



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2019 by S Witherley BA, PGDiP, PGDiP, Cert CIH, Assoc RTPI

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/19/3226212

15 Badingham Drive, Fetcham, Leatherhead, KT22 9ES

- 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 Max Webster ¹against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref MO/2019/0218/PLAH², dated, 20 November 2018 was refused by notice dated 28 March 2019.
 - The development is described on the application form as double storey front, side, rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The appeal parties confirmed the drawing subject to this appeal proposal is Rev E 22/01/0219.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the development on: 1) the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, and 2) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers having regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation - *Character and appearance*

5. No. 15 sits within a residential development that contains a mix of large detached and linked properties located within spacious plots. The buildings are set back from the highway by well-manicured open gardens. Their design and style are mock Georgian. The roof profile is predominately hipped with the ridge running parallel to the highway. The buildings have similar hipped roofs. They have a distinctive catslide roof with flat roof dormer window inserted at eaves level.
6. No. 15 features a partial front addition which contains a flat-roof canopy and integral garage which wraps around the property. To the rear is a spacious garden which is stepped down and enclosed by high walls, hedgerows and shrubs. The proposal

¹ This is the name taken from the appeal form.

² This is the confirmed planning reference number and the basis of this appeal.

seeks to extend the property at the front, side and rear with a two-storey extension. The first-floor addition upon the front elevation would introduce an element that, due to its size and bulk, would dilute the external appearance of the host property. Alongside this, the removal of the catslide roof would remove a distinctive feature and would introduce a style of roof that is not visible elsewhere in the street scene. The proposed roof profile would appear bulky and unsympathetic to the building and would fail to respect or enhance its architectural style and design.

7. The extension would be visible from several prominent viewpoints and, as a result of its unduly bulky forward extension and change in roof profile, would look incongruous within the streetscape. The proposal would appear as an awkward addition as a result of the design, scale and form of the first-floor front extension along with the proposed changes to the roof profile. The development would be out-of-keeping with the character of the area. Landscaping and boundary treatments would not adequately soften the visual impact given the scale of the extension. The scheme would be at odds with design guidance found in guidance for House Extensions 2000 (SPG).
8. The appellant refers to other extensions in the locality. These do not represent a direct parallel with the proposal, and, in any event, every application is considered on its own merits.
9. The development would visually harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Saved Policies ENV22, ENV23 and ENV32 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 (MVLN), and Policy CS14 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy 2009 (MVCS). The scheme would not secure high-quality design as encouraged by the National Planning Policy Framework.

Living conditions

10. The reason for refusal also refers to the effect of the extension on visual amenities. Contrary to the appellant's arguments, the development would result in a dominant, overbearing and bulky addition, due to the overall size, scale and built-form of the extension. The spaciousness that exists between properties would be significantly reduced. The proposal would appear unduly prominent and over-powering in public and private views. The development would adversely affect outlook thereby harm nearby residents' living conditions contrary to Policies ENV22 and ENV32 of the MVLN, and Policy CS14 of the MVCS.

Conclusion and recommendation

11. Having had regard to all other matters raised, for the above reasons, it is recommended that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR