



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by **J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIH MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/W/25/3374200

Cleland, Woodfield, Ashted, Surrey KT21 2RL

- 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 Flatt (Clifton Property and Land Limited) against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
- The application Ref is MO/2025/0125/PLA.
- The development proposed is for the demolition of an existing bungalow and detached garage and erection of 2 No semi-detached dwellings with 4 No car parking spaces and associated landscaping.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Following the submission of a bat emergence report by the appellant the Council no longer wishes to contest the second reason for refusal given on its Decision Notice. This is noted, and I have proceeded accordingly.
3. The appellant has submitted revised drawings for the appeal site as part of his appeal submission. Annexe M of the Procedural Guide, Planning Appeals, England (2019) and the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advise that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme to overcome the Council's reasons for refusal, rather a fresh planning application should usually be made. Moreover, it is important that the evidence which is considered by the Inspector is essentially the same as that which has been considered by the Council, and on which interested parties' views were sought.
4. Nonetheless, when the appeal before me was made, the appellant requested that I make my decision on revised plans. In certain circumstances a proposal can be amended through revised plans during an appeal. However, in line with the Wheatcroft principles¹, I can see that there are differences between the proposal that was considered by the Council and the revised scheme.
5. As such, it is my view that the appeal must be determined on the basis of the plans as originally submitted to the Council and upon which it based its decision and have also been subject to consultation. To do otherwise would prejudice not only the interests of the Council but also interested third parties and consultees, who may have observations to make on the revised scheme. I have therefore proceeded to determine the appeal on the basis of the plans as originally submitted.

¹ Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment (JPL, 1982, P37)

Main Issue

6. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is located in the Woodfield Character Area (WCA) near to the junction with Woodfield and Elmwood Close. The nearby surrounding area is characterised by a line of established residential dwellings which face on to the road and an area of grassed land beyond.
8. The proposal is to demolish the chalet type bungalow known as 'Cleland' and to construct two bay-fronted, two-storey, semi-detached dwellings with parking in traditional type materials that would have half hip roofs on either side.
9. The appeal dwelling is a single storey bungalow. As such, the appellant contends that the proposed two-storey development would be similar in appearance to the neighbouring two-storey dwellings and reduce views of their flat roof sections at first-floor level.
10. However, notwithstanding that the proposal would be slightly lower than the neighbouring dwellings known as 'Oak Villas' and 'Outwood', whether the views of the neighbouring flat roof sections would be reduced or not, the fact remains that the scale and mass of the bulky roofscape would be highly prominent in the Woodfield street-scene for those passing by or when viewed from the grassed area on the other side of the highway. Indeed, the 'crown' roof would be in stark contrast to the modest roofscape of the host property, which sits neatly between the existing dwellings. As such, the proposed development would be at odds with the character and appearance of the area, including the wider WCA, which the Council's SPD² records as having an attractive balance of modest buildings in varied styles, with no individual building or style being over-dominant.
11. In addition, as the proposal before me is for a full planning permission; and the roofscape and dormer windows of 'Outwood' were constructed as permitted development, I afford the appellant's comparison to this scheme limited weight.
12. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area.
13. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Policy EN4 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (2020-2039) (2024) as supported by Policies AS-H5 and AS-EN3 of the Ashted Neighbourhood Development Plan (2015-2026) (2016), which say amongst other things that all new development must be of high-quality design that makes a positive contribution to its local character.

Conclusions

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

J E Jolly

INSPECTOR

² Mole Valley Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) (2010)