

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2017

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/17/3181800

42 Wolsey Drive, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey, KT12 3BA

- 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 Tony Grizzanti against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/1509, dated 10 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for a rear dormer at 42 Wolsey Drive, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey, KT12 3BA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2017/1509, dated 10 May 2017, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling set in a suburban street. The flat-roof dormer is proposed at the rear. It would largely be tile-hung, with a set of French Doors and a Juliet balcony providing outlook and light. Although adjacent properties do not display such an addition, the appellant has provided numerous examples of similar structures on other properties in Wolsey Drive and neighbouring streets. Accordingly, whilst the proposed structure would alter the appearance of the dwelling to the rear, it would not represent an uncharacteristic feature of the area.
 4. The Council's adopted Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document – Companion Guide on Home Extensions provides some, albeit limited guidance on dormer design. The main expressed concern in the guidance is that dormers should not dominate the roof by being over-large, and this forms the basis of the Council's objection to the proposal.
-

5. The dormer would be set below the ridge of the host property, above the eaves, and would be clearly separated from the adjoining property. It would not be widely seen from the rear given the extent of the mature trees and vegetation on the boundaries of rear gardens, which provide effective screening. The bulk of 24 Cardinal Drive, which is set close to and at an angle to the appeal property, would also screen the proposal from wider views to the rear.
6. At the front, the bulk of the detached dwelling at No 38 Wolsey Drive would effectively screen views of the proposed dormer when approaching from the south. The dormer's side elevation would be partially seen in short-range oblique views from the north, but this would not catch the eye, especially since part of the structure would be masked in views from ground level by 32 Wolsey Drive's side extension. To my mind, the visual effects of the proposal on the wider street scene would be barely noticeable and not unacceptable.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed dormer would sit acceptably in its visual and spatial context without causing harm. Accordingly, no conflict arises with those provisions of policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan - Development Management Plan (2015) and CS3 & CS17 of the Council's Core Strategy directed to design and the protecting the distinctiveness of local character.

Conditions

8. Otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. The Council's suggestion as to matching building materials is necessary, in the interests of visual amenity.

Other matters

9. In response to an objection received from a neighbour at application stage the Council, having assessed the matter, took the view that no material loss of privacy would ensue. I share the outcome of the Council's assessment in this regard.
10. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into account but none is of sufficient strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: The un-numbered and unreferenced Drawings described as proposed elevations (Rev A); proposed plans (Rev A) & the

three plans described as proposed ground, first and loft floor plans respectively (all revision A).

3. The external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted, including the tile hanging, shall match those used in the existing building.