
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23RD February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/21/3278987

5 Guildford Street, Staines-Upon-Thames TW18 2EQ

- 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 Divya Kerslake against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00680/HOU, dated 27 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as roof alterations that would include raising the ridge height and the installation of an eastern flank facing dormer (right side of house when viewed from the front) with additional rooflights on the western flank elevation to create additional habitable space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of two similar properties on the north side of Guildford Street. Both are detached two storey houses built in the 1960s with a gable facing the street and a central ridge running front-to-back. These two properties are more recent than the majority of dwellings in Guildford Street which are predominantly semi-detached with gables and bay windows on the front elevation. The other properties are generally slightly taller than the appeal property and its neighbour.
4. Immediately to the west of the appeal property is Edgecumbe Court, and block of flats with an open area providing parking, a garage court and amenity space. Edgecumbe Court faces Laleham Road, is four storeys high including a mansard roof and has small dormer windows.
5. The appeal proposal would raise the ridge by 2m and the eaves by 1.1m according to the Council's submissions. A flat-roofed dormer in the enlarged roof would be constructed in the eastern side. There would be 3 windows in the proposed dormer and a new window installed in the enlarged rear gable.
6. The Council has referred to its *Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)*. This

document indicates its aim is to ensure that extensions are of a high standard. As this is in accordance with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (CS), which states that the Council will require a high standard in the design of new development to achieve buildings and places that are attractive with their own distinct identity and should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.

7. The SPD indicates that dormers should meet four criteria relating to the size and positioning of the dormer and its overall effects. Whilst the dormer would be set in from the roof edges, the eaves and the ridge and so meet the first set of criteria, it would appear very large and cumbersome and not sympathetic to the design of the roof. It would appear dominant and out of proportion with the building. As a result, it would not comply with the third and fourth criteria. The raising of the eaves would also make the house appear significantly top-heavy and awkward, the eaves being set some distance above the top of the first floor windows.
8. Although the dormer would be set on the side elevation facing No 7, the gap between the properties is such that the dormer would be readily visible in the street-scene. This and the unacceptable increase in the height of the eaves would be clear and obvious. The appellant states that Council has no objection to the raising of the ridge of the roof, although I note that they include this aspect of the proposal as adding to the overall harm. I agree with the Council's view.
9. The appellant has indicated that were the ridge to be raised separately then the dormer would be permitted development under the terms of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). It is not for me to determine whether this would be the case or not. However, the proposal requires the raising of the roof as an integral part of this scheme and the proposal as a whole requires planning permission.
10. The appellant has also referred to the design of Edgecumbe Court, which I observed at my site visit. I have noted its overall design with a mansard roof with dormers. However, this building was designed as a single entity with the entire structure having a mansard and a number of dormers. Whereas the appeal scheme seeks to make significant alterations to an existing design which would not be sympathetic.
11. The appellant has indicated that there are a number of other dormers within the area. The Council has pointed out that these are mostly at the rear of properties, have been constructed as permitted development and do not have the impact that the proposal would. I also observed the roof extension at No 2 Guildford Street, opposite the appeal site. However, the extension referred to is of a different design and has a different relationship with the neighbouring property and I have not been made aware of the circumstances under which it was constructed. Therefore, I consider that it has no overriding effect on my decision.
12. The appellant and the Council refer to permission existing for the property, granted under the prior approval arrangements for enlargement of the existing house by constructing an additional storey under Class AA, Part 1, Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (2015) (as amended). The submissions indicate that the dwelling's ridge height

could be increased and accommodation would be provided at second floor level. The Council suggests that the appeal scheme would have a greater negative effect than this approval and the appellant seeks to draw support from it. However, neither side has submitted any details or drawings and so I am unable to make any comparison. Therefore, I am unable to give this any significant weight in my overall decision.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As a result, it would be contrary to Policy EN1 of the CS and the SPD as set out above. Having taken account of all matters raised, I find nothing sufficient to outweigh that harm. Consequently, the appeal should be dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR