



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2024

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/24/3342981

Old Bank House, Giggs Hill Road, Thames Ditton, Surrey, KT7 0BT

- 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 & Mrs Simpson-Lancaster against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2023/3219.
 - The development proposed is renovation and extension of outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for renovation and extension of outbuilding at Old Bank House, Giggs Hill Road, Thames Ditton, Surrey, KT7 0BT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/3219, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: E01, E02, E03, E04, E05, E06, E07, E08, E09, E10, E11, E12, P01, P02, P03, P04, P05, P06, P07, P08, P09, P10 and P11.
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a large detached two storey dwelling which has rooms in the roofspace and a single storey extension to the rear. The appeal proposal concerns the extension and alteration of a triple garage located to the rear of the dwelling. The surrounding area comprises mainly detached and semi-detached dwellings of mixed character and appearance.

4. The existing garage has a symmetrical hipped roof form. As it is set back beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling it is not visually prominent from Giggs Hill Road.
5. The proposed front extension to the building would be centrally located on the front elevation. Whilst the eaves of the extension would be higher than that of the host building, it would sit lower than the existing ridge height. The extension would add to the bulk and mass of the building due to its raised eaves and forward projection, but it would nonetheless be read against the existing structure. It would be set in well from the sides of the existing building and would not be unduly prominent when viewed from outside of the site.
6. The proposed new side dormer would add further volume to the building, but it would not be visually prominent when viewed outside of the site. The proposed extensions would respect the scale and proportions of the host building which would remain subservient in size and scale to the main dwelling.
7. The proposed side dormer would face the rear garden of the dwelling and combined with the extensive amount of glazing and sliding doors would, in my view, better integrate with the rear garden environment than the existing garage structure. I do not share the Council's view that the resultant unbalanced elevation would be harmful or incongruous, particularly as the full extent of its front elevation cannot be seen from Giggs Hill Road. The proposed extensions would be constructed in materials to match those of the existing building and the proposed design and appearance of the converted building, including the dormers and extensive amount of glazing, would complement the appearance of the host dwelling and the contemporary design of its previous extensions.
8. I concur with the Council that the proposed development would not have any adverse effect on the character and appearance of the nearby Giggs Hill Conservation Area.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area. There would be no conflict with Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions 2012 or the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies and guidance seek, amongst other matters, a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Conditions

10. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council.
11. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition controlling the use of materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area.
12. I have considered the Council's suggestion that a condition should be imposed stating that the building shall not be used other than as accommodation incidental or ancillary to the existing dwellinghouse. However, as planning permission would be required for the independent use of the building, I find that such a condition is not reasonable or necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR