

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2016

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/16/3157039

10 Leith Road, Beare Green, Dorking, Surrey, RH5 4RQ.

- 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 Ms Vivien Kay against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application, ref: MO/2016/0628/PLAH, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and roof alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - a) The effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.
 - b) The impact of the development upon the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of 8 Leith Road.

Reasons

- a) *Effect upon character and appearance.*
3. 10 Leith Road is a detached bungalow that was erected during the inter-war period. It is located within a residential area comprising both bungalows and houses of differing designs.
 4. The scheme before me proposes the removal of the small single garage on the south side of the bungalow and its replacement by a side extension, together with alterations to the format of the roof to provide an enlarged bedroom at first floor level. Those alterations would incorporate a gable end to the rear and a section of flat roof. The side extension would be located approximately 0.75m from the common boundary with 8 Leith Road.
 5. Whilst I see no objection to the principle of a side extension, the depth of the proposed new structure and the overall scale and format of the roof alterations would be at odds with the simple design of the bungalow as constructed. In
-

particular, the rearward projection of both the ground and first floor elements of the extension and the provision of a large section of flat roof would be out of scale with the original bungalow.

6. The front (northeast) elevation of the extension is set back behind the building line, creating an acceptable appearance as viewed from the street and thereby according with the varied character of adjoining development.
7. Notwithstanding my comments in paragraph 6 above I have found on the first main issue that development as proposed, by reason of its overall bulk, scale and rearward projection, would be out of keeping with and harmful to the character and appearance of the host building. As such, the scheme would be contrary to Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy¹ and "saved" Policies ENV22 and ENV32 of the Local Plan².

b) Impact upon living conditions.

8. The extension would project some 8.5m beyond the established rear elevation of 8 Leith Road next door and be sited less than 1m from the common boundary with that property. Although I note that the garage which is to be replaced is located adjacent to the boundary with no. 8, its rearward projection accords with that of the bungalow as originally constructed. The garage also has a flat roof.
9. The scheme before me, with its pronounced rearward projection and lengthy pitched roof incorporating roof lights would be highly visible from the garden and rear conservatory to no. 8 above the intervening close boarded fence.
10. I acknowledge that the extension is unlikely to impact upon the daylight or sunlight to 8 Leith Road. It would nevertheless appear as a dominant and overbearing structure as viewed from the rear private garden and conservatory of that property.
11. I note that no objections to the proposal have been made by the occupiers of no. 8. Nevertheless, it is necessary for me to have regard to the impact of the development upon future occupiers of that property, who may take a different view.
12. For these reasons, I have found upon the second main issue that development as proposed would, by virtue of its design and rearward projection, be harmful to the residential amenities of existing and future occupiers of 8 Leith Road, contrary to the requirements of "saved" Policy ENV32 of the Local Plan.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

¹ The Mole Valley Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (October 2009).

² The Mole Valley Local Plan (October 2000).