

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2023

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/23/3315068
80 Bourneside Road, Addlestone, Surrey KT15 2JB

- 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 Richard Milsted against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. RU.22/1390, dated 2 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is for loft conversion to rear section only with two dormers to the side elevations and fenestration changes to elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a detached gable fronted house within a row of similarly designed dwellings, many of which have been altered and extended over time, although in the main their original ridge lines are intact with key exceptions being some dwellings on junctions with other roads.
4. The proposal would give rise to the creation of a new pitched roof with side dormers, to be set back approximately 2.8m from the principal elevation with an increase of ridge height of some 0.9m.
5. Notwithstanding the set back, the proposal would give rise to an incongruous feature within the street scene which would be out of character with it; and whilst I understand the appellant's requirements to increase their habitable accommodation for their family, this appears to be very much a situation of form following function. I say this having regard to the potential fall-back position of the provision of dormer windows to the side of the existing roof, however such a proposal would be materially different from that before me, bearing in mind that the overall ridge line would not increase. Further, I note the other examples cited by the appellant, however ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.

6. I accept that some of the architectural uniformity within the street has been eroded over time with a number of front elevations having been extended in a variety of ways. Nonetheless these tend to be single storey additions and the majority of roof alterations consist of rear projections which tend to retain the overall character and appearance of each respective dwelling in the public realm.
7. I acknowledge that Bourneside Road has not been prescribed any special designation for architectural or historic merit, but nonetheless that does not mean that there should be a carte blanche approach to residential extensions. The National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') in paragraph 130 states that planning decisions should ensure that developments, amongst other things, will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and are sympathetic to local character, which I find is not the case in this situation.
8. I agree that a roof extension that is sited towards the rear along the side elevation would not necessarily have a significant impact on the gable end of the house that presents itself to the street, but I disagree that the particular proposal in front of me would be obscured from the public realm. Taking into account the general width of Bourneside Road, viewpoints from its western side when looking either in a north-westerly or south-easterly direction would be materially affected by the scheme in a detrimental manner through the 'piggy-back' roof extension, which in my mind would be a step too far in terms of maintaining any semblance of uniformity of design within the road. In saying this I have had regard to the Council's Design Guidance, but I give it limited weight in coming to my conclusions.
9. I therefore consider that by reason of its overall form and scale, the increased ridge height of the roof extension would result in a visually prominent and incongruous development that would constitute an alien feature within the street scene. Consequently, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, and in addition to being contrary to paragraph 130 of the Framework it also conflicts with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan which requires all development proposals to achieve high quality design which responds to the local context.

Conclusion

10. Therefore having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR