



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2021

by Andrew Bremford BSc (Hons) MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/21/3268072

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 20/01454/HOU, dated 5 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a side extension that joins the bungalow's roof, the erection of a single storey rear extension and loft conversion including the installation of a rear facing dormer and 2 no rooflights on the proposed side extension (1 no at the front and 1 no to the side roof slopes) to provide additional habitable accommodation (following demolition of existing conservatory and partial demolition of a garage at the rear). Proposed new access via Junction Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Following the submission of the application to the Council, the proposal description was revised to the description of development set out in the banner heading above, which has been taken from the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form. The Council's officer report and evidence before me confirms that the revised description of development was subject to consultation and publicity. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the corner of Junction Road and Montrose Close, a cul-de-sac off the south side of Junction Road. There is no discernible consistency to the residential character of properties along most of Junction Road. Properties are of differing architectural styles and types and some have been extended; roof extensions and alterations vary in design and size.
5. However, the same cannot be said for properties in the immediate vicinity of the site at the entrance to Montrose Close and within the cul-de-sac itself. In views from Junction Road the appeal property forms one half of a modest pair of symmetrically balanced semi-detached bungalows, visually similar in appearance to the pair of semi-detached bungalows on the opposite side of the

road junction. The two pairs of properties have hipped roofs and similar hipped roof projecting rear extensions. Montrose Close comprises bungalows of similar symmetrical appearance and none have been extended at roof level. Thus, notwithstanding the unusual conservatory attached to its rear elevation and the rear garage, in local views from the cul-de-sac and from the entrance to Montrose Close the host property, by virtue of its modest size and similar symmetrical form to neighbouring properties, positively contributes to the character and appearance of the immediate surrounding area.

6. Moreover, the side elevations of the host property and No 16 Junction Road, located on the opposite side of the road junction, are set back by roughly the same distance from their respective boundaries with Montrose Close. Consequently, there is a reasonably balanced and spacious appearance in terms of the connection between the road and the dwellings. Due to their prominent corner position these properties are particularly visible in the street scene and so positively contribute to the spacious character of the area.
7. Whilst it would be set back approximately 0.5 metres from the front elevation of the host building, the proposed side extension would extend the property across virtually the full width of the plot, leaving a gap of only around 1.1 metres to the boundary with Montrose Close. By virtue of its size the extension would represent a large addition that would fail to respect the modest character of the host property.
8. Notwithstanding that the roof would be hipped and would be set down a little from the bungalow's ridge, the resultant wider front elevation of the property would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the pair of semi-detached bungalows. The resultant building would be materially at odds with the original prevailing symmetrical form and appearance of most other properties in the cul-de-sac.
9. The proposed side extension would also visually disrupt the balanced appearance of the two pairs of semi-detached bungalows either side of the entrance to Montrose Close. Thus, the proposal would detract from the existing spacious character of development at the road junction and would unbalance the aforementioned connection between the road and the dwellings.
10. Although the scheme approved under certificate of lawful proposed development reference 21/00248/CPD (the permitted development scheme) would include a hip to gable alteration, it would not unbalance the pair of semi-detached bungalows to the same extent as the appeal proposal owing to the fact that it would not include a side extension that would extend the property across virtually the full width of the plot.
11. Even though the proposed rear facing dormer would not reach the full ridge height and would be positioned just above the eaves, by virtue of its width (around 6.7 metres) it would occupy significantly more than half the rear roof slope. Thus, despite the use of matching materials, the large dormer would be an unduly dominant and incongruous feature readily visible from Montrose Close. Its flat roof design would be at odds with the main roof of the host building and the roof form of most neighbouring properties in Montrose Close.
12. While I acknowledge that the permitted development scheme includes a similar flat roofed rear dormer, at around 5.7 metres in width it would not be as wide

as the dormer proposed as part of the appeal scheme. In any event, I am mindful that the assessment related to whether a proposal is permitted development or not, differs considerably from the qualitative assessment required in considering matters of design and form under a planning application. In considering the appeal proposal, for the reasons I have already set out, I am not persuaded that the design of the rear facing dormer represents a desirable form of development that would reflect the character of the property. It would not represent a well designed addition as required by the Council's Supplementary Planning Document¹.

13. Overall, due to the prominent location of the site and by virtue of their scale, location and design the proposed rear dormer and side extension would be conspicuous and incongruous when viewed from the street and so would have an adverse influence on the street scene.
14. The roof height of the single storey rear infill extension would be lower than the roof of the existing projecting rear extension and the appellant says that this would provide more light into the neighbouring adjoining property, although I have no substantive evidence of this before me. Moreover, I acknowledge that the demolition of existing conservatory and the partial demolition of a garage at the rear would reinstate part of the rear garden. However, neither of these factors or the proposed use of matching materials for the development would overcome the adverse effects that I have described.
15. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Consequently, in this regard, the proposal would conflict with Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009 which, amongst other things, requires a high standard of design and seeks to ensure that proposals for new development makes a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area in which they are situated.

Conclusion

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

Andrew Bremford

INSPECTOR

¹ Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document, April 2011