



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/25/3374965

1 Randalls Crescent, Leatherhead, KT22 7NP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Moore against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Reference is MO/2025/02148.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single, part two-storey rear extension, following the demolition of existing outbuilding and conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Considerable works, albeit with some variation from the appeal scheme, have been partially completed; this does not alter the way I assess the proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the host property and the locality and b) living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace home on an open corner plot. The locality has a variety of dwelling types which, along with gardens and open swathes of land, come together to form an area of established suburban residential character and pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 5. The upper-level works, whilst relatively large, would have a degree of design subtlety, subservience and integration which would be totally lacking at ground floor. The over-sized, over raised, full width box-like structure would be widely on view and look most out of place in relation to the modest host property and neighbouring buildings. It simply cannot be described as good design in this context and would unduly impinge upon the character and appearance attributes of the locality, drawing upon nothing within this streetscene and failing to harmonise with the original dwelling.
-

6. Policy EN4 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (2020-2039) (LP) is relevant. Amongst other matters it seeks to ensure that new development has high quality design, complements its context, and is of suitable scale, massing and spacing. For the reasons given above I conclude that there would be conflict with this LP policy.

Living conditions

7. The locality is a medium density one and residents would have an expectation of reasonable levels of daylight, ambiance and outlook. Works to a dwelling, when well designed, should not unduly impact upon these attributes. Regrettably that is how the appeal scheme would affect those residing in the attached property. The extensive bulky ground floor element, sitting as it does on a substantial raised plinth when gardens fall, along with its length, boundary position and orientation would markedly remove daylight from proximate glazing. There would be an undue sense of being hemmed-in and an unreasonable reduction of outlook.
8. Previously cited LP Policy EN4 also seeks to protect residential amenity. I conclude that there would be a breach of this policy in this regard.

Other matters

9. I am aware of the planning history on this site. In particular, Council reference MO/2025/0357 for a single storey rear extension where it was determined that the prior approval was not required and application reference MO/2025/0366 for a two-storey rear extension which was an approved certificate of lawfulness. I note the Appellant's 'fall-back' argument. However, the schemes would not be able to be constructed together under the above references and legislation; and I am dealing with the entity of the appeal proposal, looking at matters as a whole, and working in the context of applicable planning policies. The appeal scheme would not represent good design and consequently I could not condone this proposal.
10. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issues identified above.
11. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within the Framework.

Overall conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality as well as on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR