



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2024

by H Miles BA(hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/W/23/3327422

10 West Avenue, Salfords, Surrey RH1 5BA

- 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 Paul Tames of Parkhurst Property Developments against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02703/F, dated 15 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing detached garage, sheds and coal bunker and creation of a new build 4 bedroom end of terrace property, front monopitch roof extended over existing donor house porch, widened drop kerb and improved parking and refuse/recyclable waste storage. Single storey rear extension, hip to gable and dormer extension to the existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice and appeal form as this accurately describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. This part of West Avenue and Woodside Way are characterised by semi detached dwellings, with breaks in built form between the pairs, in a consistent design, with hipped pitched roofs. Particularly in the vicinity of the appeal site, the majority of properties are two storeys close to their side boundary and the gaps between the pairs are somewhat limited. Nevertheless, whilst the extent of these gaps vary, the pairs of dwellings with separation between them contributes to a pleasant sense of spaciousness in this area.
5. Along West Avenue, the two storey elements closest to the boundary generally have a single window to each floor, many incorporating garage doors. The dwellings retain a single access to the plot and building. As such these properties are clearly apparent as pairs of semi detached houses. In the wider area there is a property which appears to have been extended to create an additional dwelling. However, this is not so common as to form an overriding part of the character of the area. As such there is an attractive consistent and spacious character to the area with clear separation between pairs of dwellings.

6. The proposed development would add a large two storey side addition to 10 West Avenue. It would align with the building frontage, with a hipped roof and would generally reflect the overall height and eaves level. However, features including its separate front door to the side elevation, the subdivision of the front garden and multiple bin stores would also result in the addition being clearly perceived as a separate dwelling. This would therefore create a short terrace with the host dwelling having no separation from the adjoining properties.
7. The proposed development would therefore harmfully undermine the character of semi detached dwellings with clear separation between pairs and would therefore unacceptably erode the positive characteristics of the consistent and spacious character of this area. This would clearly be perceived in public and private views. As such the harm in this regard would be considerable.
8. Therefore, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan (2019) which provides criteria to achieve high quality design from all new development including that it respects the character of the surrounding area amongst other things. As well as the guidance in the RBBC Local Character & Distinctiveness Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2021) which provides further advice to ensure that development addresses the local character and distinctiveness of its surroundings.

Other Matters

9. The proposed single new dwelling would make a positive but small contribution to the supply of housing in this area. However, this small benefit does not overcome the considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR