



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2022

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/22/3292732

12 Glebe Road, Dorking, RH4 3DT

- 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 & Mrs Sam & Louisa Fulcher against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref MO/2021/1099/PLAH, dated 10 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of two storey side extension following the removal of existing single storey side element.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of two storey side extension following the removal of existing single storey side element at 12 Glebe Road, Dorking, RH4 3DT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref MO/2021/1099/PLAH, dated 10 June 2021 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 001-001, 500-010 Rev 04, 001-100, 001-200, 500-100 Rev 08 and 500-200 Rev 06.
 - 3) Other than the area of flint walling shown on the proposed front elevation of the extension hereby approved, the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the side extension shall match the existing roof tiles and the render shown to be used on the walls of the existing dwelling on drawing No. 500-200 Rev 06.
 - 4) Prior to the first occupation of the side extension hereby permitted the first floor windows in the southeast elevation of the extension hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscured glass and only openable above a height of 1.7 metres above the internal floor level. The windows shall be permanently retained in this condition thereafter.

Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and amenities of the street scene and the area. The second main issue is the effect of the

proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Glebe Road includes a diverse range of single storey, chalet and two storey detached and link detached dwellings built on land that rises gently in a northerly direction. Roof heights and the gaps between dwellings vary within the street scene. Some dwellings project close to their side boundaries, whilst others have single storey attached side garages and extensions. This together with the varied building lines and plot sizes; the abundance of trees and soft landscaping; and the views towards the countryside, contribute to the informal and suburban character and appearance of the street scene and the spacious and sylvan qualities of the area.
4. The appeal property occupies a prominent position within the street scene, on the outside of a bend in the highway. On one side of the dwelling is a large undeveloped, soft landscaped gap which adjoins the driveway to the adjacent bungalow. This provides the dwelling with a spacious setting, when viewed from the street scene. On the south-easterly side of the dwelling is a flat roofed double garage which is located in excess of one metre from the boundary with 10 Glebe Road, (No.10).
5. To the side of the appeal site, the single storey side extension to the chalet bungalow located at No.10 projects up to the boundary between the two properties. Due to their modest height, the double garage attached to the host dwelling and the shallow pitched roof over the side extension at No.10 create a generous sized gap above ground floor level between the appeal dwelling and the original dwelling at No.10. Whilst this gap adds to the sense of space within the street scene, due to its proportions and design the double garage appears squat and utilitarian. Its stark/unadorned appearance is exacerbated by the plain flank wall of the host dwelling when viewed from the street scene. This detracts from the character, appearance and quality of the appeal dwelling and has a negative impact on the street scene.
6. Collectively and amongst other things Mole Valley Local Plan (LP) Policies ENV22, ENV23, ENV24 & ENV32 seek to ensure that new development respects the character and appearance of the locality. The effect of the scale, form, height, bulk, appearance, materials and general space around buildings on the site and the surrounding built environment should be taken into account. Extensions should retain the character and style of the existing dwelling. The Mole Valley Core Strategy (CS) Policy CS14 requires new development to respect and enhance the character of the area, whilst making best possible use of the land available.
7. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (Framework), promotes sustainable forms of development and the efficient use of land. Paragraph 130 of the Framework states that new development should be sympathetic to local character, visually attractive as a result of good architecture and add to the overall quality of the area, whilst optimising the potential of the site.
8. The proposed extension would replace the existing double garage and would fill the open gap above it. As a consequence, it would have a slight enclosing

impact within the street scene. Notwithstanding this, the resultant gap above ground floor level between the appeal dwelling and the dwelling at No.10 would be typical of other dwellings in Glebe Road and would not appear cramped or out of place. Within Glebe Road a number of two storey dwellings are located close to their side boundaries, including the two storey extensions referred to by the appellant.

9. The proposed side extension is set back slightly from the front elevation of the host dwelling and the proposed ridge lines would be lower than those of the existing main ridge line. The proposed extension would also respect the host dwelling's form, proportions and design detailing.
10. The walls of the existing dwelling comprise a combination of brick and tile hanging. Whilst not included in the application, drawing No. 500-200 Rev 06 shows that the existing external walls are being replaced with render and a flint detail. The proposed extension walls would similarly comprise render, with a two storey flint panel and so would respect and blend in with the host dwelling. Render is widely used within Glebe Road and the locality and the flint panel would visually break up the render and would pick up on the extensive flintwork in the large building at the southern end of Glebe Road.
11. As a result of these factors the proposed extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling. It would respect and materially improve the character and appearance of the host dwelling when viewed from the street scene and would comply with the design advice in the Mole Valley Design Guidance for House Extensions (2000).
12. For these reasons I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would enhance the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would similarly respect and enhance the character and amenities of the street scene and the area. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with LP Policies ENV22, ENV23, ENV24 & ENV32, CS Policy CS14 and paragraph 130 of the Framework.

Living conditions

13. Together and amongst other things LP policies ENV22 and ENV32 seek to ensure that new development does not significantly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties due to its visual impact, or loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight.
14. The proposed extension would be sited some 1.4 metres from the side boundary with No.10 and would be set back slightly from the front elevation of the dwelling at No.10. In addition, there is a tall hedge along the boundary between the front gardens of the two properties. As a consequence, the proposed extension would not affect the outlook from the ground floor front windows at No.10.
15. With the rear garden environment there is a tall close-boarded fence between the appeal property and No.10. The proposed extension would project approximately two metres beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling at No.10. Therefore, the outer wall of the proposed extension would be visible above the boundary fence, in oblique views from the rear door and attached side light at No.10. Any views of the side wall of the proposed extension from other rear ground floor windows/doors would be even more limited.

16. Whilst the front and rear first floor bedroom windows at No.10 are set within the roof-slope, they are sited several metres from the boundary with the appeal property. As with the ground floor windows at No.10 the main outlook from the first floor windows is into the front and rear gardens and beyond. Any views of the flank walls of the proposed extension would be limited and at an oblique angle.
17. There are several modest sized, high level rooflights within the roof-slope of the recent side extension at No.10. They are orientated towards the appeal site and thus the flank wall of the proposed extension would be visible from them. Despite this, the rooms served by these rooflights benefit from good sized windows with open outlooks into the front/rear gardens at No.10.
18. Within the front and rear gardens at No.10 the proposed extension would be visible. However, the relationship between the two dwellings would be typical of other dwellings within Glebe Road and the locality.
19. For these reasons the proposal would not have a materially harmful impact on the outlook from No.10.
20. The proposed extension would result in some loss of daylight and sunlight through the rooflights at No.10, as well as some loss of evening sunlight within the rear garden at No.10. Notwithstanding this, the rooms served by the rooflights would continue to receive good levels of daylight and sunlight both via the rooflights and the main front and rear facing windows of that dwelling. Similarly, the gardens at No.10 would continue to receive good levels of daylight and sunlight.
21. Finally, the proposed first floor rear bedroom window would be sited several metres from the boundary with No.10 and is designed to provide views away from that property. Although the bedroom window would facilitate views into the rear garden at No.10, the proposed extension would restrict views towards No.10 from the existing rear facing bedrooms within the appeal property. The proposed first floor window in the flank elevation of the proposed extension would be obscure glazed and so would not result in a material loss of privacy.
22. For these reasons I find that the proposal would not have a materially harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.10 due to visual impact or loss of daylight, sunlight or privacy.
23. Due to the distance and juxtaposition between the proposed extension and the dwellings at 4 and 14 Glebe Road, the proposal would not have a materially adverse impact on the living conditions of their occupiers due to visual impact or loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight.
24. I conclude on the second main issue that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties due to visual impact or loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with LP Policies ENV22 and ENV32.

Other matters

25. The council has suggested the imposition of conditions relating to the use of matching materials, the use of obscure glazing and adherence to the submitted plans. These conditions are all necessary to ensure the proposal respects the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene, to protect

the privacy of the occupiers of No.10 and in the interests of certainty. However, as the proposal includes the introduction of a flint panel and the materials on the walls of the host dwelling are shown as being changed, I have amended the wording of the suggested materials condition to reflect this. Neither the council nor the appellant have raised any concerns regarding this change.

Conclusion

26. Having regard to the conclusions on both of the main issues and all other matters raised the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR