

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2017

by G Rollings BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3162213

140 Manor Road North, Thames Ditton, KT7 0BH

- 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 Steven Iffland against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1984, dated 14 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 August 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 140 Manor Road North, Thames Ditton, KT7 0BH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/1984, dated 14 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01A, 13C, 14A, 16B, 17A, 18C, 19A.
 - 3) Flood mitigation measures shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in the Flood Risk Assessment dated October 2016, prepared by Sanderson Associates (Consulting Engineers) Ltd, and shall be maintained as necessary thereafter.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
 - Whether the proposed development incorporates an appropriate drainage strategy and consideration of flood risk.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located on the corner of Dene Gardens. The proposed extension would be located adjacent to the Dene Gardens boundary, which is currently marked with a tall hedge. Dene Gardens is a cul-de-sac of detached houses with varying street
-

- setbacks, and the appeal dwelling and the house on the opposite Dene Gardens corner, at 138 Manor Road North, have large side setbacks of a similar amount.
4. Together, the dwellings at Nos. 138 and 140 form a gateway to the entrance of Dene Gardens. These houses have a similar architectural style, but are not identical. In views along Dene Gardens towards the rear of these dwellings, they appear to have an asymmetrical layout, due to the projecting side elevation of No. 136 and the curve of Dene Gardens in this location. In views of their front elevations, along Manor Road North, there is some regularity in the arrangement of detached and semi-detached dwellings close to Dene Gardens, including the appeal dwelling, but there are also numerous deviations from a common front setback, as a result of the different housing styles and layouts occurring along this street.
 5. Although the proposed extension would alter the existing symmetry of the semi-detached pair of dwellings on the appeal site and its neighbouring property, it would suitably address the street corner, providing an endpoint to the short row of semi-detached dwellings to the east. The existing semi-detached pair and the neighbouring pair to the east have a pleasant architectural rhythm but are not particularly distinguished, and the alteration of the appeal site's symmetry with its neighbour would not be overly detrimental to the character of the pair, or that of the wider area.
 6. The extension would be slightly set in from the existing front building line and roof ridge height, meaning that it would appear subservient to the original dwelling. Although it would extend the dwelling closer to Dene Gardens, it would have a similar appearance to the existing side elevation, and the retention of part of the existing garden between the extension and Dene Gardens would allow for vegetation along its side. Although the extension would cause the dwelling to appear more immediate in views of the property, it would not dominate or overly unbalance the dwelling, or the street scene.
 7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. There would be no conflict with *Elmbridge Core Strategy* (2011) Policies CS8, CS17, or DM2, which together require development to be of high quality and have appropriate regard to the context and character of the surrounding area. These policies are consistent with the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework), which requires development to achieve a high standard of design, as a core planning principle (paragraph 17).

Drainage and flood risk

8. The appeal site is partly located within flood zone 2, with the remainder of the site in flood zone 1. These zones are defined within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)¹, which explains that for the purposes of applying the Framework, flood zone 2 land is categorised as having a 'medium probability' risk of flooding. The Council's Core Strategy Policy CS26 requires development in flood zones 2 or 3 to demonstrate flood resistance and resilience measures in line with current Environment Agency advice. This is supported by the Council's Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (May 2016), which includes guidance for averting risks of flooding, either on site or elsewhere, the home extension proposals.

¹ PPG Reference ID: 7-065-20140306; Revision date: 06 03 2014.

9. The appellant submitted an amended Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which sets out the installation of floodgates has a suitable mitigation measure against the low probable risk of flooding in this area. The FRA assesses the risk of flooding from nearby watercourses, surface water, infrastructure failure, groundwater, sewers, and climate change. Taking into consideration the evidence before me, I consider that the measures set out within the FRA would provide appropriate mitigation against flood risk, while ensuring that the risk of flooding of surrounding areas would not increase. The assessment also includes a personal safety plan, based on the site's partial location within the lesser-risk flood zone 1, which is appropriate in this case.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development incorporates an appropriate drainage strategy and consideration of flood risk, and that there would be no conflict with Core Strategy Policy CS26 or the flood resilience and resistance advice within the Framework (paragraph 103).

Conclusion and conditions

11. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters, I allow the appeal.
12. The Council has provided a list of standard conditions which I have assessed with regard to the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. Condition 2 is required to ensure that the development is carried out as proposed and in the interests of proper planning, and condition 3 is needed to ensure the provision of appropriate flood mitigation measures.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR