
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/16/3158570

Winterfold Coach House, 6a The Paddock, Westcott, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 3NT.

- 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 Mr Edward Williams against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application, ref: MO/2016/0730/PLAH, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is: "Remove 2 No. rooflight windows and replace with 1 No. dormer window."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to remove 2 No. rooflight windows and replace with 1 No. dormer window at Winterfold Coach House, 6a The Paddock, Westcott, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 3NT, in accordance with the terms of the application ref: MO/2016/0730/PLAH, dated 25 April 2016, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site Plan:	- scale 1:1250.
Drawing no. 2016/03/02.1A:	Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – scale 1:100.
Drawing no. 2016/03/02.2:	Block Plan – scale 1:500; Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations and Roof Plan – scale 1:100.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
-

- a) The effect of the proposed dormer window upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.
- b) The impact of the development upon the residential amenities of nearby residents.

Reasons

a) Effect upon character and appearance.

- 3. Winterfold Coach House is a residential building that was erected as a detached garage and utility room to 6 The Paddock. The ground floor of the structure still serves as a double garage to that property. However, it also incorporates a small utility room and kitchen serving the first floor accommodation, which comprises a bedsitting room with separate shower room and toilet.
- 4. I understand the Council acknowledges that the first floor has an established use as a separate self-contained residential unit. It is, however, accessed from The Paddock by means of a shared drive with no. 6. There is a small private amenity area to the rear of the property.
- 5. The dormer window has been carefully designed and would incorporate tiled upstands, with the result that the small area of flat roof would be screened in views from ground level. The structure would replace two rather unsightly roof lights and provide greatly enhanced headroom within the bedsitting room of this small unit of residential accommodation.
- 6. The appeal site is adjacent to the Westcott Conservation Area. I nevertheless agree with the Council's Historic Environment Officer that development as proposed would not be harmful to the character or appearance of that heritage asset as required by national policy at Chapter 12 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the Framework¹.
- 7. There are numerous tile hung dormer windows to houses within The Paddock and further afield, such that the new structure would not appear as an alien feature in the locality.
- 8. For all of these reasons I have found on the first main issue that development as proposed would be in keeping with and not harmful to the character and appearance of the host building or that of the surrounding area, as required by Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy² and "saved" Policy ENV32 of the Local Plan³.

b) Impact upon residential amenity.

- 9. The existing roof lights already permit overlooking of the conservatory to 6 The Paddock, which is within the same ownership.
- 10. The proposed dormer window would have little impact by reason of increased loss of privacy to the occupiers of that property having regard to its siting within the roof slope of no. 6a. Furthermore, I noted that the conservatory to no. 6 has blinds that mask any intervisibility between the properties and that

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework.

² The Mole Valley Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (October 2009).

³ The Mole Valley Local Plan (October 2000).

the principal elevations of the conservatory to the southeast and southwest, which overlook the garden area of no. 6, are unaffected by the proposal.

11. Accordingly, I have found upon the second main issue that development as proposed would not have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities of nearby residents as required by "saved" Policies ENV22 and ENV32 of the Local Plan.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested a total of three conditions should I be minded to allow the appeal. I have considered these against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by the Government's Planning Practice Guidance issued on 6 March 2014 and find all to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case. My reasons for the conditions are:
13. Condition 1 is the standard commencement condition imposed in accordance with section 91(1) (a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Condition 2 will ensure a satisfactory appearance to the completed development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.
14. Condition 3, which requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, provides certainty.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR