

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/24/3355047

26 Basing Way, Thames Ditton, Surrey KT7 0NX

- 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 Harold Evans against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1532.
 - The development proposed is a part two/part single-storey rear extension, roof extension incorporating rear dormer windows, front canopy, conversion of garage into living space and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the application form; I note that the Appellant also uses this on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling in attractive suburban style with pleasant proportions and elevations and reflective of most of the homes found locally. These properties come together to present an established neighbourhood with residential character and pleasing low-key appearance. The proposal is as described above with the changes and additions incorporating a crown roof.
 5. With a plot of the scale found at the appeal site, and the pattern established in the locality, there would clearly be scope for some increased footprint of the dwelling and suitable dormer additions. However, regrettably, the proposed scheme would be excessive in bulk and mass and display as overdevelopment. This would be exemplified by the need for the inclusion of the uncharacteristic crown roof. Almost without exception local roof forms display a traditional pitched approach and the crown here would stand out as an inappropriate addition lacking any degree of suitable subtlety as a change to the dwelling. It
-

would make it visually awkwardly top-heavy, with excessive mass in height and depth, and jarring to the eye as being out of place in the polite and pleasing streetscene.

6. Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that new development embodies high quality design, reflects local character, is of suitable scale and mass, and enhances street-scenes. For the reasons given above I conclude that there would be conflict with these policies. The policies have objectives that are also reflected in the Council's Home Extensions Companion Guide 2012 (CG). In my opinion the scheme would run contrary to its main aesthetic aims albeit this publication cannot be expected to cover every eventuality.

Other matters

7. I understand the wish to extend this dwelling. I can see that attention has been given to selection of materials and to a number of the components and agree with the Council on these and also on the lack of undue impact upon neighbouring residential amenity. I have reviewed the local examples of extension work drawn to my attention and also those observed during my visit to the neighbourhood. There is generally variation in scale and form from the appeal proposal; where comparisons might truly be drawn I found these to not be of a quality which should set a benchmark for good design. In any event, I must assess the case on its own merits. I note that no objections were lodged by neighbours. However, having carefully considered all points raised by the Appellant I conclude that the matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework has been considered and the development plan policies and CG which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR