



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2021

by Julie Dale Clark BA(Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/21/3277810
51 Copperfields, Fetcham KT22 9PA

- 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 Andrew Heath against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref MO/2021/0321/PLAH, dated 6 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is proposed rear dormer to create loft conversion with 3 No dormers to front elevation. Alterations to existing rear conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development refers to three dormers to the front elevation but this seems to be an error as the proposal, as described on the decision notice and shown on the plans, includes three rooflights not dormers. The dormer extension is to the rear of the house. The description also includes alterations to a rear conservatory. Any alterations at ground floor level have already been carried out but do not appear to be a conservatory. No mention is made of this element in the reason for refusal or in the appellant's statement or the Council's report. I have therefore based my assessment on the alterations at roof level only.

Main Issue

3. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached house that is fairly narrow in design. The proposal is to add living accommodation in the roof by the addition of a rear dormer extension and roof lights in the front elevation.
5. Core Strategy Policy CS 14¹ indicates that all new development must respect and enhance the character of the area. Local Plan Policy ENV32² establishes, amongst other things, that house extensions will normally be permitted that

¹ Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Adopted October 2009.

² Mole Valley Local Plan, Adopted 12 October 2000.

retain the character and style of the existing property. The house is a fairly narrow one of modest proportions and the addition of the dormer would represent a significant alteration to the existing appearance of the house.

6. I consider that the bulk and size of the dormer would be at odds with the original character of the house and make it appear top heavy and prominent. Proportionally, the dormer would overwhelm the existing roof. I appreciate that the dormer would be to the rear of the house but this does not justify poor design. The three roof lights to the front elevation seem excessive and add to the overall impact of the loft conversion. I consider therefore that the proposal conflict with policies CS 14 and ENV32.
7. I realise that there may be other dormer extensions in the area but these are not a character of this immediate area. I have considered all other matters raised but none alter my decision.
8. The proposed rear dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the policies referred to above and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR