



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2024

by P Terceiro BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/W/24/3338459

32b Upper Bridge Road, Redhill, Surrey RH1 6DD

- 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 Kieren Pugh against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02356/F.
 - The development proposed is described as *dropped kerb/vehicle crossover outside 32 Upper Bridge Road. Apparently we need planning permission to do this as the house is converted into flats. There is already a dropped kerb outside but it only partially extends the length of the property. This means that some residents have to 'bump' up the kerb to get onto their parking space. This will cause deterioration of the kerb and their vehicles over time. I am one of the share of freeholders applying on behalf of 32 Upper Bridge road. It is a 5 flat converted victorian house. Disclaimer: please forgive any inaccuracies or mistakes in this planning application, I am not a builder, surveyor or architect. I am a paramedic. Therefore my speciality is not in planning applications, we have been required to apply for this permission because it is needed to go ahead with the stage 1 VCO with Surrey.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a dropped kerb/vehicle crossover at 32b Upper Bridge Road, Redhill RH1 6DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/02356/F, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three 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 and TQRQM23347173115743.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, in the interests of clarity, a revised description of development has been agreed with the appellant and I have used this in the decision above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with reference to the Linkfield Street Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a large, wide plot which accommodates a substantial Victorian detached building which has been converted to flats. The site has an open frontage, and its front and side areas are laid to hardstanding with limited soft landscaping. The hardstanding area is currently used for parking purposes and there are sections of dropped kerb across part of the frontage of the site.
5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area (CA). Insofar as it relates to the appeal before me, the significance of the Linkfield Street CA derives from the architectural and historical interest of the Victorian/Georgian buildings, and use of external materials such as stucco and slate. The contribution that the appeal property makes to the significance of the CA derives from its design and materials.
6. The properties on Upper Bridge Road generally have areas of hardstanding for car parking to the front with dropped kerbs and limited soft landscaping. As such, parked cars are an inherent part of the CA.
7. The proposal seeks to provide a dropped kerb across the whole of the frontage of the site. While the Supplementary Planning Guidance Householder Extensions & Alterations (2004) and the RBBC Local Character & Distinctiveness Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2021) seek to discourage large expanses of hardstanding, the hardstanding and sections of dropped kerb are existing, so the space with the property's frontage can be utilised for vehicle parking in any event. Moreover, there is limited evidence that the existing vegetation would be removed. Consequently, the external alterations associated with the proposal would be limited to the dropped kerb itself.
8. Therefore, the proposed dropped kerb would unlikely result in significant changes to the amount of cars that could be parked within the property. As such, even in the absence of additional planting being provided, the proposal would not substantially detract from the existing situation, nor from the parking arrangements of nearby properties. Therefore, the proposed scheme would not harm to the character of the CA.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area and would preserve the character or appearance of the Linkfield Street CA. As such, the proposal would accord with Policies DES1 and NHE9 of the Reigate & Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan 2019. These policies seek, amongst other things, a high standard of design and layout and to preserve or enhance heritage assets.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit for implementation of the planning permission, it is necessary to impose a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty. The County Highway Authority suggests a planning condition requiring the provision of a means within the private land of preventing private water from entering the highway. However, given that the existing driveway is permeable as it is laid to gravel and that there are existing

sections of dropped kerb on site, in this instance I find that this condition is not necessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

P Terceiro

INSPECTOR