



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) Bsc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/25/3360085

69 Tylehurst Drive, Redhill, Surrey RH1 6EL

- 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 Katie Woodhams against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 24/02229/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Tylehurst Drive street scene and (ii) the effect on parking.

Reasons

3. On the first issue, I saw on my visit that the appeal property is a detached dwelling, one of a very limited number, on an estate development that the Officer's Report refers to as 'an early 21st century development of 180 dwellings north of Hooley Lane. There are also some semi-detached houses on the development but the large majority are terraced.
4. As such it is a 'tightly knit' development and with external space at a premium the relationship between the 'built form' of both individual properties and dwelling types is inevitably limited with opportunities for extensions thereby constrained. In fact this spatial high density is readily apparent from the submitted Location Plan, Drawing No. 2418(00) 000, and to a larger scale but more limited extent in area, from the Block Plan, Drawing No. 2418(01)000.
5. In the case of the appeal application, the proposal is to add a part single/ part two-storey extension to in part link up with and replace the existing garage at the rear, with the two-storey element extending alongside the north east flank of the house and tight to the boundary with the end-of-terrace No. 71. The two-storey extension would be along little more than a third of the side wall of No. 69 and would therefore be set well back from the front elevation, but only slightly recessed from the front of No. 71.
6. The grounds of appeal argue that this relationship in terms of set-backs with the host dwelling and No. 71 would be such as to prevent a terracing effect and the disruption of the visual spacing between the properties. However, I agree with the

Council's assessment that the total gap between the flank walls of Nos. 69 & 71 would be about 0.8m, whereas the Council's design guidance as applied in this case requires a 1m gap at first floor level to the boundary line plus the existing distance between No. 71's wall and this boundary.

7. Because of this narrow gap, only slightly set back from the front of No. 71, the Council is correct to conclude that notwithstanding the extension's set back from the front and set down from the ridge the extension would erode the separation and spaciousness between the dwellings. In paragraphs 3 and 4 above I referred to the implications of the tightly knit layout of the development and this is supported in the Officers Report: '*..... the application property sits in a prominent corner site and this estate has carefully been laid out to create visibility through the buildings and with separation between built form and where the buildings currently have a symmetry*'.
8. I acknowledge that in other respects the appeal scheme complies with design guidance; that it would cause no harm to the living conditions of neighbours, and that it would improve the family accommodation in the dwelling. However, I find that the development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Tylehurst Drive street scene which would thereby conflict with Policy DES1 of the Reigate & Banstead Development Management Plan 2019, the Council's SPG on Householder Extensions and Alterations 2004 and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024.
9. Turning briefly to the second main issue of the effect on parking, despite the removal of the garage and the loss of a space on the driveway the appellant argues that with the front curtilage hard surfaced two spaces would remain. This appears to be correct.
10. I do not have the information as to whether the development originally included a front garden with soft landscaping and that this has subsequently been converted to a hard surface parking area with a subsequent loss of visual amenity to the street scene. Be that as it may, the area can now be used for parking and accordingly I do not see a shortfall of parking contrary to Policies DES1 & TAP1 of the Development Management Plan and thereby a sound reason for refusal of the proposal. However, this does not outweigh my conclusion on the first issue.
11. For the reasons explained above the appeal fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR