
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: 20th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3160366

6 Greenways, Esher KT10 0QD

- 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 & Mrs H Hoogendoorn against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1458, dated 5 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is for demolition of existing side extension and construction of two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and upon flood risk.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property relates to a two storey detached house situated within a residential street comprising houses of a similar scale, set within generous plots. The east elevation of the appeal dwelling is particularly visible in the street scene. The proposed crown roof which would facilitate the construction of both the two storey side and rear extensions would increase the overall scale of this flank elevation quite significantly, which would add considerable bulk to the profile of the dwelling. The flat roof element would run counter to the traditional pitched roof forms of the host dwelling and many others within the immediate locality and would, therefore, be contrary to the prevailing pattern of development within the locality.
4. I note that Policy 1.11 of the Council's Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) highlights it is possible to create extensions that are fully integrated on detached houses. However, each case must be assessed on its own merits and cannot be viewed purely in two dimensional form i.e. from the front or rear. By virtue of the continuation of the existing ridge line in a rearward direction and a seamless extension of the eastern flank elevation, the extension would lack subservience in the manner proposed, particularly with regard to the resulting roof form.

5. Therefore, whilst the rear pitch of the extension would match the existing dwelling, the significant area of flat roof that would be created would run counter to what is currently a quite traditional building form. This is notwithstanding the fact that the extension would be set back from the boundary, no terracing effect would occur, nor would the extension over-dominate adjoining properties.
6. However, due to the exposed nature of the flank elevation in the street scene, I find that the proposal, by reason of the overall scale and bulk of the extensions would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene and the wider area. I find the proposal is contrary to Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) (ECS) and Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan (2015) (DMP) which require all new developments to achieve high quality design and to be based on an understanding of local character, which should preserve or enhance the character of the area taking account of the design guidance detailed in the SPD with regard to, amongst other things, appearance, scale, mass and the prevailing pattern of built development in the locality.

Flood Risk

7. It is noted that the appeal site is situated within an area at medium risk of surface water flooding and that ECS Policy CS26 seeks to reduce the overall and local risk of flooding in the Borough, although this policy appears to focus primarily on fluvial flooding as opposed to surface water run-off. Nonetheless Policy CS26 requires development to be located, designed and laid out to ensure that it is safe, the risk of flooding is minimised, whilst not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere.
8. The Council accept that the footprint of the extensions would be sited on existing hardstanding, and the appellants have completed the Council's Flood Risk Assessment Small Scale Development template. They highlight that the proposed ground floor extension would be built 150mm above ground level which would allow any flooding to pass through the extension by virtue of a suspended concrete floor.
9. Whilst the supporting information may not be as detailed as the Council's Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document would require, I consider that on its own, it would not fall against the proposal, as additional details could have been secured by way of planning condition, if I had been so minded as to allow the appeal. I consider that the proposal is broadly compliant with ECS Policy CS26.

Conclusion

10. However, 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