



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2025

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/W/25/3366378

6 Wray Park Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0DD

- 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 Steven Doel (Denton Homes Ltd) against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01827/F.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 2 no. dwellings to the rear of 6 Wray Park Road and creation of associated access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 2 no. dwellings to the rear of 6 Wray Park Road and creation of associated access, at 6 Wray Park Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01827/F, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are a) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the Wray Common Conservation Area; and b) the proposed access arrangements.

Reasons

3. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a conservation area, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Policy NHE9 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 (DMP) broadly accords with this approach.
4. The Wray Common Conservation Area (WCCA) is characterised by large detached, mainly Victorian houses set back within large plots. These properties generally display traditional materials and have strong detailing. Most are in close proximity to, or radiate out from Wray Common, a gently undulating area of public open space. Together with the width of the main roads and the extensive tree and boundary planting, the Conservation Area has a spacious and verdant character that contributes positively to the area.
5. In relation to the appeal proposal and based on my inspection of the site and surrounding area, as well as on the evidence before me, the significance of the

WCCA is in part derived from the aesthetic and architectural value of the historic buildings, the spaces around them and the attractive street scenes which they create.

6. The appeal site forms part of a large spacious rear garden area of a locally listed former Victorian mansion which has been subdivided into a number of units. However, there is an extant permission for the subdivision of the site and erection of a dwelling in the rear garden. Although the site was included within the WCCA after that permission was granted, the designation would have been done in the knowledge of the approval and the subdivision of the site.
7. The proposal would in large part replicate the position, size, scale and appearance of the built form of the approved dwelling. As such, the built form as now proposed would have little material difference visually from the extant scheme. This distinguishes it from the scheme dismissed on appeal in March 2025 which was for two separate dwellings of different appearance and siting.
8. Thus, the key difference between the current proposal and extant scheme would be the subdivision of the appeal site into two smaller plots. This would generally find expression in the demarcation of the rear gardens of the houses and the parking/access arrangements to the front of the houses. Each unit would have its own entrance path and door, but these are relatively discreet features of the development.
9. Both new rear gardens would appear to be towards the lower end of plot widths in the WCCA. The appellant has provided a comparison of various plot widths in the area. These note, amongst other things, that there are some similarly sized plot widths to the proposal on the opposite side of Wray Common Road. Some of the appellant's measurements are queried by interested parties and I am mindful that some of the other identified plots are either outside of the WCCA or within other conservation areas.
10. However, the individual plot widths were not considered to be a determining factor in the previous appeal. That Inspector noted that those plot widths would not be appreciable from the street or within the site. It was also noted that this part of the WCCA has less regularity in terms of form and layout, with the overall spaciousness of this part of the WCCA being its main contribution to the significance of the conservation area. Those observations are equally applicable to the current scheme and so I too do not find the plot widths in themselves to be harmful to the spaciousness of the conservation area.
11. I am also mindful that the dismissed scheme was said to further subdivide the rear garden to No.6 and thus diminish the intervisibility between the host building and its former garden. In contrast, the current proposal would retain a similar built form to the extant scheme and thus a similar relationship and level of intervisibility. Consequently, in my balanced judgement I am content that the proposal would have a neutral effect on No. 6 as a locally listed building.
12. As regards the parking and access arrangements, they would extend in front of the proposed building. The circular drive would be retained from the initial scheme and the parking for plot 1 would be in a similar position to that of the extant permission.
13. The access and parking for plot 2 would cut across the front of the site. It is not entirely clear why these parking spaces need to be set so far back but overall, the

use of grass block paving and being set away from the building creates a less formal and dominating arrangement than that of the dismissed appeal.

14. I have not been presented with any substantive information to indicate that the development would fall below any local or national standards for such matters as parking provision, internal room sizes, garden space etc. Nor is there any indication that, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours. These would have been additional proxy indicators that might imply the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site.
15. Overall, I find that the proposal would represent change to what has previously been approved but not one that adversely affects the site's contribution to the spacious qualities of the conservation area nor the experience, appreciation and understanding of the significance of the heritage assets.
16. Thus, the development would not conflict with Policies DES1, DES2 and NHE9 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development of residential garden land respects the character of the surrounding area and that development more generally preserves designated heritage assets. The proposal would similarly accord with the objectives of the Framework in ensuring development is sympathetic to local character and conserves the historic environment.

Access

17. As with the extant scheme, the proposed scheme would utilise the existing access from No.6 onto Wray Park Road. However, there is a dispute as to whether cars and delivery vehicles could access the site without coming into contact with bollards and signs that are required to be installed on the access. These would compensate for the additional vehicle movements and sub-standard visibility at the site entrance and thus help to ensure a safe access. Questions have also been raised as to whether or not all of this could be achieved within land controlled by the appellants.
18. As part of their appeal submissions the appellants have clarified the situation, particularly with regard to where the measurements have been taken from. Furthermore, they have provided additional vehicle tracking details to demonstrate that the site can be accessed by vehicles without impacting the bollards or signs. These also show a revised bollard position, away from the boundary with No.8 and the land in dispute. The Council and interested parties have had sight of the latest drawings and I have taken their comments into account. However, based on the information before me, I am satisfied that the access could accommodate cars and delivery vehicles without compromising the required safety measures.
19. Of additional concern has been the parking of cars on the south side of Wray Park Road, including on either side of the access. This is said to impact the overall ability of vehicles to safely manoeuvre into the access. I noted on my site visit that there are parking restrictions for this part of the road, which prohibit car parking between 0800 and 1830 hours Monday to Friday.
20. At the time of my visit to the site, which I accept only provided me with a snapshot of a weekday morning, these parking restrictions were not being breached. If properly enforced I see no reason why the access arrangements would present

any greater difficulties or problems in comparison to the previous approval for a single dwelling. I am also mindful that whilst the proposal will see an increase in vehicles using the access, it has no doubt been used by No.6 for many years and there is nothing before me to suggest that this has created or caused undue difficulties.

21. I have seen photographs when these parking restrictions have been breached. These and other representations appear to suggest that this is more likely to be around the time pupils are arriving at and departing from the nearby schools. Notwithstanding these concerns and any additional risk or difficulties arising from these parked vehicles, it seems to me that the parking restrictions already in place should, if properly and appropriately enforced, act as sufficient disincentive to inappropriate parking outside the appeal property.
22. As such, this issue is largely a failure of parking enforcement rather than the driveway being inherently inaccessible. My decision should be made on the basis that the parking restrictions would be enforced by the relevant authorities.
23. In addition, the Highway Authority has also cited accident data for Wray Park Road going back to 2013. However, none of these incidents occurred outside or adjacent to the appeal site. The incident closest to the site involved one car colliding into the rear of a stationary car waiting to turn, which suggests inattention by the driver rather than anything related to the appeal site or its access.
24. For the development of a single dwelling there was no expectation that the access would be used by refuse collection vehicles or fire appliances. Such control would be outside the scope of any planning conditions, but I see no reason as to why similar arrangements could not apply to the proposed scheme, particularly given the similarity in built form and its position on the site.
25. It is suggested that vegetation from the neighbouring property overhangs the site and could over time obscure the proposed signage. However, as the previous Inspector noted, this vegetation could be cut back to the boundary.
26. Therefore, for the reasons I have set out, I have not found that the development would adversely affect the free flow of traffic; cause cumulative impacts on the road network, taking into account proposed mitigation; or otherwise prejudice highway safety. On this basis it would provide a safe and convenient access for all road users and thus accord with Policy TAP1 of the DMP.
27. I do not consider the residual cumulative impacts of the proposal to be severe on transport grounds, as set out by the Framework.

Conditions

28. I have had regard to the conditions set out in the Council's submissions and relevant guidance on the imposition of conditions.
29. In addition to the standard time limit, a condition which lists the approved plans/documents is necessary in the interests of certainty.
30. Given the surrounding environment, it is necessary to control the use and finish of external materials on the building. In addition, it is necessary to ensure that the arboricultural requirements are fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details. To ensure the development respects the character and appearance of the

area, details of landscaping are required, and that any planting which fails within the first five years is replaced.

31. Similarly, given the importance of retaining a spacious context and intervisibility with the host property, it is reasonable and necessary to ensure that any additions or extensions to the building are first considered by the Council. Accordingly, certain permitted development rights need to be removed.
32. To ensure the development functions as intended, it is necessary for there to be conditions ensuring the provision of car parking and turning areas, bollards and signage, water efficiency measures, and provision of broadband infrastructure.
33. To protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers the first floor windows in the side elevations of the development shall be obscurely glazed and partly non-opening.
34. The statutory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) condition applies to the permission and there is nothing before me to indicate that the scheme could not comply with its requirements. As the statutory BNG condition is a matter the appellant would need to address directly with the Council there is no requirement for me to duplicate it in my decision. I have not been presented with any evidence or information as to why an additional Ecological Enhancement Plan and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan would be necessary in these circumstances.
35. Given that electric vehicle charging points now fall under building regulations, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, there is not a planning reason to secure such matters through this decision.
36. As the site is within a conservation area, photovoltaics or solar panels cannot be installed on a wall fronting a highway. Any panels are required to be sited so as to minimise its effect on the external appearance of the building and the amenity of the area. As such, a condition which largely replicates these requirements would be superfluous.
37. The Council has suggested conditions relating to the works and making good of that part of No.6 Wray Park Road which would need to be demolished to make way for the access into the main part of the appeal site. I was able to observe from my site visit that these works, which were permitted under the previous permission, have largely been concluded. As such, there is no benefit in my imposing conditions relating to these works.

Conclusion

38. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawing numbers and documents:

Site Location Plan	-	000 Rev P1
Proposed Block Plan	-	002 Rev P2
Proposed Site Plan	-	003 Rev P2
Proposed Plans and Elevations	-	005 Rev P2
Proposed Section Plan	-	006 Rev P1
Swept Path Assessment	-	231666/TR/31 Rev C
Tree Assessment and Arb Method Statement by HCUK Group dated September 2024 (Project Ref 09494C)		
- 3) No development above ground level shall take place until details of the materials and finishes to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall include but shall not be limited to, brick bonding/detailing and reveals, window details, roofing materials, rainwater goods, bargeboards. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) No development above ground level shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include but shall not be limited to:
 - specification of all proposed tree and shrub planting including the quantity, size, species, and positions or density of all trees/shrubs to be planted, how they will be planted and protected and the proposed time of planting;
 - hard surfacing materials including vehicle parking areas and pedestrian access/circulation areas;
 - means of enclosure and boundary treatments;
 - scheme of implementation, management and maintenance

The landscaping works, including tree planting, shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 5) All arboricultural matters, including arboricultural supervision, monitoring and tree protection measures shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details and timetables contained in the approved HCUK Group, "Tree Assessment and Arb Method Statement" and embedded "Tree Protection Plan" dated September 2024.
- 6) Prior to the occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted, the bollards and sign as shown on the submitted plan numbered 231666/TR/30 Rev C shall

be provided and permanently retained. The bollards and sign shall be kept free of vegetation.

- 7) Prior to the occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted, the vehicle parking and turning areas shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved plan 003 Rev P2. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose.
- 8) The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied unless and until a Water Efficiency Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement shall detail how the development will ensure that the potential water consumption by occupants of each new dwelling does not exceed 110 litres per person per day,

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and any measures specific to an individual dwelling shall be implemented, installed and operational prior to its occupation.
- 9) The first floor windows in the side elevations of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscured glass and shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed and shall be maintained as such at all times.
- 10) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development permitted by virtue of Classes A, B, D or F of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Order; nor development permitted by virtue of Class A of Part 2 of Schedule 2 to the Order, shall be undertaken.
- 11) The dwellings hereby permitted shall be provided with the necessary infrastructure to facilitate connection to a high-speed broadband. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, this shall include as a minimum:
 - a) A broadband connection accessed directly from the nearest exchange or cabinet,
 - b) Cabling and associated installations which enable easy access for future repair, replacement or upgrading.

*****END OF SCHEDULE*****