

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2016

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/3159849

9 Vaughan Road, Thames Ditton KT7 0UF

- 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 Bess Joffe against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1974, dated 13 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey side extension and new porch.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal relates to an extended semi-detached house situated within a residential street where dwellings have been altered and extended over time. I note that the Council raise no issue with regard to the two storey side extension, therefore my decision centres upon the proposed single storey front projections, namely the garage and porch extensions. The appeal site is situated where there is a slight turn in the road and, therefore, the profile of the front extensions would be more visible than would otherwise be the case.
4. The garage extension would create a gabled feature that would be wider than the two storey side extension, with the eaves also overlapping the principal front elevation of the subject dwelling. I acknowledge that this along with the porch extension has been designed to reflect the gable at roof level, but I consider that it would jar with the current quite simple architectural composition of the existing façade of the dwelling, and would look jumbled in its appearance.
5. With respect to the front porch extension, in two dimensional form, this would sit quite comfortably within the front elevation of the dwelling, however, it would extend significantly from this, as well as the adjacent bay window. I find that the depth of the porch extension would be such that it would appear over dominant, giving rise to an incongruent feature that would be obtrusive in the street scene.

6. I therefore cannot agree that the design approach would reflect the guidance of the Council's Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (2012) which requires extensions to integrate with the appearance of the house. I do however accept that given the single storey nature of the projections that they would not compete with the strong vertical emphasis of the house.
7. I have taken into account the other examples of front extensions cited by the appellant. However, the extensions at 27 and 28 Vaughan Road are not as deep as that the subject of the appeal before me, in addition to being built off of recessed front elevations. I acknowledge that the depth of the extension at 15 Vaughan Road would be similar to the depth of the proposed porch extension, however, whilst it is not for me to comment on the architectural quality, or otherwise of that proposal, each case must be assessed on its own merits.
8. For the reasons given above, I consider that both single storey front extensions, given their siting, scale and design would result in an adverse impact upon the character of the host dwelling, the street scene and the wider area. I find the proposal contrary to Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan and Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, in that all new development should achieve high quality design and proposals should preserve or enhance the character of the area, taking account of the design guidance detailed in the SPD with regard to appearance, scale and character of the host building, in the case of extensions. I also consider that the proposal would be contrary to one of the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework which is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity of all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR