

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2016

**by R J Maile BSc FRICS**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 30 September 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3153472**

**24 Grange Road, West Molesey, Surrey, KT8 2PP.**

- 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 Ms Eleanor Luker against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
  - The application, ref: 2016/0819, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2016.
  - The development proposed is: "Addition of a dormer style loft room into existing roof space."
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed loft conversion upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. No. 24 Grange Road is an end of terrace house with a hipped roof and a single storey rear extension. It is located within a mixed residential area comprising Edwardian or late Victorian semi-detached and terraced properties, together with more recent developments to the south and west.
  4. The scheme before me proposes the creation of a hip to gable roof extension incorporating a large dormer to the rear roof slope and a tile hung, south facing gable end. This would require removal of one of the existing chimney stacks to the flank elevation.
  5. The scale of the proposed alterations, in particular the full-width dormer to the rear and the large expanse of tile hanging to the flank wall of the gable end, would be over-dominant and wholly out of character with the host building, which comprises a modest two storey terraced house.
  6. The appeal site is not within a Conservation Area or Area of Special Residential Character. Nevertheless, by reference to national policy at Chapter 7 of the
-

Framework<sup>1</sup> and the relevant policies of the Development Plan it is proper to consider the relationship of the proposed alterations in terms of the character and appearance of the wider area.

7. The box type dormer would be visible from the street, whilst the large expanse of flank wall would be seen across the garden of 39 Grange Close. The combined effect of these design features would have an adverse impact upon the uniformity and character of the terrace as a whole.
8. For all of these reasons I have found upon the main issue that development as proposed would harm the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area. As such the proposal would conflict with national policy at Chapter 7 (Requiring good design) of the Framework, Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy<sup>2</sup>, Policy DM2 of the Local Plan<sup>3</sup> and guidance at paragraph 1.10 of the Council's adopted Design and Character SPD<sup>4</sup>.

### **Other Matters**

9. I have been referred by the appellant to a number of similar developments that have been constructed nearby, photographs of which have been provided to me in evidence and which were inspected as part of my site visit.
10. The recent extension to 23 Grange Road is identical to that proposed by this appeal. Nevertheless, I understand that the alterations to no. 23 and several of the other properties referred to were constructed by virtue of Permitted Development.
11. My decision is based upon the plans and evidence before me and, in particular, the fact that development as proposed would be highly visible within the street scene given views of the property from Grange Close to the west and Grange Road to the south across the garden of 39 Grange Close.
12. I have been asked to comment on an amended scheme which formed the basis of a pre-application enquiry to the Local Planning Authority. That scheme is not before me for determination at this appeal, although it does retain both chimney stacks and the front portion of the hipped roof, which is particularly visible from the south. However, any amended proposals must be the subject of a formal application to the Local Planning Authority in the first instance.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

*R. J. Maile*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> The National Planning Policy Framework.

<sup>2</sup> The Elmbridge Core Strategy (July 2011).

<sup>3</sup> The Elmbridge Local Plan: Development Management Plan (April 2015).

<sup>4</sup> Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document – Companion Guide: Home Extensions (April 2012).