



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November, 2017

by G. Rollings, BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13th November, 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/17/3180629

37 Park Avenue, Egham, TW20 8HJ

- 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 Natalie McDermott against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: RU.17/0627 dated 12 April, 2017 was refused by notice dated 16 June, 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as an L-shape dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an L-shape dormer at 37 Park Avenue, Egham, TW20 8HJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: RU.17/0627 dated 12 April, 2017 subject to the following 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: location plan (dated 31 January, 2017); Drawing 2, rev. D; Drawing 4, rev. D; Drawing 5, rev. D; Drawing 6, rev. D; Drawing 8, rev. D; Drawing 10, rev. D.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates a semi-detached, two-storey house with front and rear gardens. Other dwellings in this residential street are a mix of types and appearances, with predominantly bungalows and other semi-detached houses in the immediate surroundings.
4. The proposal incorporates the conversion of the existing space within the roof pitch, to create an additional floor of accommodation. The new second storey would be extended with the addition of a rear-facing dormer, incorporating a Juliet-style balcony, above the main body of the house. A rearward projection

of the dormer would be built above the existing two-storey rear outrigger, replacing its existing pitched roof and providing the dormer with the distinct L-shape included in the description of development.

5. The Council's *Householders Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance* (2003) (SPG) provides advice on extensions, including avoidance of dominant and bulky roof extensions, and supports design Policies HO9 and BE2 of the *Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001*. Together, these policies seek development that is in keeping with its surroundings, including the character of the surrounding area. The SPG advises that dormer extensions should be designed to avoid them becoming a dominant feature.
6. A roof extension that is similar in design and appearance to the proposal before me has been constructed on the dwelling immediately adjoining the appeal site, being the matching half of the semi-detached pair. The proposed dormer would mirror this existing roof extension at 38 Park Avenue, and by restoring symmetry to the rear elevation, would reduce the obtrusiveness of its current appearance. I observed that the extension at No. 38 has limited visibility from the street scene, and expect that the proposed development would have a similar absence of significant harm.
7. The extension would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the appeal site, if the property were to be considered in isolation. However, when considered in context with the neighbouring dwelling, the development would lead to an overall improvement in the appearance of the rear elevation of the semi-detached pair. In balancing the potential harm against potential improvement, I consider that the former is outweighed by the latter.
8. I have taken into account the Council's advice that it has no formal planning records of the extension at No. 38. Nonetheless, the dormer is in place and I have not been provided with any evidence of enforcement action against it. Given the particular circumstances of this case, I have no reason to consider that allowing this appeal would result in the establishment of a precedent for similarly large roof extensions within this area.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with the adopted development plan, including the aforementioned policies, for the reasons given above.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
11. The Council has provided a set of conditions that I have assessed in relation to the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)¹. Condition 2 has been applied to provide certainty, with condition 3 included to preserve that character and appearance of the area.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR

¹ PPG reference ID: 21a-003-20140306; revision date: 06 03 2014.