



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 28 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3156028

432 Hurst Road, West Molesey, Surrey, KT8 1QS.

- 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 and Mrs Frank Andreas against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0772, dated 4 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension at 432 Hurst Road, West Molesey, Surrey, KT8 1QS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/0772, dated 4 March 2016, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings numbered: OS, 01, 02, 03, 04 dated December 2015 and 05, 06, 07 and 08 dated February 2016.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host building, the street scene and thereby the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, number 432 Hurst Road, is a detached two-storey dwelling. It has a conservatory addition to the rear and a large, unattractive utilitarian carport on its east side.
4. It is located, in a prominent position, facing Hurst Road on the corner of Hurst Road and Boleyn Drive. Although Hurst Road is a busy through road, Boleyn Drive and the area to the south is residential in character, comprising a mix of semi-detached and terraced houses that, together with number 432, all appear

to have been part of a planned estate. Number 434, to the west of number 432, also facing the main road, is one half of a semi-detached house the other half of which, number 436, has a large two-storey side addition.

5. The appellants propose the demolition of the carport and the construction of a part two, part single storey extension to the east side of the house, comprising a study and living room extension on the ground floor and a new bedroom and en-suite shower room over.
6. The removal of the existing carport is to be welcomed. The proposed extension has been designed not only to reflect the architectural style and vernacular form of the host property but also, due to its scale, to appear subservient to it. Overall I consider the proposal would result in a well-mannered addition to the dwelling that would complement it and its setting in the street scene. Further, having regard to the scale of the neighbouring semi-detached dwellings to the west, the proposed addition would not make the house as extended appear overly dominant.
7. Number 432 is a detached house located on a corner plot. Accordingly, therefore, any extension here needs to both reflect the uniqueness of the property as a detached dwelling, amongst semi-detached and terraced houses, as well as its function, in townscape terms, to address its important corner plot location. I appreciate, as identified by the Council, that the extension would project in front of a notional building line currently defined by the street façades of the houses on the west side of Boleyn Drive and, due to the property's siting on a corner plot, the house as extended would become more visible in the street scene. However, in these circumstances, given that the design of the extension would be acceptable, I do not consider that either a breach of a notional building line or the fact that the house as extended would be slightly more prominent would, in themselves, cause harm to either the street scene or the character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would not cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host building, the street scene or the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS7 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (Adopted July 2011), Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan-*Development Management Plan* (Adopted April 2015) and the advice contained in the Elmbridge Local Plan-*Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document* (Adopted April 2012) as they relate to the quality of development and the need to protect the character of an area.

Conditions

9. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I have included a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension. In the interests of certainty, I shall also impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole, and that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR