



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/21/3276140

14 Devonshire Drive, Long Ditton, Surbiton KT6 5DR

- 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 H Van der Berg against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0207, dated 18 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part two/part single-storey front, side and rear extensions incorporating a new window to front, roof lights and the conversion of garage into habitable space.
-

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 located in a residential street comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached houses. These properties have a mix of hipped and gable ended roofs and some include side additions. The appeal property would have originally been a mirror image of its attached pair, 16 Devonshire Drive. As far as can be ascertained through the dense vegetation that surrounds No.16, this property has a flat-roofed side addition above its garage so the original arrangement has been disrupted.
4. The proposal would include a first floor level side addition, the expansion of the roof above this addition, the formation of single and 2-storey rear additions plus a ground floor level addition at the front. The extended roof would have a steeply pitched roof to the side which would be at odds with the shallower side pitches of nearby properties. In addition, it would significantly disrupt what remains of the symmetry between the appeal property and its attached pair.
5. I note that a Lawful Development Certificate has been issued to confirm that a hip-to-gable roof addition and rear dormer at the appeal property would be permitted development. I consider that there is a high likelihood that this scheme would go ahead and therefore attribute significant weight to it. I recognise that this scheme would also harm the symmetry of the pair.

However it would result in less additional bulk at roof level than the appeal proposal and, as gable-ended roofs are a common characteristic of the street, the permitted scheme would be a less jarring element in the street scene compared a the steeply-sided expanded roof above a side addition.

6. I therefore conclude that, due to its height, bulk and form, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Consequently, it fails to accord with Policies CS8 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 Elmbridge Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR