



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/25/3364100

2 Riverside, Pixham, Dorking, Surrey RH4 1PR

- 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 Ian Axford against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref is MO/2024/1771/PLAH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor rear extension to be built over existing ground level walls, the extension to be constructed in timber with white cladding board facade to rear and side elevations, new double glazed, white windows and doors to match existing in appearance, removal of disused masonry vent stack and aerals. Addition of bay style window to front elevation
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first-floor rear extension to be built over existing ground level walls, the extension to be constructed in timber with white cladding board facade to rear and side elevations, new double glazed, white windows and doors to match existing in appearance, removal of disused masonry vent stack and aerals. Addition of bay style window to front elevation at 2 Riverside, Pixham, Dorking, Surrey RH4 1PR in accordance with the terms of the application, 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 approved plans:- Location Plan, Block Plan – Drg No. PNC/24010/ 100, Existing Elevations – Drg No. PNC/24010/ 400, Existing Ground Floor Plan – Drg No. PNC/24010/ 201, Existing First Floor Plan – Drg No. PNC/24010/ 202, Existing Roof Plan – Drg No. PNC/24010/ 203, Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Drg No. PNC/24010/ 301, Proposed First Floor Plan – Drg No. PNC/24010/ 302, Proposed Roof Plan – Drg No. PNC/24010/ 303, and Proposed Elevations – Drg No. PNC/24010/ 401.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on: -
 - i) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - ii) the neighbouring property, No.1, with regard to overbearing impact.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is part of a row of traditional terraced properties. Whilst many of the surrounding properties similarly date from the 19th Century, there are various more recent additions, in particular flat-roofed buildings, creating a mixed character.
4. There is a uniformity to the properties along Riverside with particular regard to the frontage appearance, although to the rear, there is more variation. From my observations and the aerial imagery, many of the properties have been extended, including two-storey additions. The proposed extension would sit above the existing ground-floor extension and would facilitate the creation of an upstairs bathroom. The scale of the extension is not excessive or disproportionate and is reflective of other additions in the locality. Whilst slightly deeper, it would reflect the existing extension to No.3, effectively creating a continuous form.
5. The Council suggests that the other extensions have a greater sense of space, although this is a result of adjoining neighbours not having been extended or having a different design. There are, however, no views of the rear composition of the row as a whole, and other extensions extend the full width of the property, including that to No. 4, which is notably larger and has a pitched roof.
6. Concerns are also raised regarding the proposed materials. Due to its location, the rear extension would not be overtly visible, and I do not find the introduction of cladding to be incongruous within the setting of a mix of materials and the white-painted brick of the appeal property.
7. Whilst the appellant indicates that they are unlikely to implement the proposed bay window, this is a feature of other neighbouring properties, and the Council raised no objections to this aspect.
8. Overall, I find that the scale and design of the proposal would integrate with the host property and would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore accord with the design and local character provisions of policy EN4 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (2020-2039) (Local Plan), which, amongst other things, seek that development complements the character of the area, be of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing and form and use high-quality materials.

Relationship with No.1

9. No.1 is located due south of the appeal property. Its garden is limited compared to the rest of the properties within the row, although it does have a greater width to its plot and single-storey projections to the rear and side.
10. The parties agree that part of the proposed extension would breach a 45-degree line taken from the centre of the neighbour's first-floor window. The extension would be visible from the first-floor window and garden; however, the overall outlook would not be substantially restricted, nor would it have such an overbearing presence as to significantly harm the occupants' living conditions.
11. In coming to that view, I have had regard to the close knit nature of the properties, my observations of the outlook from the first floor window of No.2 and the relationship with the existing extension to No. 3, the depth and flat roof form of the

proposed extension, and that No.1 is at the end of the terrace with an open aspect to the other side. Additionally, due to the orientation, the proposal would not affect sunlight, and the proposed white material would help to reflect light.

12. As such, I do not find that the proposal would result in an unacceptable visual impact or sense of enclosure. It would therefore accord with the criteria of Local Plan policy EN4 (s) to (u), which seek to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents so as not to be significantly affected by development.

Conditions and Conclusion

13. In addition to the standard time condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. As the materials differ from those of the existing property and are specified on the plans, I have not imposed a condition for them to match the existing property.
14. For the reasons set out, the appeal is allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR