



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14<sup>th</sup> March 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/24/3351432**

**63 Ladbroke Road, Redhill, Surrey, RH1 1JU**

- 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 Chatwin Property Lettings Ltd against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/00902/HHOLD.
  - The development proposed is '*the demolition of existing building in rear garden. Demolition of existing concrete garage with attached garden shed. Erection of part single storey basement outbuilding to be used for storage. Erection of ground floor single garage with flat roof.*'
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The development is, in part, retrospective. The single storey building and the basement have been erected, although some of the details differ from those shown on the plans. As constructed, the building has a dummy pitched roof element to the front and an entrance door with a porch canopy, rather than the flat roof garage proposed. I have therefore considered the proposal based on the plans and details before me which formed the planning application.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property with particular regard to privacy.

### Reasons

4. No.63 is a large, detached property which forms part of a row of Edwardian properties to the northern side of Ladbroke Road and which back onto Redhill Memorial Park.
5. Sited alongside the house, the proposed garage structure appears as a single-storey building. It, however, extends to the rear of the plot, with the rear elevation forming part of that boundary. To the front and protruding some distance forward of the host property, is a sloped walkway to the lower level defined by walling. Together with the basement, which extends to the side and rear and, on which the decked rear garden area has been constructed, the development effectively encompasses all of the space around the house. As a result of the levels and the

extent of the development, the proposal has an atypical relationship with the host property and its neighbours.

6. To the rear, the park is on substantially lower ground. There is a footpath running directly adjacent to the rear boundary, and as a result of the numerous levels and structures the development creates a substantial massing. The addition of the artificial hedge screening around the terrace and the siting of the garage with a large window in the rear elevation have an intrusive and discordant appearance with the overall height of the site varying due to the gradient.
7. While other properties in the row do have outbuildings or extensions to the rear, these do not have the same visual presence, and the white render to the garage adds to its prominence and draws attention to the development. Render is not a feature of the host property, but it is found in the locality, and within the Ladbroke Road street scene, I do not find the contrasting material or the flat roof form of the garage visually obtrusive.
8. In conclusion, I find that the scale and massing of the proposal, in combination with its features, including the associated boundary treatments, create an incongruous form of development that fails to positively integrate with the host property and its neighbours. In particular, due to the levels, it has an inharmonious juxtaposition with its surroundings, specifically the adjacent public park.
9. The proposal, therefore, fails to protect the character and appearance of the area and is contrary to policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan (2019) (DMP). This requires that all development is of high-quality design, reinforces local distinctiveness and respects the character of the surrounding area with due regard to layout, plot size, siting, scale, massing, height, and views into and out of the site. There would also be conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Householder Extensions & Alterations (SPD), which similarly promotes the highest design standards and for extensions not to appear unduly prominent.

#### *Neighbour – No.61*

10. The presence of the basement creates an elevated garden level. The screening to the boundaries encloses the space, and whilst not of a sufficient height to prevent an outlook when standing near the edge, it would obscure a level of views when generally using the space and from the ground floor of the property. As part of an existing residential area, with properties with windows over a number of floors and variation to the ground levels, there is an existing level of mutual overlooking.
11. The garage element, which extends above the garden level, is located to the other side of the property to No.61, and the window in the side elevation is noted on the plans to be obscurely glazed. This, and the screening, which the appellant suggests could be a different design, can be secured by condition(s) and would ensure that the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers is not significantly affected.
12. As such, I do not find that the proposal would result in a significant loss of privacy to adversely impact on the amenity of the occupants of the neighbouring property, contrary to criterion 5 of DMP Policy DES1. Notwithstanding this, for the reasons set out above, the extent and form of the screening contributes to the visual impact of the development.

## **Conclusion**

13. Having regard to the matters set out above, and with due regard to all other matters, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR