



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2022 by C Glaister

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/22/3301382

33 Esher Road, East Molesey KT8 0AH

- 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 & Dr Thomas & Kate Coughlan against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0458, dated 10 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "Loft conversion side & rear dormer".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side/rear dormer at 33 Esher Road, East Molesey, KT8 0AH in accordance with the terms of application Ref 2022/0458, dated 10 February 2022 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: ST_JAN20_TEN _Site Plan (site and location plans), ST_JAN 22_33 ESH_001 (Rev A) (elevation, floor, and roof plans), ST_JAN 22_33 ESH_002 (Rev A) (section and floor plans).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The windows on the side elevation of the development hereby permitted shall at all times be obscure-glazed. The windows shall also at all times be non-opening (except that part which is above 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed). Once installed the obscure-glazing and restricted means of opening shall be retained thereafter.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The description used in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. In the interest of clarity, the description has been simplified for the purposes of the decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The property is one half of a two-storey semi-detached pair, together with 35 Esher Road. Most houses along this area of the road are also part of a semi-detached pair, though there is some variety in design. The main body of the property has a hipped roof. It has a hipped-roof side extension and a pitched-roof porch and garage. The main body of the attached property has a pitched roof with a gable end. As such, there is an obvious asymmetry between the pair, and this type of asymmetry is common amongst other properties nearby.
6. There are examples of side dormers at other properties on Esher Road, and there are many rear dormers that are visible from the street, including one at No 35. The proposal would introduce a dormer with a side and rear element. The rear element would be similar to the dormer at No 35, and whilst most of the roof would be flat, the roof of the side element would slope down towards the front of the house. The side element would be the smaller of the two parts, and the dormer would be most noticeable from the rear, where public views are limited.
7. The proposal would be sympathetic to the existing asymmetry of the semi-detached pair and others around it, and the side and rear dormers present on properties nearby. It would not conflict with the characteristics of the property, the semi-detached pair, or the surrounding area, and harm would not arise.
8. The Council state that the proposal would be contrary to the guidance contained within the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (April 2012) (the SPD) because it would dominate the roof from the rear. Whilst the dormer would be relatively large and deviate from some of the guidance provided in the SPD, given the findings above, it would in this particular instance, be acceptable.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or the surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policies CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (July 2011) and DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (April 2015) which together seek to ensure development is well designed, integrates sensitively with the locally distinctive townscape, and preserves or enhances the character of the area.

Conditions

10. Standard conditions relating to the commencement of the development, and to ensure adherence to the plans provided, are recommended in the interest of certainty. A condition ensuring the external materials match those used in the existing property is recommended in the interest of preserving the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the surrounding area.
11. A condition ensuring the windows on the side elevation of the dormer are obscure-glazed and limited in their opening is recommended in the interest of preserving the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR