
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2025

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/25/3366461

1 Randalls Crescent, Leatherhead, Surrey KT22 7NP

- 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 Danny Moore against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref is MO/2025/0461.
 - The development proposed is erection of a part single-storey and two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - The effect of the development on local parking conditions.

Reasons

Character and appearance of the area

3. The appeal site is located in a prominent corner position in an area of residential character where the buildings have a relatively uniform building line set back from the pavement with gardens or driveway parking.
4. The proposal would be located on an exposed location on a corner site open to public views from Randalls Crescent and Cleeve Road. The open character of the site is an important feature which preserves the openness of the area and positively contributes to its character. The proposal would be large, and negatively impact on the openness of the site, it would significantly reduce the space to the side of the dwelling infringing the building line along Cleeve Road. The combination of the loss of openness and infringement of the building line would be detrimental to the character of the area.
5. Whilst I find the proposal harmful in respect of its impact on the character and appearance of the area for the reasons outlined above, it is acknowledged that the design of the proposal would appear subservient to the dwelling itself when viewed in isolation. This does not, however, satisfactorily mitigate for the negative effects on the wider character of the area.

6. My attention has been drawn to two, two-storey side extensions on another part of the estate. I do not know the circumstances of these examples but, regardless, as they are located outside the visual surroundings of the site and have their own specific context, their existence does not carry material weight.
7. In conclusion, the proposal would conflict with Policy EN4 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2020-2039 (LP) which requires development to complement the character of the area, responding to the prevailing pattern of development and respect existing building lines amongst other considerations.

Parking

8. The proposed development would increase the number of bedrooms on the site from three to four and would reduce the number of off-street parking spaces from two to one.
9. The design and layout of Randalls Crescent is such that space for vehicles is limited. There is some on-street parking, but in many places kerbside parking would block private driveways and many of the properties do not appear to have off-road parking. In the absence of a parking survey, it is reasonable to conclude on a precautionary basis that on street parking is heavily utilised. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate displaced or additional vehicles without detriment to the amenity and character of the area for future occupiers and existing residents.
10. If the appellant wishes to provide additional parking on site, and it requires permission, this should be done through the submission of a fresh application where the merits of an alternative scheme would be a matter for the main parties to consider. I must determine the appeal on the basis of the plans before me.
11. In conclusion, in the absence of satisfactory evidence, the proposal would have a harmful effect on local parking conditions. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies INF2, Appendix 13 and EN4 of the LP which seek to ensure development provides a satisfactory number of off-street parking spaces and ensure the amenity of future occupiers and existing residents is not affected by unacceptable traffic movements amongst other considerations.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

C Coles

INSPECTOR