



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2025

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/25/3361116

6 Randalls Road, Leatherhead, Surrey, KT22 7TQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Sue Leary against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref is MO/2024/1856/PLAH.
 - The development proposed is Rear Dormer Extension, Loft Conversion, Front gable roof ridge raised.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a single storey bungalow which is located within a row of two storey dwellings. Most dwellings along this part of Randalls Road are set back from the road frontage by a uniform distance. An exception to this is the appeal property which is positioned deeper into its plot.
4. The existing dwelling has a front gable which is lower in height than the main roof. However, due to its width and significant forward projection, the gable is a dominant feature of the dwelling.
5. The gable would be raised in height by about 1m, exceeding the existing ridge height of the dwelling by a small amount. The overall height of the extension would not, in itself, be inappropriate given the surrounding context and height of the adjacent two storey dwellings. The proposed increase in the ridge height of the gable would further increase its dominance but it would be read against the extended roof form of the host dwelling following the proposed hip to gable extensions and in this regard, would not appear disproportionate in scale.
6. However, as a consequence of raising the eaves height of the gable by about 1m, the separation distance between the top of the ground floor window and the raised eaves would look odd, uncharacteristic and poorly proportioned due to the bland expanse of brickwork and would result in the extension appearing insufficiently integrated with the form, design, character and appearance of the host dwelling. Given its existing forward projection, the gable extension would be very evident in

the street scene where it would also be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area due to its incongruous design.

7. The proposed rear dormer would only be set down slightly from the original ridge of the dwelling. It would also extend across virtually the full width of the dwelling with no meaningful set back from the side gables. The rear face of the dormer would be stepped and would have considerable depth. Accordingly, whilst the hip to gable extensions would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the proposed dormer by virtue of its width and depth would totally subsume and dominate the roof of the dwelling and would have little regard for the proportions and form of the host dwelling. Very little of the main roof structure would be visible from the rear and as a result, the dormer would significantly change the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, resulting in it appearing top heavy and flat roofed when viewed from the rear.
8. Whilst the rear elevation of the dwelling is not overly visible from the public domain, the proposed dormer extension would be seen from the surrounding dwellings and gardens. Whilst nearby dwellings vary in their design and appearance, I noted at my site visit that large rear dormers are not a strong characteristic of the immediate area. Accordingly, the proposed rear dormer would appear overly dominant and visually harmful to the existing rear garden environment. Although not a determinative factor, the proposal would also conflict with the design guidance set out in the Council's Design Guidance for House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (2000).
9. The appellant has highlighted that further along Randalls Road, no 36 was originally a bungalow of a similar design to the appeal property. This dwelling has subsequently been significantly extended. Whilst I do not have full details of the extensions that have been carried out, from what I could observe, the extensions are somewhat different in their design and appearance to the appeal proposal. I therefore afford little weight to this consideration.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy EN4 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2020-2039 (adopted 2024) which requires all new development to be of a high-quality design that makes a positive contribution to its local character.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR