

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by Kevin Gleeson BA MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3161044

80 Kings Road, Walton-on-Thames KT12 4JZ

- 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 Sara Bradley against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1875, dated 6 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is two rear side dormers and raised above ridge loft conversion.
-

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 property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal premises comprise a two storey detached house with a gable frontage. The property type is common along Kings Road although similar properties demonstrate a variety of different forms particularly in terms of the heights of ridges and eaves. A number of similar properties within the road have had loft conversions with side dormers set back from the front elevation of the property.
 4. The proposal would involve the construction of two side dormers set back from the front elevation, each with a sloping front face containing roof lights and a flat roof. Roof lights would also be introduced on either side of the existing roof slope and on the side elevations of the proposed dormers. To the rear the dormers would have a vertical elevation containing windows. The dormers would extend above the height of the existing ridge by approximately 0.86 metres and would extend the full width of the roof, rising from the eaves.
 5. Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Borough Council Core Strategy, 2011 (the Core Strategy) requires new development to deliver high quality design which responds to the positive features of individual locations, integrating sensitively with locally distinctive townscape. New development should also enhance the street scene. Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy also aims to ensure that new development is integrated with and enhances local character. Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Borough Council Development Management Plan, 2015 (DMP)
-

also seeks to achieve high quality design and seeks to ensure that proposals preserve or enhance the character of the area with particular regard to appearance, scale and height among other factors.

6. The Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document, 2012 (SPD) Home Extensions Companion Guide advises that roof extensions should not dominate the roof and should preserve the character of the street scape.
7. Notwithstanding the set back from the front elevation, the size of the development extending across the full width of the property and its height in excess of the existing ridge height, which I regard as considerable, would significantly increase the bulk of the building. The extension would therefore have a dominant and detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the existing building.
8. Because of the extension above the ridge height the proposed development would be clearly visible from the street in spite of the set back from the front elevation and the close proximity of neighbouring properties. It would be particularly noticeable alongside nos. 74-78 Kings Road which have a similar appearance. This would result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area.
9. Whilst other properties in the road have similar dormer set backs, none appear to have been extended above the original ridge height as proposed in this case. The appellant also referred to planning permission having been granted for an extension to raise the ridge height on a property in Weybridge but I am not aware of the particular circumstances in that case. In any event I have considered the appeal scheme on its own merits.
10. I therefore find that the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and would have a dominant and overbearing impact. It would therefore be contrary to the requirements of Policy DM2 of the DMP and Policies CS17 and CS3 of the Core Strategy by failing to respect the character of the area as well as the advice in the SPD which indicates that extensions should not dominate the roof. Additionally the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which aims to ensure good design.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has indicated that through the use of under-utilised loft space the amount of accommodation could be increased without increasing the footprint of the building. In addition, it is stated that the proposals would not adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, these matters are not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Kevin Gleeson

INSPECTOR