



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2023

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/22/3310303

52 Alexandra Road, Thames Ditton KT7 0QT

- 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 and Mrs Muir against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/1654, dated 4 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is roof extensions with changes to roof line to create rear L-shaped dormer, changes to chimney stack and rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the determination of the application, the council amended the description of development to add more detail to the proposal. The council supplied an e-mail thread confirming that this had been done on 21 July 2021 with the appellants knowledge. I have therefore used the description of development on the decision notice for accuracy.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area.
4. Alexandra Road is a residential street of houses with small front gardens, some arranged generally in terraced or semi-detached blocks. There is a mixture of designs along the street, all appearing to originate from around the early 1900s.
5. No52 is a 3 bedroomed house, forming part of a block of 4 terraced, two storey houses (No's 48-54), all of which are of a similar gable fronted design which collectively gives a strong 'serrated' roof pattern along this part of the street.
6. The rear of the property is characterised by a mix of additions including an outrigger and various extensions with roofs to each element of a pitched design.
7. Policy CS17 (Local Character, Density and Design) of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) (CS) requires development proposals to take account of established character, density and design within an area.

8. Policy DM2 (Design and Amenity) of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015) (DMP) seeks development that preserves or enhances the character of the Do local area.
9. The Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (2012) (SPD) provides advice and general guidance on the design principles for residential extensions. It seeks to avoid unsightly extensions which ignore the style and character of the original house, where it would adversely affect the appearance of the street scene.
10. The appeal proposals would result in the addition of a large box dormer window on the second floor which would be added to the rear of the host dwelling. This would sit above the existing rear outrigger, adding a 4th and 5th bedroom together with a shower room. Much of the development proposed to the rear would not have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the area.
11. However, the main impact of the proposals would be visible from the street where this would be at odds with the serrated roof pattern as a result of the new pitched roof addition to at the rear. This would interrupt the established existing roof pattern, altering the street scene.
12. I therefore find there would be harm to the principal elevation of the host dwelling and wider character of the area, contrary to policies CS17 of the CS, DM2 of the DMP and the relevant parts of the SPD and NPPF.

Other Matters

13. I have considered the other examples of box dormers provided by the appellant which appear at No's 40 and 44. Whilst I recognise the appellant's case that there are similarities with these appeal proposals there is little comparison with the appeal property given its existing character and what I consider to be a particularly strong relationship with its neighbours. To that end, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.

Conclusions

14. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR