

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2016

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

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

Decision date: 19 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3159420

9 Hengest Avenue, Esher, Surrey, KT10 0BP.

- 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 Mrs Pooja Shanthraj against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application ref: 2016/1450, dated 5 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is: "Hip to gable Velux."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed hip to gable extension upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 9 Hengest Avenue comprises one of a terrace of modern houses. It is part of an extensive mixed residential estate that was constructed upon land forming part of the Metropolitan Green Belt.
4. In terms of its impact upon the Green Belt, I acknowledge that the proposal before me falls within the exceptions to Green Belt policy set out at paragraph 89 of the Framework¹ in that it would represent an extension and alteration to a building that would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. For these reasons, therefore, development as proposed would accord with national policy in the Framework and Policy DM18 of the Local Plan².
5. As part of my site visit I noted that there have been a number of alterations to dwellings nearby which incorporate hip to gable extensions. Most notably, that to 31 Hengest Avenue is similar to the scheme now before me. However, the

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework.

² The Elmbridge Local Plan: Development Management Plan (adopted April 2015).

works to that property have retained a small section of pitched roof to the flank elevation, together with the existing guttering and fascia. This has the effect of reducing the impact of the new gable end. By contrast, Drawing no. 4 of the submitted plans indicates a full height rendered wall to the exposed part of the south elevation. This unattractive and unrelieved section of flank wall would be at odds with the modest credentials of the host dwelling.

6. The gap between 9 and 15 Hengest Road to the south, at some 10m, is much greater than between nos. 29 and 31 (approximately 4m). Consequently, the scheme before me would be far more visible within the street scene than the alterations to no. 31, to which my attention was specifically directed. As such, it would represent an over-dominant feature in the street scene.
7. These factors, in combination, have led me to find upon the main issue that on balance development as proposed would have an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area contrary to Policies CS8 and CS17 of the Core Strategy³ and Policy DM2 of the Local Plan.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

³ The Elmbridge Core Strategy (adopted July 2011).