



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2024 by N Manley BA (Hons)

Decision by S Edwards BA MA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/23/3331928

29 Dale Road, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey KT12 2PY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andreas Lindinger against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2023/1246.
 - The development proposed is described as a "Hip-to-gable roof extensions to both sides incorporating rear dormer windows with juliet balconies and front and rear rooflight, part two/part single-storey side infill extension, front porch and increase in height of chimney stacks, following demolition of the existing rear conservatory."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for "Hip-to-gable roof extensions to both sides incorporating rear dormer windows with juliet balconies and front and rear rooflight, part two/part single-storey side infill extension, front porch and increase in height of chimney stacks, following demolition of the existing rear conservatory", at 29 Dale Road, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey KT12 2PY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/1246, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TDB-189-PL-00-A, TDB-189-PL-01, TBD-189-PL-06-A and TBD-189-PL-10-D.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Government published a revision of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in December 2023. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material

considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

4. The description of the proposed works detailed on the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. I have adopted the description used in the Council's Decision Notice which reflects accurately and concisely the appeal proposal.
5. The name of the appellant as set out in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. The appeal form lists the appellants as Jenni and Andi Lindinger, but the right to lodge and appeal only extends to the named applicant.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. 29 Dale Road (no 29) is a two-storey, detached property situated on the north-western side of a cul-de-sac. The appeal dwelling boasts a hipped roof and a good-sized rear garden, complete with a detached garage. Although no 29 largely follows the same front building line as its neighbouring properties, the surrounding area has no unified architectural theme, and features a mix of dwellings with diverse styles and materials, including a variety of roof forms with dormer windows being a noticeable feature on several nearby dwellings.
8. The development proposed would see the roof extended from hip-to-gable on both sides, adding rear dormer windows with Juliet balconies, as well as rooflights at the front and back. Additionally, to create more living space, the current rear conservatory would be removed and replaced with a single- and two-storey extension. Finally, the existing chimney stacks would be heightened and a new porch built.
9. It is the Council's position the introduction of a crown roof at no 29 would be out of keeping with the character of the area. However, there is a noticeable variety in roof styles in proximity to the appeal site, including a crown roof at 5 Dale Road. Therefore, given the variety of roof styles nearby, I conclude that introducing a crown roof would not detract from the area's character and appearance. Additionally, when viewed within this context of roof varieties, the change in roof profile for the host property would not result in a harmful alteration to its character and appearance.
10. The proposed alterations, including changes to the roof and extensions, would increase the bulk of the property. However, these additions would remain proportionate to the host dwelling and would not extend beyond the rear building line of the adjacent properties. This would ensure that the proposal does not detract from the character and appearance of the area. The large size of the proposed dormer windows would be mitigated by a number of factors. The use of matching materials would enable the development to integrate with the host dwelling. Moreover, the dormers would not extend across the full width of the rear roof slope and would be relatively centred, thus allowing

sufficient room either side to ensure that they retain a degree of subservience. The dormers would only be seen from the rear garden of the appeal site and from neighbouring properties, thus ensuring that these additions cause no adverse impact on the street scene.

11. Moreover, during my site visit I observed several nearby dormer windows of varying scale, size and massing. Considering their proposed placement, size, scale, and massing in comparison to nearby developments, I am led to the conclusion that the appeal scheme would not cause any harm and would preserve the character and appearance of both the appeal property and the surrounding area.
12. For the above reasons, the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and would accord with Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan - Development Management Plan (adopted April 2015), Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (adopted July 2011), the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (adopted April 2012) and the Framework. Together, these notably seek to ensure development preserves the character of an area, taking into account appearance, scale, mass and height, integrates sensitively within locally distinctive townscape.

Other Matters

13. I have taken into account the concerns raised regarding a potential loss of privacy and amenity to occupiers of neighbouring dwellings as a result of the development. However, the Council did address this matter within their officer's report and concluded there not be any harmful impact on the privacy or amenity of the occupiers of surrounding neighbours. Based on my assessment of the evidence before me, and my site visit and observations, I see no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusion.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit, I shall impose a condition specifying the relevant drawings which the development must accord with, in the interests of certainty and to provide clarity. A condition regarding external materials is considered necessary to preserve the character and appearance of the locality.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR