



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2019

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/19/3234016

27 Leacroft, Staines-Upon-Thames TW18 4PB

- 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 Page against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00657/HOU, dated 9 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is formation of habitable room in roofspace with rear dormer and front velux rooflights
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development set out above is taken from the application form but only refers to a rear dormer and front velux rooflights. However, it is quite apparent from the proposed drawings that a front dormer would also form part of the development. I have therefore considered the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms one half of a two storey building which contains two pairs of maisonettes. The original design of the building would have been symmetrical. However, due to the presence of a flat roof dormer window to the front of the adjoining maisonettes, the front facing roofslope is no longer a symmetrical feature of the building.
5. When viewed from the front, the neighbouring dormer window is located towards the side facing gable end. It is therefore offset from the centre of the building. The proposal would introduce a dormer window that would have a pitched roof and would be located towards the centre of the building. As a consequence, both in terms of its location and its appearance, it would fail to complement the existing structure within the roofslope. The front facing roof alterations would therefore result in further harm to the symmetry of the original building. In this respect, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The rear facing dormer window would be less prominent from the main road. However, it would only be marginally set down from the existing ridge and would be close to the existing eaves line. It would also be located close to the side facing gable end and shared party wall. The proposal would therefore occupy much of the existing roofslope and as a consequence, from the rear, the building would be altered to effectively have the appearance of a three-storey structure with a flat roof. In this respect, the rear facing dormer window would dominate and overwhelm the existing building due to its size, scale and overall appearance. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. Other examples of dormer windows within the locality have been brought to my attention and it is apparent that dormer windows are a feature of the surrounding area. I do not have the full details of these developments before me, however, regardless of their presence, for the reasons identified above, I have found that this proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The other examples do not therefore alter or affect these findings.
8. For the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would fail to accord with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies, Development Plan Document (2009) as well as advice contained within the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011. Taken together, these seek developments of a high standard which make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area in which they are situated.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons identified above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR