



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by K Crutchfield BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 MARCH 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/25/3375668

Lerryn, Rosemary Lane, Horley, Surrey RH6 9HG

- 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 Sharon Snook against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01524/HHOLD.
 - The development is described as “Retrospective application for minor variation to approved loft dormer approved via proposed lawful development certificate application”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The above description of development is taken from the application form. However, the development would be more accurately described as the construction of a loft dormer. The development had been substantially completed by the time of my visit and therefore I will deal with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is being sought retrospectively for the construction of the dormer.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

4. The character of the local area is residential; there are a mixture of bungalows, two storey dwellings and apartment buildings. The appeal property is a bungalow within a row of similar bungalows that have a staggered relationship. There are no examples of dormer windows visible from the street within this row of bungalows.
5. The appeal development comprises of a flat roof dormer window on the side elevation, which is higher than the existing ridge of the host property. The dormer is prominent in the street scene given the staggered relationship of the properties.
6. Both parties make reference to a lawful development certificate (LDC) at the appeal property for a similar dormer. The LDC scheme is a legitimate fallback position and there is a real prospect that it would be implemented in the event that I dismiss the appeal. However, the dormer shown on the plans for the LDC does not exceed the existing ridge height. The appeal dormer, by contrast, sits noticeably above the original ridge line of the host bungalow. Its scale and bulk, and lack of subordination, means that it does not integrate well with the existing roof form. The

poor design makes the dormer a discordant feature which is out of keeping with the host dwelling; this conflicts with the advice in the Householder Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004) which advises that the design and location of dormers should be in keeping with the appearance of the main property. The differences between the two schemes mean that I have attached the fallback position under permitted development limited weight.

7. I conclude that the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the local area. It conflicts with Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan (2019). This policy is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in seeking to ensure that new development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. The appellant states that the dormer is lower than the chimney. However, I observed on my site visit that there is no chimney as shown on the plans. Even if the chimney were to be reinstated, it would not overcome my concerns regarding the design of the dormer.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Crutchfield

INSPECTOR