



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2025

By Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/25/3373617
20 Sunmead Close, Fetcham KT22 9AP

- 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 Ms Tracy Whiting against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref is MO/2025/1137.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application form as a “single storey side and rear extension”.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The proposed development is described on the appeal form and decision notice as the erection of a single storey side and rear extension following the demolition of an existing lean-to extension and carport. This provides a more accurate description of the proposal than that given on the application form and I have, therefore, used it in the decision below.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension following the demolition of an existing lean-to extension and carport, at 20 Sunmead Close, Fetcham KT22 9AP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref MO/2025/1137 and the plans submitted with it, 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 following approved plans: 02, 04 Rev B, 05 Rev C and location plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the locality and the streetscene.

- The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling at 19 Sunmead Close, with regard to whether the development would appear overbearing.

Reasons

4. The proposal concerns a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a pitched and hipped main roof in a street characterised by similar properties. In the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), Design Guidance for House Extensions, 2000, it is indicated that single storey extensions visible from public areas should normally have pitched roofs. The proposed rear and side single storey extension would wrap around the corner of the host dwelling and have a flat roof.
5. However, the immediate context provided by the adjacent dwelling at no 21 is a particularly prominent flat roofed ground floor side addition that has no set back so that it is flush with the main front wall. Moreover, the part of the proposed addition to the side and visible from the street would be set back from the main front wall by more than half the depth of the two storey flank wall of the host dwelling. Its width at only 2m across the front would be a fairly modest proportion of that of the existing property at two storey height. These factors would reflect the relatively modest size and scale of this part of the addition and significantly limit the degree to which the existence of the flat roof would be appreciated from the street.
6. There is also a relatively prominent flat-topped garage at no 16 and elsewhere in Sunmead Close there are ground floor rear extensions where the flat roof form is readily apparent from the street. Due to these factors, the roof form of the extension at both the side and rear would be appropriate, reflecting other additions in the vicinity. As a result, the advice in the SPG should not be strictly applied in this case.
7. The garden to the rear and side of the host dwelling is broadly triangular in shape. The depth beyond the proposed extension at the rear would be fairly limited, with the Council estimating it at about 2 to 3.8m. However, despite the presence of an outbuilding there would also be a significant area of open space to the side, so that even with the additional footprint from the rear extension and wraparound part, there would be sufficient space to prevent a cramped appearance.
8. In any event, the amount of space around the dwelling at the rear and side would not be readily apparent from any public viewpoint. Moreover, it is clear from the submitted location plan that garden sizes and shapes in the street vary significantly and that at the appeal site would not be unacceptably out of line with this variation.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the locality or the streetscene. It would accord with Policy EN4 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (LP) 2020–2039, Adopted 2024, which seeks to ensure that new development is of a high quality design and appropriate in scale, height and form.
10. In the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) it is indicated that decisions should ensure that developments satisfy a number of considerations, which would be complied with in this instance. These include that the proposed development should add to the overall quality of the area, as well as being visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

11. The extension would project alongside the rear boundary with the attached dwelling at no 19 for a depth of 3m at a height of about 3.3m. I saw at my site visit that this property has a relatively wide rear garden with a fairly open outlook. While rising above the boundary fence, the Council indicates that the extension would be set back 0.4m. In these circumstances, the fairly modest depth, height and scale of the addition would be insufficient to result in such an oppressive degree of enclosure as to appear overbearing from within the neighbouring property itself or the rear garden.
12. As a result, the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling would not be harmed. In consequence, there would be no conflict with LP Policy EN4, which seeks to prevent such adverse effects.
13. There would also be compliance with the Framework, which indicates that developments should promote a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
14. Taking account of all other matters raised, given the absence of any harm it is determined that the appeal succeeds. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. Requiring the facing materials to match those of the existing dwelling is necessary to protect the appearance of the host dwelling and locality.

M Evans

INSPECTOR