



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2024 by A Conteh

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 DECEMBER 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/24/3345737

13 Daneshill Close, Redhill, Surrey RH1 2DJ

- 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 S Vuppala against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00235/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is upper storey flank extension, single storey flat-roof rear extension and small single storey front extension with a mono-pitch (lean-to) roof over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for upper storey flank extension, single storey flat-roof rear extension and small single storey front extension with a mono-pitch (lean-to) roof over at 13 Daneshill Close, Redhill, RH1 2DJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00235/HHOLD, 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 external materials of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 2310-13Daneshill-02 Rev P1 and 2310-13Daneshill-03 Rev P1.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. Daneshill Close consists of detached two storey houses, the position of which varies in relation to the road, with some dwellings set further back within their

plot than others. The curved nature of Daneshill Close also causes some properties to be at an angle to one another, while sloping ground means dwellings sit at different levels. Their set back from the road and front gardens gives the road a spacious character.

5. Some properties have single storey elements to the side, including the appeal site. These, combined with vegetation and/or side gates, leave minimal gaps between built forms at ground floor level. Other dwellings have been extended and are now of a considerable size, resulting in small spaces between adjacent properties at first floor level. Despite this proximity, the differences in their design and siting mean that it is visibly evident that all of these properties are detached dwellings.
6. The proposed extension would add height in the form of a second floor to the side but would not project closer to the boundary than the existing single storey element. It would reduce the gap between the site and No 15 at first floor level and would not leave the one metre gap recommended in paragraph 5.4.2 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Supplementary Planning Guidance Householder Extensions & Alterations 2004 (SPG). Nonetheless, the remaining space between the properties at first floor level would be similar to that between other properties further down the road. Therefore, it would not be out of keeping with the character and appearance of this street in this respect.
7. The appeal site sits slightly higher than No 11, while No 15 is on higher ground and projects further forward than the appeal property. The proposed upper storey flank extension would not alter the height difference between the appeal site and No 15 and the proposed front extension would not significantly increase the forward projection of the building.
8. Furthermore, the proposal involves the use of render on the proposed upper storey flank extension and on more of the host property than at present. As a result of these factors, the proposed development would not change the distinct features of the property and there would be a clear visual distinction between it and No 15. Therefore, despite the reduction in space at first floor level, the appeal property would still appear detached and would not create a terracing effect in the street scene.
9. No 15 is only approximately one metre gap from the shared boundary with the appeal site. It is highly unlikely that the neighbouring property would fit a viable extension in this space, therefore I do not consider there is a realistic possibility of side extensions joining together with the appeal proposal to create a terracing effect in the future. Consequently, the proposed upper storey flank extension would not result in harm to the visual appearance of the immediate street scene.
10. The Council has raised no concerns about the other aspects of the proposed development, namely the single storey flat-roof rear extension and small single storey front extension with a mono-pitch (lean-to) roof. From the evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree.
11. Several dwellings on Daneshill Close have two storey side extensions, varying between being set behind or cohesively joining the original dwelling. While the Council indicates these developments predate the introduction of the Supplementary Planning Guidance, they have changed the character of the street such that first floor gaps between properties are no longer a significant

part of the street scene. Furthermore, they demonstrate that such extensions can be achieved without a terracing effect. Consequently, they show that the proposed upper storey flank extension would not be at odds with the character of the surrounding area or an incongruous addition to the street scene.

12. For the reasons above, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan (2019) which promotes local distinctiveness and ensures new development respects and makes a positive contribution to its surrounding character and appearance.

Other Matters

13. I note the concerns raised by the occupiers of No 15 regarding possible infringement of the Party Wall Act. However, this is not a matter within my remit in determining the appeal, as it is covered by separate legislation. It is for the appellant to obtain any other consents they may require in addition to planning permission.

Conditions

14. Conditions related to the time limit on commencement and development being carried out in accordance with the submitted plans are necessary in the interests of certainty. I also recommend a condition requiring materials on the proposed development to match the existing dwelling to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

A Conteh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR