



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/25/3364542

The Burrow, 27 Woodside Way, Salfords, Redhill, Surrey RH1 5BD

- 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 Dr Jennifer Igwe against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 25/00208/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension and single storey rear and front extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Woodside Way, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions as regards outlook for the occupiers of No. 25 Woodside Way.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is one half of a semi-detached pair with No. 25 and that the latter property has already had a two-storey side extension that has no setback from the original frontage and leaves only a minimal gap to the boundary with No. 23. However, the hip roof of No. 25 does enable the narrow gap between it and No. 23 to widen above eaves level to slightly reduce a potential terracing effect on the street scene.
4. On the first main issue and in respect of the street scene, the appeal scheme would noticeably add to the spread and mass of building along this part of Woodside Way with the proposed two-storey side extension and, as with No. 25, leaving only a minimal gap to the boundary - in this case with No. 29. This adverse effect would be compounded by the hip to gable roof alteration and the rear dormer, which would combine to add further mass and bulk to the existing dwelling and the semi-detached pair as a single built form.
5. The gap between No. 27 and No. 29 in front of that dwelling's garage would enable the proposed two-storey side extension and the 3m depth gabled rear extension to be seen from the public domain and thereby further increase the perception of a harmfully over-scaled dwelling on a plot of limited size. The issue of too much building on the site and resultant harm to the character and appearance of the host

dwelling would be compounded by the single storey rear extension, which would infill the gap between the two-storey addition and the boundary with No. 25.

6. In respect of the second issue, the effect on the outlook from No. 25, the building of the two storey and the single storey rear extensions would obstruct the aspect from the windows and garden of this neighbour, especially when the presence of the existing large garden room at No. 27 is considered.
7. When taken overall, almost every element of the appeal proposal would clearly contravene the Council's design guidance in the Council's Householder Extensions and Alterations SPG 2024. Furthermore, the development would be in harmful conflict with paragraphs 1, 3 & 5 of Policy DES1 of the Reigate & Banstead Local Plan: Development Management Plan 2019 and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework revised December 2024.
8. I acknowledge the appeal statement's reference to other house extensions in Woodside Way, in particular No. 21, and their similarities to the appeal proposal. Without full knowledge of their planning history, it is difficult to provide informed comment. However, I note that five examples have been cited for direct comparison in a road with a much larger number of properties.
9. I am therefore not persuaded that the character and appearance of Woodside Way has changed sufficiently for these to be successfully argued as precedents. Moreover, the officer's report says, correctly in my view, that an addition should either have a subservient appearance in relation to the original dwelling or be so well integrated with the main dwelling that it is not recognised as an extension.
10. The appeal proposal follows the other extended properties by taking neither approach. And whilst the aspiration to increase and improve family accommodation is entirely understandable, insufficient consideration has been given to the public interest of ensuring that the character and appearance of the original property and the street scene is safeguarded. Nor have the living conditions in terms of the outlook for the occupiers of No. 25 been protected.
11. For these reasons, the appeal fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR