



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

By J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/22/3297871

68 Stag Leys, Ashted, Surrey, KT21 2TQ

- 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 George Haritos against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref MO/2021/1297/PLAH, dated 15 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is Demolition of existing conservatory. Erect part single/two storey rear extension with 2 rear dormers. Provide 3 front dormers. Raise existing ridge line by 1600mm. Provide pitch roof over existing garage and existing side covered way. Provide front storm porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a loft conversion served by roof lights on the front elevation and two large dormer windows on the rear. It is in a road that is of varied scale and form, comprising of detached bungalows, chalets and two storey houses.
4. The proposal would involve raising the height of the dwelling by 1.6 metres. Whilst this would be higher than the adjacent bungalow at 67 Stag Leys, it would be within the range of building heights in the immediate area. Furthermore, I noted at my site visit that Nos 66 and 69 are currently undergoing extensions and alterations and display a higher ridge height than the existing appeal property. Whilst I acknowledge that the appeal property is forward of No 67 and is more prominent, the dwelling at No 69 is also closer to the road. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed alterations to the ridge height of the dwelling would not be detrimental to the already varied character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal also involves three equally spaced dormer windows on the front elevation of the dwelling. These windows would all have a similar width to the main ground floor windows on the front of the property. Whilst the dormers

would be set down from the ridge of the dwelling and would be located up from the eaves, I nonetheless consider that due to their width they would dominate the roof slope and result in a 'top heavy' appearance which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.

6. The proposal also involves a part single storey, part two storey extension of 4m depth to the rear. The extension would incorporate a two-storey central gabled section, with two narrow but elongated dormer windows on both sides. In my view, the two storey gable feature would be particularly dominant and would be at odds with the chalet style of the dwelling. Furthermore, to both sides of the central gabled feature the slope of the roof would be angled on two planes which would appear contrived and out of keeping with the design and appearance of the existing dwelling. The side profile of the roof would be visible in the street scene due to the stagger between Nos 67 and 68 and the proposed additions would appear incongruous and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. For these reasons, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Thus, it would be contrary to Policy CS14 of the Mole Valley Local Development Framework Core Strategy (October 2009); Policies ENV22 and ENV32 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (October 2000); and Policies AS-H5 and AS-En3 of the Ashted Neighbourhood Forum Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015-2026. These policies require, amongst other things, development to respect the character and appearance of the locality, whilst being of an appropriate scale, form and appearance for the site.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge the examples of other extensions in the local area which have been permitted by the Council. However, none of these appear to be of a directly comparable design to the appeal proposal which I have considered on its own merits.
9. The proposal would provide improved, sustainable accommodation for the appellant and his family. I am also satisfied that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, these considerations do not alter my findings on the main issue as set out above.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR