
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2016

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3154143

1 Garrick Gardens, West Molesey, Surrey KT8 1SL

- 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 N Wallace against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0370, dated 1 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor side extension and new wall for rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor side extension and new wall for rear garden at 1 Garrick Gardens, West Molesey, Surrey KT8 1SL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2016/0370, dated 1 February 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans: Drawing No 1608/04 Existing Plans, Drawing No 1608/05 Existing Elevations, Drawing No 1608/06 Existing 3D, Drawing No 1608/07 Proposed Plans, Drawing No 1608/08 Proposed Elevations, Drawing No 1608/09 Proposed 3D, Drawing No 1608/10A Block Plan, Drawing No 1608/13A OS Map, Drawing No 2016016/TPP001 Tree Protection Plan and Drawing No 2016016/TCP001 Tree Constraints Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension 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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end terrace dwelling with a 1.8 metre high brick wall enclosing its rear garden. It is located in a modern residential area characterised by mainly two and three storey terraced houses and flats. The area has a relatively uniform layout with the properties all set a similar distance back from the road with grass verges and relatively open frontages, giving the area a relatively formal but open character and appearance.
-

4. The proposed single storey side extension would align with the front and rear elevations of the appeal dwelling and extend some 1.8 metres to the side. It would have a pitched roof matching the pitched roof of the appeal dwelling and would be some 2.7 metres high to the eaves and some 4.5 metres high to the ridge.
5. I acknowledge that the pitch of the proposed roof would be shallower than the pitch of the main roof and the proposed eaves would be lower than the roofline of the existing porch. However, the proposed extension would be relatively modest in scale, constructed from matching materials and would have a front window which would be in proportion with the existing windows. Thus, I find the proposed extension is broadly in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling. Nevertheless, it would be positioned to the side of the appeal dwelling between the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties, such that it would not be prominent in the street scene.
6. The proposal would extend and enclose a narrow strip of hard surfacing which runs directly adjacent to a public footpath. I acknowledge that the strip of hard surfacing is an original design feature of the estate and assists to give the estate and the public footpath a relatively open character and appearance. However, there is a larger strip of hard surfacing on the opposite side of the footpath, thus in my view the openness of the footpath would remain with the proposed development in place.
7. For these reasons, I find the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it would accord with the development plan and the good design aims of the Elmbridge Borough Council Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: House Extensions (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal would specifically comply with Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015) and Policies CS7 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) which, taken together, aim to ensure good design and that new development preserves or enhances the character of an area.

Conditions

8. The conditions imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition which requires materials to match the existing dwelling in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR