

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/16/3153841

47 Melrose Gardens, Hersham, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey, KT12 5HG.

- 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 Mrs Lisa O'Grady against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application, ref: 2016/0565, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is: "Double Hip to Gable Rear Dormer."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. This property comprises a detached, inter-war house located within an area of similar detached and semi-detached dwellings.
4. The scheme before me proposes the construction of a hip to gable extension, together with an increase in the ridge height of 0.7m and incorporating a large, rear-facing dormer window with Juliette balcony.
5. The combination of the increased ridge height and the bulk of the alterations to the hipped roof form would be at odds with the simple configuration of the 'as built' dwelling and create an over-dominant roofscape as viewed from both the front and rear of the property.
6. The appeal site is not within a Conservation Area or Area of Special Residential Character. Nevertheless, national policy at Chapter 7 (Requiring good design) of the Framework¹ emphasises the need for new development to have regard to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework.

7. No. 47 is one of a run of four detached houses that have largely retained their 'as built' credentials. Similarly, there are a further seven detached properties (nos. 53-55 Melrose Gardens and 1-9 Endsleigh Gardens) which are unaltered in terms of their roofscape.
8. The semi-detached dwelling at 51 Melrose Gardens and other semi-detached properties nearby have been altered to create accommodation within the roof space. However, their original ridge heights have been maintained, while the alterations are not as obtrusive as would be the case with a single detached dwellinghouse. This is apparent from my inspection of the detached house in Brampton Gardens that has been altered in a similar fashion to that proposed by this appeal.
9. For all of these reasons I have found upon the main issue that development as proposed will adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area contrary to national policy at Chapter 7 of the Framework, Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy², Policy DM2 of the Local Plan³ and to guidance at paragraph 1.10 of the Council's adopted Design and Character SPD⁴.

Other Matters

10. I note the fall-back position referred to in the appellant's planning statement in the event that planning permission is refused.
11. I accept that the prospect of the fall-back position being implemented is highly probable. Nevertheless, in the absence of any more detailed information as to what such a scheme would involve I have decided this appeal upon the basis of the detailed drawings before me, together with an inspection of the site and the surrounding area, including the other alterations to which my attention has been directed.

Conclusion

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

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

² The Elmbridge Core Strategy (July 2011)

³ The Elmbridge Local Plan: Development Management Plan (April 2015)

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