
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 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: 14 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/16/3162757

5 Cavendish Court, Sunbury On Thames, TW16 7SH

- 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 Stephen Walker against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01162/HOU, dated 13 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is one of a semi-detached pair, of which there are five arranged along the length of Cavendish Court. The appeal proposal comprises an extension of the existing two-storey dwelling to fill the space, currently used as garden land, between the side of the existing building and the side boundary of the site. This side boundary abuts the Cavendish Court highway.
 4. The five dwelling pairs on Cavendish Court have been subject to minor alterations and extensions to a minor extent, but the appeal proposal would be the first of this scale on the street. None of these buildings' main side elevations currently abut the highway in the manner proposed within the appeal scheme. The properties adjoining the road currently have fences marking the highway edge, and dwellings are set perpendicularly with the road, and most set back from the street and separated by garden space.
 5. The proposed extension would widen the existing building on the site, which would disrupt the existing clear, regular pattern of development along the street, and also fill the space next to the road. This would reduce the openness of the property and views along the road, and cause it to appear wider and positioned differently with the otherwise harmonious arrangement of dwellings along the street. For these reasons, the development would appear incongruous and out of place when compared with the other dwelling pairs along the street.
-

6. I acknowledge that there are other properties in the surrounding area that have benefited from extensions which are similar to that proposed in this instance. However, because the proposed extension would be harmful to the reasons that I have set out above, I do not consider that these are a suitable precedent for the appeal site.
7. I have also taken into account the parties' views on the proportionate extension width as set out in the Council's adopted Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (2011). However, because of the overall effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and its conflict with the Council's Core Strategy Policy EN1, which requires development to achieve a high standard of design that makes a positive contribution to the street scene, it has not been necessary for me to calculate that end the extension width in precise detail. Additionally, I note the appellant's comments regarding the integrated nature of the design, but consider that any benefits of the proposed extension do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and for the aforementioned reasons, would conflict with Core Strategy Policy EN1.

Conclusion

9. The proposed development fails to comply with the adopted development plan for the area, and it does not therefore meet the definition of sustainable development as set out in the Framework. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR