
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2020

by O S Woodward BA(Hons.) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/20/3248521
40 Southfields, East Molesey KT8 0BP

- 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 Marc Thomas & Inge Midl against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/3552, dated 19 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a part two/part single-storey rear/side extension, front porch and alterations to fenestration following partial demolition of the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Marc Thomas and Inge Midl against Elmbridge Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. A hip-to-gable roof extension to the appeal property was under-construction at the time of my site visit. This appeared similar to that subject to Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Use or Development Ref 2019/2548. The extension was substantially completed, at least in terms of the external works. As the construction is sufficiently advanced and the Certificate of Lawfulness indicates that this arrangement is lawful I have determined the appeal on the basis that the gabled roof is effectively the existing arrangement. The appeal works relate to additional rear and side extensions to the property.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and the wider area.

Reasons

5. The site contains a detached dwelling situated near the end of a close. The close is lined by 2-storey detached dwellings. These are largely of similar architectural style, albeit with a variety of different detailed designs. There have been a number of extensions to existing properties, particularly to the rear and at ground floor level, although also in some cases at first floor level

and side extensions. Overall, despite the variety of extensions and detailed design approaches, the properties along the road have maintained a sense of architectural consistency and harmony.

6. With regard to the roofscape, there is only one property in the vicinity of the appeal site with a gable ended main roof, and this is a modern property clearly of a different overall architectural style to the other properties along the street. There are also a limited number of gable ends to secondary roofs, but these are small and face onto the highway. Where dormer windows have been constructed these have been sensitively incorporated into retained hipped roof slopes. One of the key characteristics that has been maintained is the retention of roof forms that remain subservient and respectful at roof level to their host properties.
7. The proposed roof slope to the side extension would be pitched and set lower than the height of the gable end it would sit against. However, it would nevertheless relate poorly to the existing gable ended roof. The mixture of roof styles would be discordant due to the awkward juxtaposition of a single hipped roof form set against the gable configuration of the house. This would be conspicuous from the street despite the set back of the appeal property relative to its neighbours and the proposed set back of the extension from the front elevation, and therefore I cannot agree that it would represent good design. The relationship of the existing gable ended roof with the proposed hipped side extension roof would therefore be incongruous and at odds with the character and appearance of the host building and the other properties along the close.
8. I am aware that a largely similar side extension has been granted permission as part of the works approved under planning permission Ref 2019/2549. However, that permission related to extensions to the house prior to the gable roof extension being constructed. At roof level, that side extension roof was proposed to be hipped and then to link into the original hipped roof of the original property. This roof form and relationship would have maintained a subservient roof form characteristic to the property and the area, and would not have harmed the character and appearance of the area. Whilst there is a more than theoretic possibility that such an extension might have been implemented had the main roof remained in its previous configuration, it is now less than certain that it could be implemented in its revised context. This fallback therefore does not lead me to consider that the appeal proposal would be otherwise acceptable.
9. The acceptability of the side extension below roof level is not in dispute and I see no reason to disagree with this assessment. I also agree with the appellant that a terracing appearance would not result. However, the lack of harmful effects of other elements of the extension do not alter my findings considering the proposal as a whole, including the roof form.
10. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the building and the wider area, and would fail to comply with the relevant parts of Policies CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015. Amongst other things, these policies seek high quality design that respects local character and the character of the host building. The proposal would also fail to comply with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which, amongst other things, requires high quality design. Lastly, the proposal would fail to comply with the Design &

Character SPD (Home Extensions Companion Guide) 2012, which, amongst other things, requires that design be carefully considered in its surrounding context, be of appropriate massing and scale, and be coherent.

Other Matter

11. A letter of support has stated that there are many similar developments in the area. However, there is only one example within the vicinity of the site of a gable ended roof, which is to a new build property that is clearly of a different overall architectural style to the other properties along the street, and there are no examples of hipped roofed side extensions juxtaposed against gable ended main roofs. This does not therefore lead me to a different conclusion on the appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

O S Woodward

INSPECTOR