



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/25/3375059

Highclere, 3 Ruden Way, Epsom Downs, Surrey, KT17 3LL

- 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 Simon Hammond against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01561/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a large, detached property to the west side of Ruden Way within a residential area. The property sits amongst a group of large dwellings along this stretch; all set on a uniform building line behind fairly deep and often landscaped frontages. These features contribute to a spacious and semi-rural feel to the immediate locality. This side of the road has a markedly different character to the east side, where the detached properties appear noticeably more prominent as features within the street scene being laid out in a staggered echelon pattern with generally more shallow frontages.
4. The proposal seeks to replace an existing garage to the side of the dwelling with a detached double garage to the front, with a pyramidal apex roof.
5. The Council's *Supplementary Planning Guidance Householder Extensions & Alterations 2004* (SPG) recognises that garages in the front garden of a property tend to look out of place in the street scene. In this case, the garage would sit within the existing front garden to No 3, set back from the plot's front boundary by over 6m, forward of the dwelling's front face by a similar margin and around 7m from the boundary with No 5 to the north. Due to its position away from the dwelling and boundaries of the site, and prominence within land that is currently open, I find it would appear as an awkward and isolated building within its setting, and typical of one the SPG specifically advises against. Notwithstanding any form of enclosure to the front boundary, the garage would not be out of sight and would be seen

standing alone as an incongruous feature and detrimental to the spacious qualities to this side of Ruden Way.

6. The appellant has directed me to garages to the front of Nos 2 and 6 Ruden Way. These sit within a different context where they are seen as neither isolated nor incongruous but rather as features that appear as an integrated part of the development pattern to this side of the road. The circumstances here do not alter my findings as they relate to the site specific context of the proposal at No 3.
7. Overall, by failing to respect the character of the surrounding area, including the open and spacious visual appearance of the immediate street scene, the proposed garage would fail to achieve the high quality of design that is required by Policy DES1 of the Reigate & Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan 2019. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR