

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2023

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/23/3330694

Oaks Corner, Carleton Close, Esher, Surrey KT10 8EE

- 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 Huda Hakme against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref. 2023/1619, dated 9 June 2023 was refused by notice dated 12 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension incorporating a rear dormer window, single storey side extension rooflights and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that Oaks Corner is a dwelling with gables to the front, side and rear elevations - a design feature in common with nearby houses that also have gables to one or more elevations. The appeal scheme includes the removal of the rear gable and its replacement with a full width dormer extending to about 7.7m along the roof of the two-storey dwelling.
 4. With its large size and noting that, contrary to the Council's home extensions design guidance, the dormer extension would be at the same height as the ridge and set in only marginally from the eaves and sides, the outcome would be an addition that draws the eye as being both of excessive bulk and disproportionately large for the host dwelling.
 5. I therefore share the Council's view that the dormer would significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwelling, a judgement also made by two of the consultees on the application. I am aware that two other local residents are supportive of the proposal, but in my opinion neither they nor the grounds of appeal refer to issues of sufficient relevance or weight to alter my assessment.
 6. I acknowledge that amendments to an earlier proposal have been made to alter the proposed dormer's windows, including the removal of a Juliet balcony. However, in my view the fundamental objection to the appeal scheme is the
-

excessive and harmfully disproportionate size of the roof extension to a house of an existing pleasing design. Nor does the appellant's reference to alleged errors in the officers' report go to the heart of the matter, and I therefore give them only limited weight.

7. The Notice of Refusal refers only to the effect of the development on the house itself. However, although the dormer has a rearward siting it would be seen from the public realm and from adjoining houses in the Close and nearby roads. I therefore consider it reasonable to conclude that there would also be harm caused to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. I appreciate that the appellant is seeking to increase family accommodation in the dwelling, but because the proposal is in my view clearly contrary to the principles of good design I consider that it would also be contrary to the relevant local and national planning policies. These are Policies CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011; Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge (Local Plan) Development Management Plan 2015 and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.
9. For these reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR