The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2021 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/21/3283233
6 Links View Avenue, Brockham, Betchworth, Dorking, Surrey RH3 7EP

- 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 Raymond Smith against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
- The application Ref MO/2021/0454/PLAH, dated 2 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
- The development proposed is described as "to turn front hip end roof, into gable end, with window in".

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 20 July 2021. Regard has been had to the revised national policy as a material consideration in the decision-making process. However, in this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. There is therefore no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework.

4. The dormers shown in the existing plans did not appear to accurately represent what was seen during the site visit. The extent of the development shown in the proposed plans is therefore unclear. In the interest of clarity, the appeal is considered with respect to the description provided in the application form.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The site is located in a residential area. The property is a modest bungalow. There are many similar properties in the area, although there are also larger two-storey dwellings, including some on the opposite side of Links View Avenue. The appeal property has a hipped roof, and there is a dormer present

on either side. No 40 Hillside Gardens is a bungalow nearby originally similar to 6 Links View Avenue. It has development at roof level including a gabled element set back from the eaves at the front and a single dormer on one side.

7. The plans do not clearly indicate that the proposal would be the same as the development at No 40, and suggest that the gable would occupy a greater proportion of the front roof slope. The gable, in combination with the existing dormers on either side of the roof, would appear top-heavy and would fail to respect the current form of the roof.

8. The appeal is considered with regard to its own individual merits. The dormers and side additions at other properties in the area are dissimilar to the proposal and do not justify or mitigate the harm identified. Whilst there are larger houses nearby, the harm is associated with the design of the development rather than the overall size of the dwelling, and these houses do not therefore mitigate the harm that would arise. An absence of objections is a neutral matter which does not, in itself, weigh in favour of the development.

9. For these reasons, the development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the surrounding area. It would not therefore comply with Policies ENV22 and ENV32 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (October 2000) or Policy CS 14 of The Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy (October 2009) which together seek to ensure development is appropriate to the site and respects and enhances the character and appearance of the existing property and area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR