



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2021

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/20/3262180

1 Park Road, Esher, KT10 8NP

- 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 Michael Hadcock against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/2035, dated 10 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is alterations to ground floor rear door and window, and a single pitched roof dormer to the rear roofscape.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to ground floor rear door and window, and a single pitched roof dormer to the rear roofscape at 1 Park Road, Esher, KT10 8NP, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2020/2035, dated 10 August 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 location plan, 20037/01, 20037/02 and 20037/03.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 1 Park Road is an end of terrace two storey house, constructed of brick with a slate roof. It is within the Esher conservation area, which encompasses a wide range of long established buildings and different patterns of development, including a main commercial centre and residential streets of varying densities and housing types. Park Road is characterised by small scale terraced houses of simple traditional design, many of which have had modern alterations made to the windows and doors of the front elevations. The area at the rear to the northwest along Heather Place is characterised by a more mixed type of

development which forms the backland of the surrounding streets and generally lacks architectural cohesion.

4. I consider that the relevant policies in this case include CS9 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 (the Core Strategy) and DM2 and DM12 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan 2015 (the local plan) which seek to ensure a high standard of design which maintains attractive residential areas and takes account of local character and protects the Borough's historic environment. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Home Extensions* 2012 offers additional guidance on dormers in terms of their size and location.
5. There is a statutory duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The National Planning Policy Framework (updated 2018) (the Framework) states that in the consideration of development proposals weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets in accordance with the significance of the asset and any harm should require clear and convincing justification.
6. The Council has raised no objection to the alterations to the fenestration at ground floor level, and I see no reason to disagree with this. The proposed dormer would be sited slightly off centre in the main slope of the rear roof and would be slightly less than half the width of the roof. It would occupy most of the roof from eaves to ridge, sitting above the lower catslide over the two storey rear extension. In this latter respect, it would not be strictly in accordance with the advice in the SPD. However, the modest size of the house and the relatively shallow roof pitch are such that the amount of space available within the roof slope is very limited and any reduction in the height of the dormer would render it unviable.
7. The dormer would be visible from street level a short distance into Heather Place to the rear and from the car park in Heather Place. Notwithstanding this, I consider that it would not be unduly prominent in the wider context, particularly in view of the mixed forms of development in the immediately surrounding area, and it would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the conservation area.
8. I conclude that it would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and that it is consistent with Core Strategy policies CS9 and CS17 and local plan policies DM2 and DM12 and the Framework.
9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR