



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2022

by H Miles BA(hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 APRIL 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/W/21/3285424

32 and 34 North Road, Hersham, Walton-On-Thames KT12 5JF

- 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 Goddard against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/2617, dated 19 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is joined application for the erection of loft conversion at no32 and no34, involving raised ridge, hip to gable conversion, erection of a rear dormer, installation of front roof lights and removal of a chimney at no32.
-

Decision

1. This appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. This part of North Road is characterised by pairs of semi-detached dwellings of a consistent design and appearance. Their shared features include their pitched roofs with small, hipped sections and a regular ridge line, which are readily visible in the streetscene. These similarities result in an attractive conspicuous sense of uniformity.
4. There have been some alterations to no. 33 which were undertaken under permitted development. The extensions include a large rear dormer and the removal of the hipped roof feature, although the overall ridge height has not been altered. However, these features are not so common as to form an overriding part of the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed development would raise the height of the ridge, increase its pitch, and remove the hipped roof features. It would also introduce large rear dormers which would occupy the majority of the increased size of the rear roof. Two of the three windows in each dormer would broadly match those below.
6. The significantly increased bulk and massing at roof level would result in a roof form that did not reflect the regular characteristics in this street, would undermine the attractive uniformity and would be overly dominant in this context and visually jarring in the streetscene. This would be the case if the extensions to the two properties were considered together or individually.

7. Although the road is narrow, the proposed increased height and bulk would be likely to be perceived from both North Road as well as the nearby pedestrian footpath and neighbouring properties. As such this harm would be experienced.
8. Therefore, in this respect, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies CS5 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan April 2015. Together these policies seek high quality design with regard to local character with particular reference to Hersham, amongst other things. It would also be contrary to the advice in the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home extensions April 2012 which provides further guidance including with regard to roof extensions which should not be over large.

Other Matters

9. It is put to me that a hip to gable extension and rear dormers could be undertaken under permitted development. However, this would not include the increase to the ridge height. Subsequently the dormer would also be smaller. As such the proposed development would be more harmful than that which may be implemented under permitted development. Consequently, this does not justify the proposed development.
10. The proposed development would increase the amount of living accommodation and provide a larger family home. However, given the extent of the development such benefits are limited in their scale. As such, they would not outweigh the notable public and permanent harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR