

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2016

by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/16/3160234

13 Montford Road, Sunbury-on-Thames, Surrey, TW16 6EQ

- 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 D Leir against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01194/HOU, dated 5 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension following demolition of the existing entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue for the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 13 Montford Road is a two storey detached house in a street of residential properties. Some have small extensions at ground floor level, but the upper floors are largely unaltered and so the simple form of the original dwellings is still one of the prevailing characteristics of the streetscene. The proposal seeks permission for a 2 storey front extension which would replace the existing front porch. It would extend marginally forward of the existing building line and would extend across around half the width of the front elevation.
 4. The dwelling sits in a staggered frontage and this would partly offset the visual impact in views of the side profile from the south. However, in views from the east, due to the width and height of the addition, it would obscure a large proportion of the front elevation. The mass of the addition would not be mitigated by the hipped roofline and would appear unduly prominent, detracting from the simple proportions of the host dwelling. I note that in the wider area there is some variation in appearance of dwellings and that other properties have been extended, with small porches or other single storey additions. However, alterations are generally proportionate in form and as they are single storey do not detract from the wider streetscene. In contrast, due to its 2 storey form the proposal before me would have an intrusive and discordant appearance which would be harmful to both the appearance of the host dwelling, and the character of the area.
-

5. I take into account that a larger 2 storey extension has been added to No 3. This is prominently visible in the streetscene and is notable as the only extension of its type, which does not reflect the more modest proportions of additions elsewhere. I am therefore satisfied that its presence does not provide an acceptable precedent or justify the harm that would arise in this case.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to comply with Policy EN1 of the *Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plans Document*, which seeks to ensure that the design of new development respects and makes a positive contribution to the streetscene and the character of the area in which it is situated. It would also conflict with guidance within the *National Planning Policy Framework* which advises that permission should be refused for development of poor design, which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. It would also conflict with guidance in the "*Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development*" Supplementary Planning Document which has similar aims.
7. I take into account that the proposal would not give rise to harm in relation to highway safety or residential amenity. However, these absences of harm are a neutral factor in the planning balance which cannot outweigh the harm identified in this case. Accordingly, for the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR