



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 February 2021

by **S Dean MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/20/3264741

77 Terrace Road, WALTON-ON-THAMES, KT12 2SW

- 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 S Morris against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/2611, dated 6 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a Roof extension incorporating side dormers, rear juliet balcony, raise ridge height by 0.7m, raise chimney heights by 0.7m and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is one of a number of prominent, closely related, attractive, two-storey detached houses which are, somewhat unusually, wider and taller to the rear, with an obvious break in their roof line. In my opinion, the unusual design of these houses contributes strongly to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal site is clearly visible in the context of its similar neighbours in views along the road, and views of the rear are possible from Thames Mead.
4. The large, box dormers proposed would be a prominent, uncharacteristic and extremely incongruous feature within the street-scene. The immediate context to the appeal site is dominated by this line of attractively detailed, reasonably regular houses of consistent character and appearance in spite of minor changes and alterations throughout their history. No other properties in the immediate street-scene have similar dormers or bulky additions to the roof. The proposal would therefore have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of both the property itself and the area in which it sits.
5. I note that there is an extant planning permission which allows for the raising of the roof height to the same as that proposed in this appeal. However, as it is the combination of both the dormers and the raised roof which I find to be so harmful to the character and appearance of the area, this extant permission does not change my conclusions on the proposal.

6. I note the nominal fallback position outlined by the appellant. However, I do not consider that there is in fact a real prospect of development taking place in the way which it would have to in order to benefit first from the extant planning permission and then from prior approval permitted development rights, in order to arrive at what is proposed in this appeal. As such, the weight I give to the nominal fallback position is extremely limited.
7. As such, I consider that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of both the dwelling, its immediate and wider context. It would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan April 2015, Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy July 2011 and guidance contained in the Elmbridge Local Plan Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document, April 2012. These seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development features high-quality design, which responds to, and is appropriate for the character and appearance of the area around it.

Conclusion

8. As I have found that the proposal would be contrary to the development plan, and that the fallback position is of extremely limited weight, I find that there are no material considerations of such weight to indicate that the decision be taken other than in accordance with the development plan.
9. For the reasons given above I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR