



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/19/3235109

41 Birch Grove, Shepperton TW17 8SS

- 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 J Murray against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00558/HOU, dated 15 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2019.
 - The development is Proposed Extension to Dormer Window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached bungalow with a hipped roof. It is located in a short cul-de-sac which plays host to a number of similar properties. The bungalow has been previously extended at roof level in the form of a side facing dormer window with a flat roof that is comparable in height with the ridge of the original roof. It is a large structure that has the effect of increasing the scale and bulk of the original building. However, due to its location on one side of the roof, the original form of the building can still be appreciated. In this respect therefore, the form and appearance of the building remains comparable with its neighbours.
4. The proposal would replicate the appearance of the existing dormer window albeit on the other side of the roof. In doing this, the flat roofs of the dormer windows would span the full width of the building save for a small step in from the eaves line. Consequently, the mass and bulk of the roof would be substantially increased. This would significantly alter the form of the building, in effect turning it into a two-storey property with a flat roof. Therefore, rather than balancing the overall shape and look of the dwelling, the resultant roof form would overwhelm and dominate the form and appearance of the original building.
5. There are instances of other roof alterations within the road. However, where these are apparent, they are less intrusive in scale and bulk and are generally sensitive to the roof forms of the original buildings. They therefore do not alter my findings in relation to the scale and appearance of the proposed addition. In

addition, although the roof alteration would only be visible from beyond the house, for the reasons identified above, it would still have a visually obtrusive appearance that would be at odds with the smaller scale of the neighbouring buildings.

6. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to accord with Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009) and 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

7. For the reasons identified above, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR