



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2022

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/22/3297987

20 Florence Gardens, Staines-Upon-Thames TW18 1HG

- 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 Thomas Gardner against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01962/HOU, dated 29 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 02 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'Construction of a double storey side extension, single storey side and rear extension and loft conversion comprising of side dormer and Velux skylights'
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached two-storey dwelling situated on a corner plot fronting Rosewood Drive and flanking Westbourne Road. The site benefits from a large plot, which is visible within the street scene of Westbourne Road. The area is predominantly residential, mostly comprising of two-storey dwellings of a similar era and type, and bungalows.
4. The appeal proposal would introduce a two-storey side extension, single storey side and rear extension, loft conversion and side dormer. The appeal scheme extensions are somewhat similar to extensions subject of an extant planning permission (Council ref. 20/00895) and as such, the Council's reasons for refusal relate only to the dormer element of the appeal scheme.
5. The Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) seeks for dormer windows to be centrally located within the roof slope, with a metre set-in from the edge of the roof and set down from the ridge to create a subservient form of dormer. The SPD should be applied flexibly to the circumstances of the case. The appeal scheme would introduce a dormer to the centre of the flank roof which would span almost its entire width; thereby eroding the hipped roof form and creating a dominant and massive feature in the side elevation.

6. The dormer would does not have a 1 metre set-in from the roof edge and would not be set down from the ridge. This does not comply with the SPD guidance, and the dominant effect would be exacerbated by the disproportionately large scale of the dormer. Its tile hung sides and simple design would fail to overcome its mass, scale and siting and would fail to integrate it into the roof of the host dwelling.
7. Moreover, the dormer would appear unduly prominent and incongruous within the street scene of Westbourne Road.
8. There are many rear dormers in the area which are visible within the street scene, however, they are predominantly glimpsed on rear roof slopes or partly visible to their flank. Whilst some such dormers also do not have a set-in and have a similar flat-roof design to the appeal scheme, they are not as prominent or dominant as the appeal scheme would be given its siting on the narrow side elevation. As such, the appeal scheme would appear out of keeping with the character of the area.
9. The extant planning permission also includes a dormer to the flank elevation. This is a material consideration to which I attach substantial weight. The approved dormer would be set-in slightly from the roof edge and would be set-down from the ridge; it would also be more modest in proportion to the overall width of the flank roof slope, avoiding a massive, dominant impact and retaining the overall hipped roof shape. Due to its proportionate nature, it would also appear less prominent in the street scene. As such, the approved dormer would be preferable to the appeal scheme and would represent good design. The effect of the approved scheme on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area would be substantially different to the current appeal scheme. Whilst the Appellant suggests that the appeal scheme seeks to address third party concerns regarding the overall scale and mass of the approved scheme, it does not do so in an appropriate, effective way and it would not represent an improvement over the approved scheme.
10. For these reasons, the appeal scheme would conflict with policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (CS), adopted in 2009, and the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, that development should respect, and make a positive contribution to, the street scene, and that it is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal is contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan. No material considerations indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR