side incorporating the garage and creating greater width to the frontage and orientating the property to the road. Whilst not objecting to the scale of the development the Council's concerns are with the design of the extension which would have a crown roof.

4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - Householder Extensions and Alterations 2004 (SPG) does not specifically reference or prevent crown roofs. It does indicate that flat roofs do not integrate with most properties but also advises that it is open to the designer to demonstrate that a mix of roof forms works and that the design is appropriate to the overall appearance of the property.
5. While I agree with the Council that the existing property in South Close Green with a full crown roof is not a feature which positively contributes to its character, the properties in the road exhibit a range of designs including the incorporation of flat roof features. The proposed crown roof would only span the extension with the original parts of the roof retained. This would include not only the higher rear section but also the projecting gable end, which in my view would still be the prominent element of the front elevation.
6. Due to the height the flat roof of the crown would not be visible from the road and the pitch of the sides would reflect that of the existing roof. Whilst it is the depth of the extension which necessitates the form, visually there would be no overly incongruous arrangements with the roof planes aligning but also having a subservience in height. The existing property and the neighbours incorporate a mix of roof forms including, hips, gables, and dormers with variations in heights and orientations of ridgelines. As such, I do not find that the proposal would be at odds with the character of the area and would integrate with the existing property.
7. Overall, the proposal would not be harmful to the appearance of the host property and would accord with the requirements of policy DES1 of Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 and the SPG which promote high-quality design which reinforces local distinctiveness and respects the character of the surrounding area. It would similarly accord with the design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

8. Conditions are necessary in the interests of compliance with statutory requirements relating to the commencement of development [1] and certainty [2]. In the interests of the integration of the extension and the appearance of the property, it is also necessary to secure the materials to match [3].

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR