



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025

by V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/W/24/3345708

11 Rookery Way, Lower Kingswood, Surrey KT20 7DT

- 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 Franks against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00408/F.
 - The development proposed is side and rear extension to ground floor unit, after demolition of garden store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side and rear extension to ground floor unit, after demolition of garden store at 11 Rookery Way, Lower Kingswood, Surrey KT20 7DT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00408/F, 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 drawing nos; location plan produced 01-Mar-2024, 01-24.1.1, 24.1.2, and 24.1.3.
 - 3) The bricks and the windows in the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The buildings within the mainly residential area that the appeal site is in, include short terraces; semi-detached and detached buildings; and small blocks of flats. Albeit of varying heights, these buildings are generally relatively low-rise. Many of the properties appear to have been subject of alterations, and several have attached single storey garages to the side, or single storey side extensions. Some of these extensions have flat roofs and others are pitched.
4. The buildings within Rookery Way are separated from the carriageway by grass verges and pavements as well as by private front garden areas or other areas of, often grassed, open space. As such, and notwithstanding the variety

in the size of gaps between buildings, the area retains a pleasant sense of openness.

5. Those parts of the single storey extension which would be visible from the public realm within Rookery Way (the street), would be of a similar scale and form to several other single storey flat roofed garages and side extensions within the area. Moreover, being setback only a little from its host, the extension would conform with the general alignment of buildings within the street. For these reasons, and even though the extension would have a flat roof, it would not be incongruous within the area.
6. The front garden of the adjoining property at number 13 Rookery Way is laid to hardstanding, as are large parts of many other front gardens within the street. During my site visit, I observed that lots of these areas were used for car parking. As such, and even if the front garden area were also to be used for car parking, this use would not be discordant with other nearby properties.
7. A low-level planter would be constructed on that side of the front garden which is adjacent to number 13 Rookery Way. Furthermore, that part of the hedgerow which would be forward of the extension, and which separates the appeal site from the neighbouring property to the southeast, would be retained. As such, and despite the proposal to replace the small areas of grass to the front of the building with hardstanding, the pleasant sense of 'greenness' to the front of the building would be maintained.
8. Together, the building on the appeal site and the proposed extension would fill the width of the appeal site. However, and notwithstanding that the extension would substantially increase the footprint of the building, it would be set well back from the street and have a low height and profile. For these reasons it would not cause any harmful loss of spaciousness within either the plot or the wider street scene.
9. The proposed extension would not follow the shape or form of the host property, as required by the Councils Householder extensions & alterations Supplementary Planning Guidance¹. Nevertheless, due to both its low height relative to the host dwelling, and the sizable plot within which it would be located, the extension would not appear disproportionate in relation to the size of the property. Furthermore, and for the reasons previously given, it would not be prominent within the local street scene or inconsistent with other development in the area.
10. For these reasons, the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would comply with policy DES1 of the Reigate & Banstead Borough Council - Reigate & Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan – adopted September 2019. Amongst other things, this policy requires new development to reinforce local distinctiveness; to respect the character of the surrounding area; and to have due regard to the siting, scale, massing, height, and roofscapes within the surrounding area.

¹ Reigate and Banstead Borough Council - Supplementary Planning Guidance - Householder extensions & alterations – March 2004

Other Matters

11. I must assess the scheme that is before me. Should a future scheme come forward for a side extension at 9 Rookery Way, that would need to be assessed having regard to the site and policy context at that time.

Conditions

12. The statutory condition which specifies the time-period for the implementation of the development is imposed. For certainty, a plans condition is also added, identifying the plans to which the permission relates. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is also imposed to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, this appeal should be allowed.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR