

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2020

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/20/3253782

8 Prospect Road, Long Ditton, Surbiton, Surrey KT6 5PY

- 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 & Mrs A Champion against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref. 2020/0129, dated 21 January 2020 was refused by notice dated 17 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer window and front roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The Council's Home Extensions Companion Guide SPD 2012 ('the SPD') provides guidance on roof extensions, including that they should not dominate the roof by being over large and that some existing roof should remain beneath the new dormer.
 4. The submitted plans clearly show that the appeal proposal does not follow this guidance and that the bulky rectilinear roof form would be significantly different from the existing pitch and hip. I note that the Council has taken more issue with the appearance of the proposed dormer additions on the rear roof slope rather than the impact of the hip to gable extension itself.
 5. However, I saw on my visit that No. 8 is at the end of a terrace of four dwellings, with the terrace itself being one of four very similar housing groups in Prospect Road, three on this side of the road and one on the opposite side. The remainder of the road is made up of one much longer terrace and pairs of semi-detached dwellings.
 6. The original predominant character of these buildings is one of hipped roofs on the end of terrace buildings and on each half of a semi-detached pair. In my view this roof form, together with the symmetry within the front elevation of each terrace and between terraces, establishes a pleasing design ethos and
-

rhythm in Prospect Road. This is especially so in the case of the four four-dwelling terraces at this end of the road.

7. I note that the Council takes the view that the surrounding properties have varied roof designs and that the proposed gable end roof extension would blend with the surrounding area. However, I do not share this assessment as the existing such extensions appear to be limited to the apparently unauthorised No. 12 and at No. 37 on the opposite side. No. 33 has also been cited but in this case the hip has essentially been retained and the flat roof extension set back. At my visit I also noticed that No. 25 has had a full height side extension but with a hipped roof retained .
8. Whilst I fully understand the appellants' view that, given the development at No. 12 their own similar proposal should be approved, in my judgement both the extensions at No. 12 and No.37 only serve to illustrate that the approval of further such hip to gable extensions would erode the existing pleasing character and appearance of the street scene. And as with the effect of No. 12 in relation to the block including Nos. 9, 10 & 11, the gable would unbalance the appearance of the host terrace of Nos. 5-8.
9. I acknowledge that the impact on the street scene is not the Council's main objection to the application, but in respect of the rear dormers I have explained in paragraphs 3 & 4 above that these significantly depart from the Council's design guidance. The flank of the rear extensions will be seen from the public realm through the gap between Nos. 8 & 9, but the extensions will mainly be seen from private rear gardens of adjacent houses and from properties in Clearwater Place.
10. Because of the rearward, more private aspect of Prospect Road and its more mixed character, including in particular the large number of extensions to the rear of Nos. 9-12 and the below eaves additions to Nos. 5-8 in the host terrace, I afford less weight than the Council to the adverse impact of this part of the appeal proposal. That said, it remains an unduly dominant and unsympathetic proposed addition to what appears to be the currently unaltered roof of this terrace. When this is taken together with the harmful impact of the hip to gable addition on the street scene, I conclude that there would be an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.
11. This would be in conflict with Policies CS8 & CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011; Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan: Development Management Plan 2015; the Council's SPD and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
12. The appeal therefore fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR