



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/25/3361243

1C Daneshill, Redhill, Surrey, RH1 2DW.

- 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 Gary Baum against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02241/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is a carport to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed carport on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 1C Daneshill (No1C) is a two-storey detached dwelling with integral garage. It is one of a small enclave of three similar dwellings, accessed from Daneshill, a road characterised by mainly residential properties.
4. The appellant proposes the construction of a modest flat roofed carport. It would be built on a small area of private front garden/driveway, within the curtilage of No 1C and in a location which is currently used for parking.
5. The carport would be set close too and at an acute angle to the front of No 1C. Its roof would be the same height as the eaves line of the pitched fascia to the existing garage and porch roof. It would be of a visually light weight design supported on slim tubular metal columns. Nevertheless, due to its location, limited screening and more importantly its relationship to the host property it would be open to public view.
6. Notwithstanding its simple and modest form and design I consider given its contrasting design and uncomfortable relationship to the host property it would appear as an incongruous and utilitarian structure here.

7. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed carport due to its relationship to No1C, and as it would not reflect the character or appearance of the host dwelling, it would be harmful to the appearance and character of the area.
8. To allow it would therefore be contrary to objectives of Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan (Adopted September 2019), the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - Householder Extensions and Alterations (Adopted March 2004) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document-Local Character and Distinctiveness Design Guide 2021 as they relate to, amongst other things the quality of development and the need for development to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of its surroundings.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has indicated that he would be prepared to consider an alternative design. This, however, is a matter outside of the remit of this appeal and would in any case have to be addressed by the local planning authority in the first instance.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR