



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 November 2020

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/20/3258989
18 Junction Road, Ashford TW15 1NQ

- 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 Bradley Thomas against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00544/HOU, dated 15 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of a side/rear extension comprising a gable end loft conversion with two rear dormers, velux skylights and a crown roof containing two skylight lanterns above the rear extension following the partial demolition of the existing garage and demolition of existing conservatory.
-

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 property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Number 18 Junction Road (No 18) is a semi-detached bungalow located at the corner of Junction Road and Montrose Close. The surrounding area has a varied residential character with properties along Junction Road including bungalows, chalet bungalows and two-storey houses, a number of which have been extended at roof level. Consequently, the roofscape within the area is diverse. Montrose Close comprises bungalows, none of which have been extended at roof level. No 18 forms a symmetrical pair with 20 Junction Road (No 20), both of which have hipped roofs and projecting rear extensions. Due to their position, opposite the junction of Pear Tree Road and Junction Road, these properties are prominent in the street scene and contribute to its character. The hipped roofs to No 18 and 16 Junction Road on the opposite side of the junction with Montrose Close and the set back of these hipped roofs from the boundaries, contribute to the spacious character of the area.
4. The proposed single-storey side extension would extend the property across the width of the site with a modest set in, approximately 1 metre, from the boundary to Montrose Close. The ridge line of the roof would be significantly extended to form a gable end. This would be a large addition to this modestly sized property. It would not respect the original form and scale of the host property to which it would not be subordinate. The use of matching materials

would not overcome this harm. At the rear of the extended roof, there would be two large dormer extensions. Whilst these would be positioned below the ridge line and just above the eaves, their combined width and their limited set in from the edges of the roof would make them appear as bulky and dominant additions to the host property.

5. The wider front elevation and the formation of a gable end would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties formed by Nos 18 and 20 and the symmetry between these properties would be lost. This would be prominent within the streetscene due to the position of the appeal property and within the context of nearby pairs of semi-detached properties which have retained their symmetrical appearance. In addition, the formation of a gable end, so close to the boundary with Montrose road would appear as an intrusive feature which would erode the spacious character of the area. Whilst the tile hung finish of this gable end at roof level would make it visually less prominent, it would not overcome the harm arising from the shape, bulk and proximity of this gable end to the junction.
6. Whilst I accept there is limited uniformity along Junction Road, the appeal property forms part of a balanced pair of properties and is in keeping with the design of properties within its vicinity and makes a positive contribution to the area. The proposals would harm this and the surrounding area for the reasons I have set out. In any case, having had the benefit of seeing these nearby developments, I am not persuaded that the development would not harm the character and appearance of either the appeal property or the street scene. In addition, No 18 forms part of the group of properties on Montrose Close which have maintained their original form. It would appear incongruous and in stark contrast to these modest bungalows. This would adversely affect the character and appearance of this street.
7. I conclude the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009 which requires a high standard of design, that should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area. It would also not accord with the guidance set out in the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011 which advises that extensions to symmetrical semi-detached buildings should be designed to be subordinate.

Other Matters

8. The proposed development would provide some enhancements to the rear garden of the property. The reduced height of an existing rear extension may also provide more light into the adjoining property although I have no substantive evidence of this. In any event, these benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin
INSPECTOR