The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2017

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3164437
53 Langton Road, West Molesley, Surrey, KT8 2HZ

- 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 Schofield against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2016/2949 dated 7 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2016.
- The development proposed is *'New rear/side extension to the existing house.'*

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two, part single storey side/rear extension at 53 Langton Road, West Moseley, Surrey, KT8 2HZ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2016/2949, dated 7 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:

   i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 1084.01, 1084.02, 1084.03a, 1084.04a, 1084.05a and 1084.06.

   iii) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. I have slightly changed the proposal's description to focus more closely on the actual development involved.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, gable-roofed, detached dwelling of period age. It has a relatively narrow frontage and the proposal seeks planning permission for a side extension, to a width of some 1.2m which would leave a

gap of just over 0.9m between the new flank wall and the side wall of No 55. The submitted plans indicate that the extension would be set back approximately 2.7m from the dwelling's frontage. Above the proposed new front door a catslide type roof would rise to eaves height, where a short section of flat roof would then extend rearwards to a point consistent with the dwelling's main gable. Immediately behind, the extension would continue, but at a much lower point, effectively squaring off a side gap at single-storey level to an existing two-storey rear projection.

5. At my site visit I noted that the street, although predominantly comprising of dwellings of similar age, does show a variety of styles. Further, on the opposite side of the street there are examples of gaps between dwellings being infilled by recessed side extensions, albeit of single-storey height but overlain by pitched, tiled roofs. In this context the most relevant local policies to measure the proposal against are Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan (DMP) and Policy CS17 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS). Both seek high quality design, consistent with the scale and character of the immediate area, the prevailing pattern of development and also harmony with the dwelling itself. Further, the latter policy, along with CS Policy CS7, indicates that new development should enhance the streetscene. I consider that, in this particular instance, the proposed extension's significant set back, along with its sharply sloping front roof, would give the appearance of subordination to the host dwelling. Whilst the roof profiles of the dwelling and that of the intended extension would not necessarily match the combination of the extension's very limited width and recess would play down its effect on both the streetscene and the dwelling itself. The only window visible from the front would be a narrow skylight.

6. I note that the Council has expressed concern as to the proposed flat roof directly behind the extension's front pitch. However, this narrow section is also of very limited area beyond which the extension drops to single-storey height. In terms of materials it is intended that the walls be of painted render to match the host dwelling whilst the use of tiles on the extension's front roof would blend with those which currently sit on the prominent, full width, canopy which pitches over the front bay window.

7. Although the resultant gap to the flank wall of No 55 would be slightly below the 1m guidance as set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Design & Character' (SPD) and the proposal might not actually enhance the streetscene in its true sense, I do not consider that the extension's design and height would be harmful in its setting. Moreover, when taking together all the other factors discussed above, I am satisfied that the proposal would represent an appropriate form of development not inconsistent with the objectives of the relevant local policies referred to.

8. I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of either the host dwelling or its surrounding area, and there would be no material conflict with DMP Policy DM2, CS Policies CS7 or CS17, the aims of the Council's SPD or relevant advice within the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal succeeds. As regards conditions, in the interests of certainty I impose a

condition requiring that the development be implemented in accordance with the approved plans. Finally, to ensure a satisfactory appearance I also impose a condition requiring for the use of external materials to match that of the existing dwelling.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR