



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/L3625/D/25/3368597

15 Woodroyd Gardens, Horley, Surrey, RH6 7LP

- 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 Ronald Smith against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02192/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of rear extension at 15 Woodroyd Gardens, Horley, Surrey, RH6 7LP, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24/02192/HHOLD 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: location plan 01 received 4.12.2024, floor plan 01 received 10.3.2025 and combined plan received 10.3.2025.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

3. 15 Woodroyd Gardens is a detached bungalow located in an established residential area. It has a hipped roof and presents a low profile to the street scene compared to many of the nearby bungalows. I understand that it was built as an infill, and it extends further into the rear garden area than the immediate neighbours.
4. The policies relevant in this case include DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan 2019 (the local plan) which requires, among other things, that new development should not impact adversely upon the amenity of occupants of existing nearby buildings. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Householder extensions and alterations* 2004 (the SPD) offers detailed advice on residential extensions.

5. The Council has raised no objection to the design of the proposal, and I see no reason to disagree with this view.
6. The proposed single storey extension would project approximately 3 metres from the existing rear elevation of the bungalow. This is a relatively modest projection, and I consider that it would not have an unacceptable impact on the outlook from the neighbouring properties on either side and would not appear overbearing. The rear elevations of these properties face roughly south/southeast, and all have long spacious gardens.
7. There is a high fence along the boundary between Nos. 15 and 16 and a high wall along the boundary between Nos. 15 and 14. I consider that these would provide adequate screening to prevent overlooking from the proposed side windows and ensure a level of privacy for the occupants of Nos. 14 and 16 similar to that which exists at present.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring properties, and that it is consistent with local plan policy DES1 and the advice in the SPD.
9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR