
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2021

by **Gareth W Thomas BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/21/3275850

172 Stanwell Road, Ashford TW15 3QS

- 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 Craig Donovan against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00178/HOU, dated 1st February 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is part addition of first floor/raise of ridge by 0.8m and insertion of 2no side dormers accommodating new bedroom and bathroom spaces.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. Situated between 2no. two storey houses, the appeal bungalow is one of relatively few single storey properties along this road and due to the shallow pitch of its front-facing gable, takes on the appearance of a low-key and somewhat subservient character by comparison with other dwellings. The proposal would see the raising of part of the roof together with the introduction of two large dormers to each side of the roof slope.
4. The Council has design guidelines for such alterations in its Supplementary Planning Document on Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development (2011) (the SPD). Guidance includes requirements that roof extensions and alterations should be in scale with the existing structure. With regard to dormer windows, this indicates that they should be well-designed and set down 0.5m from the ridge and up one metre from the eaves. Further they should be designed so that they are compatible with the main roof and to not be over-dominant. I take this to mean that they should generally incorporate a pitched roof and be proportionate with the existing roof slope.
5. I find that the increased height albeit of part of the roof and the overly large flat-roofed dormers would be over-dominant features when viewed from the road. The dormers in particular would have a combined width significantly greater than their height and would result in almost total coverage of both roof

slopes. They would totally change the appearance of this modest single storey structure to the significant detriment of the character and appearance of the host property and the immediate local area.

6. I do not accept the appellant's contention that the proposed development is innovative in style and whilst I accept that there is architectural variety in the local area and the appeal property does not lie within a designated conservation area, the proposal would be poorly designed and unduly prominent and incongruous in its immediate context. Furthermore, I do not agree that a precedent for these forms of development has already been established in the local area. In fact, those few single storey dwellings that have been extended incorporate well-designed dormers by comparison.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal conflicts with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009) and the Council's SPD. These policies set out amongst other matters the need to create buildings and places that are attractive with their own identity and require new developments to make a positive contribution to the character of the existing street scene in terms of scale, height and proportions. The proposed development would thereby fail to meet any reasonable design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR