



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2019

by Christopher Miell MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/19/3231275

8 Redcote Place, Dorking RH4 1PE

- 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 & Mrs N Sharp against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref MO/2019/0487/PLAH, dated 12 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations including two dormer windows to the western side elevation and the addition of gable ends to the front and rear roof slopes to facilitate a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice within the banner heading above as this is more complete.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling located on the north side of Redcote Place. Redcote Place is a residential development from the late 1990s, which has a suburban residential character with a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties laid out around a cul-de-sac. The properties are typically two-storey in scale and have hipped to gable roof forms. The gables are located to the front and rear of the properties and vary in size, but typically the ridge height of the properties within Redcote Place remains consistent. Consequently, the mix of properties and overall roofscape appears well balanced when viewed from the street, which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. It is proposed to alter and extend the roof form of the appeal property to provide second floor accommodation. The ridge height of the appeal property would be raised by about 0.6 metres and there would be a gabled roof form to the front, rear and northeast side elevation. The southwest side elevation would have a hipped roof form and two dormer windows.

6. It has been brought to my attention that planning permission¹ was granted on 2 October 2018 for the erection of a first-floor side extension, rear porch and to raise the ridge height of the existing property to facilitate a loft conversion with dormer windows to the front and rear elevation of the appeal property. The approved scheme would have a hipped roof with modest gables to the front and rear and a half hip feature on the northeast side elevation.
7. Whilst the recent planning permission does not appear to have been implemented, based on the evidence before me, there is no question that the extant permission could be implemented. As such, it represents the appellant's fallback position.
8. The appellant contends that the height and overall amount of development currently proposed is less than that permitted by the extant permission and thus the current proposal is acceptable. In addition, the appellant argues that the proposal is of a high-quality design which would contribute to the established variety of properties within Redcote Place.
9. Whilst I accept that the extant permission permits a scheme with a greater amount of floorspace and higher ridge height, the design and appearance of the respective schemes is significantly different and therefore they are not directly comparable. The approved scheme has a hipped roof form with small gable features to the front and rear elevation, which would complement the roofscape of the neighbouring properties within Redcote Place, and a first-floor side extension, whilst the appeal proposal has prominent gable ends to the front, rear and northeast side elevation with no side extension. As such, I have afforded the appellant's fall-back position limited weight in my overall assessment.
10. Despite the proposed use of sympathetic materials, the proposed alterations would significantly alter the appearance of the existing dwelling and result in a property with a three-storey appearance and bulky roof form. When compared to the two-storey height and predominately hipped to gable roof forms of the other dwellings within Redcote Place, the appeal property would appear as an unduly prominent form of development when viewed from the street, which would cause significant and demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. In conclusion, the proposal does not accord with Policy CS14 of the Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted October 2009) and Policies ENV22, ENV23 and ENV32 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (Adopted October 2000), which, amongst other things, requires new development, including house extensions, to respect and enhance the character of the area. In addition, the proposal would not be sympathetic to the local character, which is inconsistent with Paragraph 127 of the Framework.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Christopher Miell

INSPECTOR

¹ Council Ref: MO/2018/1225/PLAH