



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2022

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/W/22/3291285

97 Feltham Road, Ashford, TW15 1BS

- 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 & Mrs Baldev Singh & Gurpeet Kaur Bhathal against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01290/FUL, dated 3 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is Roof alterations to create a new one bedroom flat including two side dormer windows, a rear rooflight and a front gable extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal used by the Council in their decision notice as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed.
3. As part of the appeal the appellant has included an amended elevations plan. The amended plan provides the side profile of the proposed front gable roof extension which was incorrectly omitted from the original plans. As this is a correction rather than a proposed alteration to the original plans, I am satisfied that no party's interests would be prejudiced if I take these amended plans into account.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon:
 - the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of occupiers of the proposed flat, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is a 2 storey detached building set back from Feltham Road comprising a shop on the ground floor and flats on the first floor and to the

rear. The section of roof affected by the proposed development is an unaltered crown roof.

6. The area around the site comprises a mix of residential and some commercial development with a variety of designs. Houses nearby have 2 storey front projecting bays with gable or hipped roofs and nearby shopping parades have first floor gable dormers on their front elevation. In these cases, the projecting roofs sit below the main roof ridge and appear as subservient elements within a varied roofscape which contributes to the character of the area.
7. The proposed development includes 2 side dormers and what is described as a front gable extension but is in effect a front dormer. It would extend out from just below the roof crown down to the eaves and fill a substantial part of the roof plane dominating the front elevation. The side dormers would extend from the crown of the roof to just above the eaves too and would also be visible from the street. Whilst they would be less dominant than the gable extension, in combination with it they would substantially alter the roof profile and design which in my view would harm the building's character and appearance. Furthermore, the front gable extension would be out of character with the subservient dormers and bay roofs elsewhere along the street and, along with the side dormers, conflict with the aims and guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development (2011) (SPD) which advises that dormers should not be over dominant and should be set-in a minimum of 1 metre from the roof edge, down 0.5 metres from the ridge and up 1 metre from the eaves.
8. I therefore conclude on this main issue that the proposed development would conflict with Policy EN1 of the Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009) (DPD) and the Council's SPD which require development to respect the street scene and character of the area.

Living conditions

9. The proposed side dormer serving the bedroom would overlook the roof on the neighbouring house. However, the house sits slightly back from the building line of the appeal property and has lower eaves and a roof that slopes away from the proposed dormer. Consequently, there will be some views to the side of the neighbour's roof from the proposed bedroom window such that it would not fill the occupant's field of vision and appear unduly overbearing. Also, there would be views of the street from the proposed living room window providing an alternative outlook. I do not therefore consider the outlook from the proposed development would harm the living conditions of future occupants to the extent that it would justify withholding planning permission. I therefore conclude on this main issue that the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy EN1 of the DPD and the SPD which require development to avoid significant harm in terms of outlook.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to an appeal decision¹ relating to alterations to the roof at the rear of the appeal property. Although no details of that proposal have been provided to me, it appears from the appeal decision that the

¹ APP/Z3635/W/20/3244852

alterations were set below the crown roof and back from the eaves and not visible from the street. As such, they are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal before me.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR