
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2021

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/W/20/3259503

Shandon, Thorpe Road, Egham TW18 3EQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Daniel Courtney against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RU.20/0743, dated 27 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2020.
 - The application sought planning permission for proposed two storey rear / side extension and conversion of extended dwelling to form 4no. flats without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref RU.18/1672, dated 19 February 2019.
 - The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: *'The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved plans- TRS/04 received 17/12/18, TRS/06 Rev A, TRS/02 Rev B, received 31/01/19 and FRA received 06/02/19'.*
 - The reason given for the condition is: *'To ensure an acceptable scheme and to comply with saved Policy BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001'.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background

2. Planning permission was granted in 2019 for the erection of a two storey rear/side extension and conversion of the extended dwelling to form 4no flats. Condition 2 requires that the development must be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Those plans show that the extended building would have a pitched roof form. The proposal here seeks to alter the roof of the extended building to include gables. Condition 2 would be varied accordingly.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed amendment on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at Marwood.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property consists of a 2 storey detached dwelling, which is on a prominent corner plot adjacent to the junction of Thorpe Road and Meadow Gardens. The existing dwelling is of modest scale and its hipped roof contributes to the well-proportioned appearance of the property.
5. The approved drawings for the 2019 planning permission show that the roof of the extended building would be pitched on all sides, which would minimise the bulk and dominance of the proposal in the street scene.
6. The proposed amendment would introduce a gabled roof form, which would include a large section of flat roof on top. This would result in a considerable increase in mass, which would subsume the existing dwelling and create a bulky appearance. Furthermore, the southern side gable facing Meadow Gardens would have a large expanse of solid wall with little visual interest, which would appear as a dominant and discordant feature in the street scene.
7. There are examples of properties in the area that have gabled roofs. However, they mostly have a ridge apex, which limits the volume and mass of the roof. In this case, the combination of gables and a large section of flat roof would create considerable mass, which would not be in keeping with the typical roof forms seen in the area.
8. I appreciate that Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended permits alterations and additions to the roof of a dwellinghouse, which may include hip to gable roof extensions. However, this is subject to limitations, including the volume of the addition, and so the size of any roof addition carried out to the existing dwelling under permitted development rights would be relatively modest. The proposal would not be permitted development and therefore this consideration carries minimal weight.
9. I have had regard to the appellant's reference to planning applications at Nos 18 Thorpe Road & 1a The Parade where the Council has approved proposals with gabled roofs. I saw that the proposal at 18 Thorpe Road has been constructed and includes gabled roofs. However, it provides well-articulated elevations and the massing of the building ensures that it does not appear bulky or dominant in the street scene. The appeal scheme would not achieve the same standard of design in this respect. Details of the proposal at No 1a The Parade are not before me, nevertheless I have determined the appeal scheme on its own planning merits.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan adopted July 2020 (The Local Plan), which, amongst other things, states that all development proposals will be expected to achieve high quality design which responds to the local context. It would also be contrary to Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character and history.

Living conditions

11. The proposed development would be set away from the northern side boundary and it would not extend beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring detached bungalow at Marwood. Consequently, whilst the proposed amendment would add considerable mass to the roof, it would not appear overbearing or cause an unacceptable loss of outlook to the habitable rooms and garden of the neighbouring property.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of Marwood. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy EE1 of the Local Plan, which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development proposals have no adverse impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. It would also accord with paragraph 127 of the Framework, which, amongst other things, seeks a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Conclusion

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

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR