



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/25/3359705

77 Holmesdale Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0BT

- 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 James Campbell against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 24/01276/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a garage door-style shutter at the entrance of the parking area to the rear of the property (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the installation of a garage door-style shutter at the entrance of the parking area to the rear of the property at 77 Holmesdale Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0BT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 24/01276/HHOLD, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the condition that the garage door-style shutter at the entrance to the site shall be operated electronically via a remote control and shall thereafter be maintained in this form for as long as the hard surface area to which it forms the access is used for parking.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the shutter on the street scene and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The roller shutter has already been installed and I was therefore able to make an accurate appraisal of the effect on its surroundings. In the Council's view the design and scale of the shutter are such that it is *'an incongruous, hard and urbanising form of development'*. I agree with the Council to the extent that roller shutters are not in themselves visually pleasing and when used for security purposes in shopping streets they are perceived negatively. Normally, they might reasonably be expected and acceptable only on industrial estates.
4. However, the shutter has been installed in a particularly narrow stretch of Mark Street and in his application form the applicant (now appellant) has explained that this is unlit at night. And prior to the installation of the shutter, even leaving aside the security risk to the property, the rear courtyard of No. 77 was the subject of anti-social behaviour from dog walkers, fly tippers and patrons of pubs using the lane at night as a shortcut home. In these circumstances I agree that the principle of an enclosure of this height is acceptable.

5. The use of large gates or doors would have a more acceptable appearance but are impracticable if opening and shutting inwards because of obstruction by the parked car, and if outwards a road safety hazard to motorists and cyclists. Furthermore, as regards the view from Holmesdale Road the shutter is seen at an oblique angle from some distance and glimpsed rather than properly seen. I also consider that the shutter, its frame and their installation appear to be of a high standard, whilst being flush with both side walls the structure has 'clean lines' in architectural terms.
6. The grounds of appeal also highlight that the context of the site is by no means wholly residential with commercial premises and two other examples of similar steel shutters. Mark Street itself at this point is of limited visual merit because it is dominated by the flanks of Nos. 75 and 77 and there is an adjoining office building with ground floor car parking.
7. On balance, I conclude that the roller shutter is acceptable in this position and does not have an unacceptably harmful effect on the street scene and the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly it does not conflict with Policy DES1 of the Reigate & Banstead Development Management Plan 2019; Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy 2014, and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.
8. I shall therefore allow the appeal. I have imposed the condition suggested by the Highway Authority to limit the operation of the shutter to remote control in the interests of highway safety and convenience. I have omitted the standard condition relating to compliance with the approved plans because these are confined to a location plan and block plan, thereby making such a condition essentially unnecessary.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR