



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2020

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/20/3251857
25 and 27 Glebe Road, Ashted KT21 2NU

- 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 James Thorpe against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref MO/2019/2017/PLA, dated 12 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is to raise roof ridge height and insert 1 No. rear dormer window to both properties to create rooms in roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a pair of semi-detached properties located on the western side of Glebe Road. Glebe Road gradually rises from Barnett Wood Lane, and the appeal properties are the last pair in the row of semis before the road turns the corner. Around the corner properties are detached with greater spacing between. Due to the layout several properties back on to the appeal site and the rear of Nos 25 and 27 are clearly visible from the road through the gaps.
4. Generally, the area has a residential character with properties of a traditional form. There is a variety of design, and many properties have been extended, however they maintain a two-storey scale.
5. To facilitate the proposed rooms in the roof the height of the building would be increased. I agree with the parties that the proposed ridge height, particularly given the variation in roof levels along the road due to the gradient, would not be overly prominent. However, the proposed roof extensions cover a large extent of the roof slope and has a large flat roof element running off the ridgeline linking the two pitched dormers. It is noted that the appellant has sought to revise the design from a previously refused scheme. Nevertheless, in my view the proposal would add significant bulk and massing at roof level. It would result in a dominant feature which would be conspicuous in views along

Glebe Road. In particular through the large gap between Nos.31-33, appearing as a prominent and incongruous feature.

6. As such, the development would in my opinion be out of keeping with the character of the area and contrary to Local Plan¹ policies ENV22, ENV23, Core Strategy² policy CS14 and Ashted Neighbourhood Plan Policy AS-H5 which seek to ensure that development respects the character of the area. There would also be conflict with Local Plan policy ENV32 in requiring extensions to retain the character and style of the existing property and not to be unduly prominent.
7. I appreciate that the development would provide enhanced accommodation for the occupiers, and that there may be ways of achieving roof accommodation under permitted development rights. Nevertheless, I have not been provided with details of such a scheme and moreover the appellant indicates that the internal space would be reduced, and it would be a more complicated construction. I therefore give this matter limited weight, and it would not overcome the impact of the proposed development on the character of the area and identified conflict with the development plan.
8. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other matters, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

¹ Saved policies of the Mole Valley Local Plan

² Mole Valley Local Plan Core Strategy DPD