



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2023

by D Szymanski BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/23/3320138

Daymer Cottage, 47 Reigate Road, Hookwood, Surrey RH6 0HL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA paragraph A.3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Roger Gilbert against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02618/PAP1AA, dated 25 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is Construction of 1 additional storey over the footprint of the original bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), where a dwellinghouse consists of one storey, planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by one additional storey, subject to limitations and conditions.
3. The Council has not raised any conflict with the limitations and requirements of (a) – (k) of AA.1 of the GPDO. Consideration is necessary of the prior approval requirements under condition AA.2 (3)(a)(ii) as to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of: (aa) the principal elevation, and (bb) any side elevation that fronts a highway.
4. Paragraph AA.3 (12) confirms that in determining an application regard must be had to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) so far as relevant to the subject matter of the prior approval, as if the application were a planning application. My determination is made on the same basis. Though I note the Council has misquoted the paragraph number it considers relevant, the policy text it refers to is still extant in the Framework in paragraph 130.
5. Therefore, the main issue is whether prior approval should be given, having particular regard to paragraph AA.2 (3)(a)(ii) with reference to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

6. The dwellings within the visual context of the appeal site dwelling to the north, south and east are primarily single storey height buildings including one storey bungalows, some with openings such as rooflights, and some chalet bungalows, with limited outbuildings in generous plots, complementary to the verdant valley setting. This forms part of the prevailing character and appearance of the area. The appeal site comprises single storey bungalow under a multiple hipped gable roof form with window openings of various sizes, on a large plot, so it is in keeping with its surroundings.
7. The proposed development would fundamentally alter the design and appearance of the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse. The significant increase in its height would result in it being clearly visible as a substantial two storey building of significantly increased scale due to the large extent and height of its front elevation. The proposed design incorporates a visually symmetrical fenestration and symmetrical gable roof, although the openings would be noticeably off centred when viewed across the front elevation.
8. Its height and appearance with a second storey below the roof, would appear significantly taller, inconsistent with, and highly strident with the prevailing height and appearance of the dwellings and buildings within the context within which it would be viewed to its north, south and east. The land level relative to the highway and the setback would not mitigate this. The resulting appearance with its increased height would be highly incongruent, discordant with and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding built environment.
9. Despite suitable external materials, I cannot agree the dwelling would appear well designed, visually attractive or represents good architecture. Therefore, it cannot be regarded as appropriate innovation or change, represent an overall improvement, or be viewed as adding to the overall quality of the area.
10. The waste management building was well-set back from the roadside within mature landscaping. An asymmetric two-storey dwelling (No 18), a two-storey mock-Georgian style dwelling (No 24) due north and another two-storey property further to the south, appeared a small number of examples in the much wider area. They are some significant distance from the appeal site, screened by mature landscaping, and not viewed within the same visual context as the appeal site.
11. No 18 was approved on a lower level than the previous dwelling and next to a neighbouring property to the south with what appeared a full height second storey in its elevation, and a second lower property with a storey in the roof. No 24 is the other side of these properties. The approved scheme provided is not a full two storey height across its width, reflecting to some degree the properties close to it. The dwelling I saw has a low-profile crown roof. Those decisions appear to have been made based upon the dwellings closest to them, so the circumstances and visual context of Nos 18 and 24 are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal before me. Therefore, they attract limited weight in assessing the local character for this specific appeal site.
12. I also visited Westvale, which is a large modern comprehensively planned development of primarily two and three storey buildings. This appeared to be approximately 300-400m east of appeal site and was separated by rural land and extensive mature tree cover around the River Mole, so is distinctly

separate and has little influence upon how the appeal site is viewed. Therefore, the examples referred to me attract limited weight.

13. For the reasons set out above, the external appearance of the dwellinghouse would be significantly out of keeping with and harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Having regard to paragraph AA.3(12) of the GPDO, the proposed development would conflict with paragraph 130 of the Framework. Amongst other things this expects development to add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, and be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, prior approval is not granted, and the appeal is dismissed.

Dan Szymanski

INSPECTOR