
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by Amanda Blicq BSc (Hons) MA CMLI

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

Decision date: 27 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/16/3158230

57 Rosefield Road, Staines-upon-Thames TW18 4NB

- 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 and Mrs P Marks against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00746/HOU, dated 9 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable roof alteration with a rear dormer and three rooflights in the front elevation to join up with a proposed first floor side extension above the existing side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. For brevity I have used the description of the development given on the Council's decision notice in the heading above.
3. Both main parties are in agreement that there is a Certificate of Lawful Proposed Use or Development¹ (CPD) for a hip to gable roof alteration, rear dormer and rooflights. This constitutes a fall-back scheme and is considered later in my reasoning.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site (No 57) is a modest semi-detached dwelling situated in the middle of three pairs of similar dwellings on Rosefield Road. These dwellings appear to be more recent additions to Rosefield Road's building pattern which has an underlying pattern of groups of semi-detached dwellings, each of which has a distinct period architectural style. There is limited evidence of alterations or extensions which gives a strong architectural coherence to the street scene, and the repeating pattern of building styles contributes to the street scene's distinctiveness.

¹ 15/01651/CPD

6. Number 51 Rosefield Road (No 51), which is similar to No 57, has a first floor side extension but it has a hipped roof which is both set back and set down from the host dwelling.
7. The development would comprise the alteration of the side hipped roof to a gable end, as well as the construction of a first floor extension setback from the front elevation. As the Council's reasons for refusal appear to be concerned only with the effect of the development on the host dwelling's roof, I have largely confined my reasoning to that element of the application.
8. I share the Council's concern that the replacement of the existing hipped roof with a side gable would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings. It would also add significant bulk above eaves height to the host dwelling, and would appear incongruous with the existing repeating pattern of hipped roofs evident on this series of semi-detached dwellings. The appellant has drawn attention to other dwellings on Rosefield Road which have gable ends. However, my observations lead me to conclude that those gable ends are original features and do not therefore contribute to an unbalancing effect with the respective attached dwellings.
9. Similarly, although No 51 has been extended to the side, it has retained the hipped roof to ensure consistency between the series of dwellings within which it sits.
10. In the light of the above, I conclude that the development would unbalance the pair of dwellings and have a detrimental effect on the distinctive appearance of Rosefield Road which derives its distinctiveness largely from the symmetry and repeating pattern of dwellings lining the road frontage. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene.
11. Consequently, the development would not make a positive contribution to the street scene or pay due regard to the characteristics of adjoining buildings. This would be contrary to Policy EN1 of the Local Plan². It would also be contrary to guidelines given in the SPD³ which states that roofs over extensions should match the existing angle of slope and design in terms of hipped or gable ends.

Fall-back scheme

12. I appreciate that the CPD would allow the alteration of the hipped roof to a gable. However, the evidence before me indicates that whilst the CPD would allow the creation of an additional bedroom and ensuite in the roof space, it would not provide additional accommodation at first floor level, which is proposed under this appeal.
13. Consequently, given that difference between the appeal and the CPD, I am not entirely satisfied that the development allowed under the CPD is likely to be carried out. As such, I disagree with the appellant that the CPD justifies the appeal before me.
14. The appellant argues that if the roof alterations were carried out in accordance with the CPD, the Council would be likely to permit a first floor side extension.

² Spelthorne Borough Council, Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009

³ Spelthorne Borough Council, Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development, April 2011

However, I disagree with the appellant on this point as the Council's future actions cannot be presumed.

15. I appreciate that the Council has not considered the CPD in the officer's report but this does not alter my reasoning.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and taking all matters into account, I conclude that the development would be contrary to the relevant policies of the Council's Local Plan and that therefore the appeal should be dismissed.

Amanda Blicq

INSPECTOR