



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/25/3370090

8 Claremount Gardens, Epsom Downs, KT18 5XF

- 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 Stuart Findlay against the decision of Reigate & Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00951/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, first floor side extension to detached private dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development, and, in particular the first floor side extension, on the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached, two storey dwelling on the north-west side of Claremount Gardens which has a mix of both single storey and two storey properties of varying designs. There are open gaps between the properties although the width of these vary and the two storey dwellings at Nos 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 are sited quite close together. However, a number of these properties, including the appeal property, have garages and or ground floor development to the side built up to the flank boundary, but retain a larger gap above to maintain a sense of spaciousness within the street scene. There is an angled boundary between the appeal property and No 10 which lies to the south-west, and No 10 has a flank elevation over 2 storeys under a hipped roof along the common boundary with a gap of approximately 1 m to provide a pathway and access to the rear. There is also a limited gap between the appeal property and the flank wall of No 6 to the north-east.
4. The proposal seeks to extend the existing property with a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension. At first floor the existing workshop to the side of the dwelling and to the rear of the garage would be replaced with a new extension with development above, over the existing garage and new side extension.

5. The ground floor side extension, following the line of the garage, would run along the angled boundary whereas the first floor extension would be straightened to be perpendicular with the front and rear elevations of the existing property. This would provide a gap between the flank elevation of the extension and the flank wall of No 10 of over 2m but this would diminish towards the rear where the first floor addition would extend almost to the common boundary.
6. I consider that the proximity of the first floor extension to the side boundary would unacceptably reduce the gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring property. Whilst there would be a gap at first floor level at the front this would be quickly reduced because of the angled boundary, narrowing to a very minimal gap. The narrowing of the gap would be perceived from the front and in the street scene. There is already a very limited gap between the appeal property and No 6. When this is taken into account together with the proposed extension, the property as proposed to be extended would appear cramped within its plot and would unacceptably erode the pattern of spacing between dwellings. This would harm the street scene.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would harm the street scene. This would conflict with Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019, the Council's SPG on Householder Extensions and Alterations 2004 and the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high standard of design which respects the local context.
8. There would be no issue with the design approach to the extensions in terms of their relationship to the existing house and the proposals would not materially harm the amenities of the neighbours of surrounding residents, but these findings do not outweigh the harm I have concluded to the street scene as set out above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR