



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 9 May 2024

by C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 June 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/L3625/W/23/3332064

Land adjacent to 1 Drake Road, Drake Road, Horley RH6 8SJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Batetambe Tanyi against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01483/F.
 - The development proposed is described as a self-build three storey three bedroom house to be used as a family home by the applicant. The ground floor will have an open plan kitchen-living room combination with a downstairs WC and an under stairs storage closet. The first floor will have 3 bedrooms and one bathroom. The second floor will be a loft room which will contain an en-suite bathroom. As amended on 30/08/2023.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L3625/W/24/3336458

Land Parcel At 527388 143266, Drake Road, Horley, Surrey RH6 8SJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Batetambe Tanyi against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02206/F.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of self-build dwelling (as amended on 9/11/2023).
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposals for Appeals A and B are similar and the main issues are the same. As such, to avoid repetition I have provided one reasoning section, detailing my findings for both appeals. Notwithstanding this, each proposal and appeal has been considered individually, and on its own merits.
4. For each of the appeals I have used the site address as provided on the respective application forms. However, while the addresses are described differently, they both relate to the same site.

Main Issue

5. The main issue for both Appeal A and Appeal B is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The immediate area is a relatively modern housing estate that largely comprises a range of two storey semi-detached or detached dwellings of red brick construction. The urban form is fairly high density and tightly knit, thereby providing the wider area with a reasonably enclosed and cramped feel.
7. The appeal site currently forms a small undeveloped area of grass that sits between No. 1 Drake Road and a private parking area. In contrast to the prevailing character of the immediate area, the site provides an element of much needed openness within the street scene, thereby contributing positively to the character and appearance of the surroundings.
8. The two proposals before me are very similar in nature, given that they both involve the provision of a single dwelling on the site. Appeal B appears to be a marginally better scheme as a result of the fact that it would provide a much more coherent boundary line on the eastern part of the site.
9. However, in both cases, the proposals would provide additional built form on land where there is currently none. While the adjacent parking area would remain, the existing openness of the site itself would be lost, thereby making the immediate surrounding area feel even more cramped and enclosed than it already does.
10. The size of the proposed dwelling itself may not look out of place, however, the identified harm would be exacerbated by the fact that the site is quite constrained which would be readily apparent given the clear lack of space between the rear of the proposed dwelling and the garage block behind. Therefore, in either instance, the proposed schemes would appear incongruous with the surroundings.
11. As a result, I conclude that both proposed schemes would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. They would therefore conflict with Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan (2019) which seeks to ensure that developments are well designed and that they preserve character and appearance. They would also conflict with the relevant aspects of the Local Distinctiveness Design Guide SPD which has similar aims.

Conclusion

12. The proposed developments conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. Whilst the provision of one new self-build dwelling would add to the local housing stock and would have some economic benefits for the local area, given the small-scale nature of the scheme, any such benefits are likely to be limited.
13. Accordingly, there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. As a result, Appeal A is dismissed and Appeal B is also dismissed.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR