



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 February 2026

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/25/3376164**

**4 West Farm Avenue, Ashtead, Surrey, KT21 2LG**

- 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 Chum Hazarika against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
  - The application Ref is MO/2025/02022.
  - The development proposed is two-storey side extension, single storey front and rear extensions, first floor rear extension and associated fenestration and internal alterations.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two-storey side extension, single storey front and rear extensions, first floor rear extension and associated fenestration and internal alterations at 4 West Farm Avenue, Ashtead, Surrey KT21 2LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref MO/2025/02022, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Location Plan 1293/04; Block Plan 1293/05; Proposed Layout and Elevations 1293/03.
  - 4) Prior to the first occupation the first-floor windows in the northern side elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed in obscured glass and only openable above a height of 1.7 metres above the internal floor level. The windows shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

### Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling located within an urban area. The property has front and rear gardens. The surrounding area is residential with detached dwellings occupying similar sized plots with a variety of architectural styles and materials.
4. Policy EN4 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2020-2039 (MVLDP) aims to ensure all new development is of high-quality design that makes a positive contribution to its local character. Any development proposals should (amongst other

considerations) be of an appropriate scale, height, massing, proportion and form; achieve appropriate spacing between buildings; respect existing building lines; use high quality and durable materials and include architectural detailing that responds to detailing on the host and/or surrounding buildings.

5. Policies AS-H5 and AS-En3 of the Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan (2015-2026) (ANDP) require development to be visually integrated with its surroundings and designed to have regard to the character of the local area and street scene.
6. The Design Guidance for House Extensions and Outbuildings – Supplementary Planning Document (July 2025) (SPD) requires two-storey extensions to normally appear smaller in scale and proportion to the main dwelling and should be set down from the ridge of the existing house and set back from the front elevation. An exception to this that could be acceptable is where the extension is designed by matching the proportions, detailing and fenestration sizes so that it is not readily recognisable as an extension and is typically more successful on detached dwellings and where there is space on the plot to maintain sufficient separation to the boundary.
7. The Council have found the first-floor rear extension and single storey front extension to be acceptable. However, the two-storey side and rear extension would not be set down from the ridge of the main dwelling or set back from the front building line and would therefore be inappropriate in scale, would not be subservient to the main dwelling and would be overly prominent in the streetscene and reduce space around the dwelling.
8. Furthermore, the Council considers the combination of the extensions to the dwelling alongside the existing two-storey side and rear extension would not be appropriate in scale for the size of dwelling or the plot, would not be subservient in scale and would result in over development of the site.
9. Whilst I accept the proposal would not appear subservient to the host dwelling, maintaining the ridge at the side would not be harmful to the visual appearance of the dwelling or the character and appearance of the area. The two-storey rear extension has a lower ridge line than the host dwelling and the bulk and mass of the proposal would not be prominent on the street scene due to its location to the side and rear of the dwelling. The SPD is guidance and not policy, but despite this, the SPD allows for a proposal to match the proportions detailing and fenestration on the host dwelling so that the proposal would not be readily recognisable as an extension. This is considered most successful with detached, individually designed houses as in this case.
10. The proposal successfully integrates with the host dwelling in terms of matching materials and although there are alterations to the fenestration, especially on the front gable, these alterations have a contemporary appearance which would not be inappropriate on the dwelling where there are no specific design features to replicate.
11. The proposal would retain appropriate separation distances to the side boundaries and although the proposal would come forward of the existing dwelling at the front, this would be single storey and this element was found acceptable by the Council. The proposal would also maintain the building line of West Farm Avenue which is

staggered. The property is located on a wide and deep plot which can accommodate a dwelling of the size proposed.

12. In conclusion, the proposal would have no significant effect on the visual amenities of the area and would comply with policy EN4 of the MVLP and policies AS-H5 and AS-En3 of the ANDP which aim to ensure all new development is of high-quality design and makes a positive contribution to its local character.

### **Conditions**

13. I have had regard to the various planning conditions that have been suggested by the Council and considered them against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
14. In the interests of certainty I have imposed a time limit, plans and materials condition.
15. In order to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties I have imposed a condition requiring the windows on the first floor of the north elevation to be obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7 metres above the internal floor level and to be maintained as such in perpetuity.

### **Conclusion**

16. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

*C Coles*

INSPECTOR