



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31/12/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/20/3259691

4 The Avenue, Brockham, Betchworth RH3 7EN

- 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 Auston against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref: MO/2020/0950/FLH dated 10 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is double storey side and rear extension, part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form indicates that this proposal is the resubmission of an earlier application under the Council's Ref: MO/2020/0609. This has also been referenced in both the Council's and the Appellant's submissions, but my decision is based solely on the proposals before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached property within a residential cul de sac, comprising a variety of detached and semi-detached dwellings, together with some single storey properties. There is an existing detached garage to the side of the appeal property. The property and its semi-detached pair are modest in scale and form but sit on relatively generous plots.
5. The extension would be primarily to the side with alterations and additions to the rear. There would be an extended ground floor footprint to the side and wrapping around to the rear, with a two storey element to the side and rear set within an extended pitched roof.
6. The increased width of the property would be substantial and would be only slightly less than the width of the existing house. At the rear the gable addition at first floor would be out of scale with and would dominate the rear

elevation. The proposed roof form would be convoluted with its several different roof planes and would result in a substantial increase in the overall bulk and massing of the property. The overall scale, bulk and massing of the extension as proposed would overwhelm the original proportions of the property. Through its width, bulk and massing and proposed roof form, it would be an overdevelopment of the existing property and would detract from its modest character and appearance.

7. I have taken into account the variety of designs of the individual properties within The Avenue. However, I consider that the bulk and massing of the property, as proposed to be extended, would result in an overly prominent property that would be visually intrusive in the street scene. The other 'half' of the semi-detached pair has a roof dormer so that they no longer read as a symmetrical pair, but the scale of the extension proposed would result in a visually discordant imbalance in the scale and proportions of the semi-detached pair.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed extensions and alterations to the appeal property would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the street scene. This would conflict with Policy CS14 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy and Policies ENV22 and ENV32 of the Mole Valley Local Plan, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Other Considerations

9. The extension would extend to the common boundary with the attached neighbours at No. 6. However, it would have a limited depth along the boundary, with its inset from the common boundary and further inset to the two storey element. The detached property to the north-east at No 2 has an extension to the side and rear. The proposed extension would only extend a little further than the extended rear line of the neighbouring property and the two storey element would be set in further from the common boundary.
10. I am satisfied that there would be no material harm to the living conditions of both neighbours at Nos 2 and 6, with particular regard to outlook and effect on light. Although extensive in terms of its proposed area of glazing, the view from the rear first floor window in the proposed extension would be primarily directly to the rear with only oblique views to the neighbouring gardens. This is not uncommon in residential areas where properties adjoin each other and would not therefore, in itself, be a justification for withholding planning permission.
11. The Council has also not raised an objection in respect of harm to the living conditions of the neighbours. However, my findings on this matter do not outweigh the conclusion I have reached under my main issue.

Conclusion

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

L J Evans

INSPECTOR