



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2022

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/22/3306131

2 Denleigh Gardens, Thames Ditton, Surrey, KT7 0YL

- 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 Panditharatna against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/1675, dated 26 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion facilitated by roof alterations, including barn hip, rear dormer and insertion of rooflights to front elevation. First floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling located in a triangular shaped plot at the corner of Denleigh Gardens and Ennismore Gardens. The other half of the semi is 21 Ennismore Gardens which is generally similar in appearance to the appeal property other than for a single storey front extension to No 2. Both properties have lower two storey elements to the side which are set back from the front elevation and are subservient in appearance to the main part of each dwelling. The semi-detached pair are prominently located and are clearly visible from both road frontages and adjacent footpaths.
4. The surrounding area comprises of mainly detached and semi-detached houses, most of which, including the appeal property and the semi-detached pair, have a hipped roof design.
5. The proposed infill front extension would be flush with the main front elevation of the host dwelling. The ridge height of the two storey side element of the dwelling would also be raised to facilitate the loft conversion and would be the same height as the remainder of the host dwelling. The proposed roof alterations which would introduce a gable end with half hip would add considerable bulk and mass to the host property.

6. In my view, due to siting of the dwelling on a corner plot, the flank elevation of the proposed extension and roof alterations would be highly dominant particularly when viewed from Denleigh Gardens and would not appear sufficiently subordinate to the host dwelling. In this regard, the proposal would be contrary to the advice contained in the Council's Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (2012) (SPD). I find the proposal would represent an incongruous form of development that would overwhelm and would be at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It would also significantly unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair.
7. Whilst I note that many dwellings in the local area have been altered and extended and in some cases these alterations have altered the symmetry between semi-detached pairs, hipped roof forms remain the predominant roof form in the local area. Accordingly, the introduction of a gable end with half hip and the associated increase in bulk and mass would appear at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the area and would be harmful to it.
8. The appellant has highlighted at example at 29 Ennismore Gardens where extensions to the dwelling, including a side extension with a gable end and half hip have recently been carried out. Whilst I acknowledge the similarities between this extension and the appeal proposal, I do not know the full circumstances of the case. In any event, I am required to determine the appeal on its own merits and this example whilst relevant, does not provide sufficient justification for development that is out of character with the area.
9. I therefore conclude on this main issue that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 which collectively require development to be of a high quality and to integrate sensitively with and contribute to local character and a distinct sense of place. The proposal would also fail to comply with advice contained within the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which also require a high standard of design.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR