



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 April 2025

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/24/3357999

26 Basing Way, Thames Ditton, KT7 0NX

- 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 Harold Evans against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/2560.
 - The development proposed is described as 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. In their decision notice the council refer to the 2023 version of the National Planning Policy Framework. This has since been revised, with the current National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) being published in December 2024. In the current Framework paragraph 135 of the 2023 publication, which deals with design matters, remains unchanged. I confirm that in this decision I refer to the 2024 Framework.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Basing Way is characterised by traditionally designed detached and semi-detached dwellings from a limited range of designs and palette of materials. Whilst the elevations of the dwellings are partially screened by planting their roofs are clearly visible and are a feature of the street scene. The dwellings have consistent front building lines, modest front gardens that front onto a quiet road with no road markings or street lights. Collectively these features contribute to the attractive, cohesive and verdant character and appearance of Basing Way and Basing Close.
5. Consistent with this the appeal dwelling comprises a traditionally designed detached family house with a low eaves height. It has a front facing gable and deep half hip on one side and a gable end on the other side. The adjacent dwelling to the northeast is very similar in design and appearance. Although it has a rear dormer extension its original roof design is clearly visible and remains the dominant feature when viewed from the street scene. There are other large rear dormer extensions within Basing Way and Basing Close, which similarly can be glimpsed beyond the front and side roof slopes.

6. Together and amongst other things policies CS4 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 (CS) and policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 (DMP), require new development to deliver high quality design, which maximises the efficient use of land whilst responding to the positive features of individual locations. Developments should preserve or enhance the character of the area, with particular regard to appearance, scale, mass, height, topography, building patterns and the character of the host building. Paragraph 135 of the Framework has similar objectives.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document – the Companion Guide: Home Extensions 2012 (SPD), explains that roof extensions are often the most difficult to add successfully to a house. They should not dominate the roof by being over large or higher than 2 sides of a hipped roof. Extensions should harmonise with the original appearance of the house.
8. The materials to be used in the construction of the proposed extension would match those of the host dwelling and the proportions and alignment of the fenestration is balanced. However, the depth of the first floor roof would be materially increased and an uncharacteristic and large flat crown roof, with very shallow hip features would be introduced. The proposed roof lights would sit within the shallow hip on one side and towards the ridge line on the front roof slope. As a result, the proposed roof would appear top heavy and unduly bulky. It would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene and fails to satisfactorily address the concerns raised to the previous scheme.
9. The harm that would be caused by the proposal would outweigh the benefits for the appellant and their family that would result from the proposed additional accommodation. Further, it is not something that could be adequately addressed through the imposition of conditions.
10. As stated above there are some large rear dormer extensions within Basing Way and Basing Close. Whilst they may appear top heavy within the rear garden environment, their impact on the front elevations of the host dwellings and street scenes is limited. There is also a small crown roof in Basing Way which is barely noticeable and sits within a fully hipped roof. I acknowledge that there are a number of flat crown roofs in Basing Road, although none are directly comparable to the proposal. These flat roofs have assimilated into the street scene with varied degrees of success and highlight the need to assess each proposal on its individual merits and in light of the prevailing planning policies. I also find the character of Basing Road to be more varied and less sensitive to change than Basing Way.
11. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, including Basing Way and Basing Close. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with CS Policies CS4 and CS17, DMP Policy DM2 and the SPD.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR