



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 11 June 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/25/3362335**

**21 The Glebe, Leigh, Reigate, Surrey RH2 8NL**

- 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 Andy Reinlo against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
  - The application Ref is MO/2024/1905/PLAH.
  - The development proposed is the creation of a vehicle crossover, removal of the front boundary hedging and creation of hardstanding driveway.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the creation of a vehicle crossover, removal of the front boundary hedging and creation of hardstanding driveway at 21 The Glebe, Leigh, Reigate, Surrey RH2 8NL in accordance with the terms of the application, MO/2024/1905/PLAH and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions: -
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL001 Rev B, PL002 and PL003 Rev B.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on local amenity, with particular regard to the parking provisions.

### Reasons

3. The Glebe effectively comprises a horseshoe arrangement of properties set around a central green space. The access road extends around one side with a number of parking areas adjacent to the road. Individual parking spaces are not defined within these bays, which are perpendicular to the road and are unrestricted in use for both residents and visitors. In addition, there are no restrictions along the road with vehicles parking along one side.
4. The appeal property is a mid-terrace house located towards the southern end of The Glebe, set back from the road behind a row of parking spaces and the footway. The proposal would create two parking spaces within the front garden, with an access width of 2.5m and a tapered arrangement to the dropped kerb, extending to a full width of 3.5m.

5. Many of the properties in The Glebe have introduced driveways with dropped kerbs, allowing access to parking created within the front garden. This includes extending over grass verges, and there are a number with accesses through the existing parking areas, including the neighbouring property No.22. Where this has occurred, the access route within the parking area is not denoted as such.
6. While it represents only a small snapshot, when I visited the site during the day, there was plenty of parking available within the parking bays and along the road. The demand for parking will be higher in the evenings and on weekends, which the Council and third parties advise is at a premium, although I have not been provided with any quantifiable evidence. Conversely, and while the actual survey data is not before me, the appellant indicates that during observations over a weekend period, on average, 8-10 spaces were available.
7. The demand and availability of parking will fluctuate at different times, and there are undoubtedly times of stress and frustration. As availability is on a first-come, first-served basis, there may also be issues related to convenience and the number and type of vehicles associated with individual properties. I also recognise that some properties do not have the opportunity to create private off-road parking. However, from my observations, there are more properties with access to private off-road parking than without. These provisions reduce the number of properties wholly reliant on the communal areas, and only a small number of these accesses are through the existing parking bays.
8. The proposed two parking spaces would only be for the benefit of the occupiers of No.21, but there would be a reduction in the demand for that parking requirement from within the shared parking provisions. As the spaces within the parking bays are not marked, the positioning of parked vehicles and the associated capacity are not controlled. The application plans do, however, indicate that the extent of the bay, up to the existing dropped kerb at No. 22, can currently accommodate 11 spaces of a standard width of 2.4m and would be reduced to 10 spaces as a result of the development.
9. I have not been provided with evidence to convince me that indiscriminate and dangerous parking would occur through the loss of one space in the context of the available parking along the road as a whole. While it is desirable for drivers to park as close as possible to their destination, this is not always guaranteed and has limited bearing on my main findings.
10. Therefore, in conclusion, I do not find that the proposal would result in a significant increase in demand for parking and unduly impact the parking provisions available for the occupiers of the properties within The Glebe. As such, the development would accord with Mole Valley Local Plan policy ENV4 (Amenity), which seeks to ensure that residents are not significantly impacted by adverse effects on amenity.

### **Other Matters**

11. The site is located within the Green Belt. The Council has assessed the proposal as an engineering operation, in line with exception (h) (i) of paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), and that openness would be preserved. I have no reason to disagree with this conclusion.
12. Parking to the front of the property would not be out of keeping with the character of the area, which the Council acknowledges. While the demand for parking has

undoubtedly changed since the properties were built, I have not been directed to any particular safety issues, and the Surrey County Council, as the highway authority, has not raised any objections on safety, capacity, or policy grounds. The Framework states that development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

13. Concerns are raised in relation to other properties undertaking similar arrangements, and while I understand the cumulative impact, each proposal is to be considered on its own merits and the evidence at that time.

### **Conditions**

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. I have not applied the suggested material condition as this requires external surfaces to match those used in the existing building which is not applicable to this case. The proposed crossover will, in any case, have to be constructed to a set highway specification (which will include materials) and be undertaken by Council-approved contractors on behalf of the appellant.
15. The highway authority suggested a number of other conditions, but these were not considered reasonable by the Council and have not been included in the suggested conditions in the appeal questionnaire. Having regard to the type of development and its existing residential location with associated low traffic speeds, I agree.

### **Conclusion**

16. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore allowed.

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR