



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2020

by O S Woodward BA(Hons.) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/20/3245181

7 Heymede, Leatherhead, Surrey KT22 8PG

- 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 David Williams against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref MO/2019/1182/PLAH, dated 28 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is to erect a new first floor extension following removal of mono-pitched roofs; erect ground floor front and rear extensions, and remove mono-pitched roof to south facing wing and replace with flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal bungalow is part of a collection of similar properties all seemingly originally built as part of the same development. Its character is derived from its modernist design, in particular the essential design characteristics of the large mono-pitched roofs, the interplay where they meet, the detailing of the brick chimneys, and the predominant use of brickwork with restrained elements of glazing and weatherboarding articulating the facades.
4. Although the bungalow is in a fairly secluded position in a cul-de-sac, the site is visible within the street scene and from an area of nearby open space. Some of the surrounding bungalows have been extended and altered, but they have all remained modestly sized and have retained their mono-pitched roofs, chimneys, and are predominantly brickwork. There is a uniformity to the bungalows and, although the area is not within a conservation area nor subject to any other specific design related designations, there is a strong and distinctive sense of place. The appeal property contributes positively within this setting.
5. The proposed works would involve removing the two mono-pitched roofs and the chimney. The slope of the mono-pitched roofs can be readily appreciated behind the parapets unless looking directly straight on to an elevation and the proposed removal of the two roofs would result in the loss of important and

- essential features of the original building. The proposed demolition of the brick chimney, and the rendering over of the brick facades at ground floor level, would also result in the loss of important and essential features of the building.
6. The first floor addition would be flat roofed and of modern design, and would be weatherboarded. It would change the building from a bungalow into a 2-storey property. It would be bulky, noticeably higher than the highest part of the existing roofline. The weatherboarding would be taller than the render to the retained ground floor, and there would be prominent and excessive glazing at this level. This would unbalance the appearance of the property, creating a top-heavy massing. The recessed porch area and the overhang would add some articulation, but this would not overcome the significant unbalancing of the appeal property from the proposed first floor addition.
 7. In addition, the proposed large flat roofs would be out of keeping with the building and the wider area, which has very few flat roofs. They would be particularly out of keeping with the mono-pitched rooflines of the other bungalows in the immediate setting of the appeal property on the cul-de-sac. The examples provided by the appellant of flat roofs are mostly to garages rather than the main part of dwellings, and in all cases are small parts of the overall roofscape of any individual dwelling. I particularly note that none of the examples are to the bungalows surrounding the appeal property.
 8. There is an example of a substantially altered bungalow, at No 4 Heymede. This property is on the opposite side of Heymede from the cul-de-sac slightly divorced from the appeal site, but is part of the same collection of bungalows. Although substantially altered and extended and of modern appearance, in contrast to the appeal proposal, the property has remained as a bungalow, and has retained some essential design characteristics such as mono-pitched roofs and a chimney. It does not, therefore, provide the context for works to create a 2-storey, flat-roofed house.
 9. In comparison to the existing bungalow, the first floor addition would be much more prominent from public areas. I also observed on site that it would likely rise above the existing hedging in many places and would be much more prominent to, and overbearing upon, many of the neighbouring properties. The proposed increase in height, bulk and mass would result in a 2-storey building that would be incongruous in the setting of modestly scaled surrounding bungalows. It would harm the essential character of the area.
 10. The examples provided by the appellant of weatherboarding to first floor and of overhangs are to houses located further north along Heymede, downhill from the appeal property and the other bungalows. The two areas have distinctly different characters, and the appeal property feels very much a part of the bungalow character area. In any case, the examples provided are of more restrained use of overhangs and weatherboarding than that proposed.
 11. The appellant has provided examples of modern approaches to extending bungalows from a similar period. However, the examples provided are in Nottinghamshire, in a different setting, with a different original design and different styles of extensions. They do not therefore provide precedent for the appeal proposal. The appellant has also highlighted that to create the same amount of additional floor area as proposed but all at ground level would have a severe effect on the landscape of the site. This could potentially be true, but

no alternative ground floor only scheme has been provided and in any case I have assessed the proposal on its own merits.

12. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the building and the wider area and would fail to comply with the relevant parts of Policies ENV22, ENV23 and ENV32 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000, and Policy CS14 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy 2009. Amongst other things, these policies seek high quality design that respects the character and appearance of the area, and state that extensions to properties should retain the character and style of the original property. The proposal would also fail to comply with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, seeks high quality design.

Other Matter

13. The appellant has stated that the proposal would be highly insulated and therefore sustainable. Even if the resulting building were to be more sustainable than the existing, this would not overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

O S Woodward

INSPECTOR