
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2021

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/21/3275454

36 Nightingale Road, West Molesey KT8 2PQ

- 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 T Brown against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0543, dated 15 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "Hip to gable L-shaped dormer loft conversion and installation of front roof lights".
-

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 host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house. It is situated in a residential street comprising handsome semi-detached houses some of which retain their original hipped roof forms whilst others have gable-ended roofs incorporating dormers on the rear roof slope.
4. A Lawful Development Certificate (ref: 2021/0579) has been issued by the Council to confirm that the erection of a hip-to-gable roof addition plus a full-width rear dormer at the appeal property is permitted development. I consider there to be a high likelihood that this development would be carried out if the appeal proposal is refused and therefore the permitted development represents a fall-back position to which I attribute significant weight. The permitted scheme would largely mirror the arrangement on the attached house and roof additions elsewhere in the street.
5. Like the permitted development scheme, the appeal proposal would comprise a hip-to-gable roof addition plus a full-width rear dormer. The dormer element would however be large as it would protrude rearwards above the rear wing of the appeal property. Due to its elevated position, bulk and rearwards projection this element would be an incongruous feature that would unbalance the roof form of the semi-detached pair and would be out of keeping with the prevailing roof forms in the area.

6. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It therefore fails to comply with Policies CS7 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan (2015) (DMP) which together require all new development to achieve high quality design based on an understanding of local character. There is also conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, which states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve, and the Elmbridge Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (2012).
7. Reference has been made to the roof addition at 28 Nightingale Road, which includes a projecting rear element similar to that proposed at the appeal property. This highly prominent and incongruous roof addition, which I understand was permitted development, highlights the clear harm to the character and appearance of the area that can result from such development.

Other Matters

8. I note that the appeal proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents and would not have flood risk implications. The lack of harm in these respects, and the benefits to the appellant of additional space, do not outweigh the clear harm identified above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR