



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2025

by **Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/25/3367756

28 Orchard Road, Smallfield, Horley, Surrey, RH6 9QP

- 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 David Alfred against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is TA/2024/1101.
 - The development proposed is one front dormer, one rear dormer, hip to gable.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of one front dormer, one rear dormer, hip to gable at 28 Orchard Road, Smallfield, Horley, Surrey, RH6 9QP, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref TA/2024/1101 and the plans submitted with it.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 28 Orchard Road is a semi-detached bungalow which is typical of the bungalows along the street where red brick is the predominant material, with some white render, together with steep hipped and tiled roofs. Many of the bungalows have had one or more dormer window additions to the front, rear or side, but most of these have not been subject to planning applications.
4. The appellant has referred to certain permitted development rights relating to extensions to the roof in dwellings. It is not for me to address or define whether these rights apply here. I am required to determine what is before me, which is the appeal against the refusal of planning permission.
5. The relevant policies in this case include CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 (the Core Strategy) and DP7 and DP11 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2-Detailed Policies 2014 (the local plan) which relate to new development which is expected to be of a high quality of design and, among other things, respect the character, setting and local context.
6. Planning permission was granted in 2022 (2022/662) for a hip to gable extension, a front flat roofed dormer and two rear flat roofed dormers. That development has not been carried out in accordance with the approved plans. There has been discussion during the determination of the application the subject of this appeal as to the accuracy of the dimensions shown on the submitted plans and those as built.

Notwithstanding any discrepancies, it is possible to judge the development since it is completed and visible from public land.

7. The development as built now includes one large flat roofed rear dormer which extends from next to the new gable wall almost to the boundary with the adjoining property, No. 30. Notwithstanding the precise dimensions, whether taken from the plans or any other method referred to in the documents, the dormer has the appearance of extending virtually the full width of the rear roof slope. It is set a minimal distance from the ridge and from the eaves.
8. In views from properties in Heather Walk and the associated car parking area it dominates the rear elevation and appears as a disproportionately large and visually obtrusive feature in contrast to the generally more modest dormers and overall proportions of the nearby properties. Its impact is emphasised by the use of light grey cladding which is not in keeping with the more traditional tile hanging used in the majority of dormers in the area and mainly red brick construction of the bungalows. It is partially screened from the area immediately to the rear in Heather Walk by a number of small trees, but these are deciduous and would offer little screening once the leaves are off.
9. The impact of the rear dormer, combined with the new gable and the grey cladding, also strikes a somewhat discordant note when seen in views from Orchard Road, though these views are from a relatively narrow space across the open frontages of No. 26 and No. 28 itself.
10. I have taken account of the references to other dormer windows in the area, particularly at Nos. 4 and 32 Orchard Road. On the basis of the information before me, I understand that references to No. 4 relate to the two separate dormers on the front elevation and that these subsequently had some influence over the decision to grant permission for the development at No. 32. In addition, it appears that the option to construct the rear dormer and the hip to gable extension at No. 32 would have been available under permitted development rights. The latter was under construction at the time of my visit, and I was unable to form a clear impression of its size and form. However, the plans indicate that the rear dormer would be set down from the ridge and up from the eaves. This also seemed to be the case when viewed from the street and from Heather Walk.
11. I consider that the rear dormer at No. 28 as built is disproportionate in scale and out of keeping in terms of its materials with the host dwelling, but I am mindful that there are circumstances under which it could have been constructed to a similar size under permitted development rights.
12. It is an established planning principle that each case is determined on its merits. However, the planning permission granted to No. 32 for a similar, though apparently slightly smaller dormer so close nearby has influenced my decision. It seems to me unreasonable to dismiss this appeal in the context of that development. I consider that it is unfortunate that the examples set here and at No. 32 could make it difficult for the Council to resist a further proliferation of similar proposals where a fallback to permitted development rights applies, the cumulative effect of which would ultimately erode the traditional architectural character of the area.

13. On balance, I conclude that while the rear dormer is less than satisfactory in terms of its design and size, it has a limited harmful impact on the character and appearance of the principal street scene of Orchard Road. It does not cause unacceptable harm to the area sufficient to warrant dismissing the appeal. In this respect it is acceptable in the context of policies CSP18 of the Core Strategy and DP7 and DP11 of the local plan.

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

15. I have considered the condition put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. The development has been completed, and no conditions are necessary.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR