

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 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/16/3164296

18 Moseley Park Close, East Moseley, Surrey, KT8 0NN

- 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 Christopher Perkins against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/2918 dated 5 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*First floor extension over existing single-storey extension.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached, post-war dwelling, built in a mock-Georgian style. It lies at the end of a cul-de-sac along which the dwellings are all of similar character, set back from the footway and with pleasant front gardens. No 18 is fortunate in that, due to its siting, it has space to the side and has already been extended by way of single-storey side and rear extensions, whilst its garage lies adjacent and is accessed directly off the street's hammer-head. The proposal seeks to build at first floor level over the sections of the side/rear extension to provide for a new en-suite bedroom.
 4. The proposed development, attempts to mirror the dwelling's characteristic hip-ended roof form and, as such, what currently appear as modest, pitched roof, side extensions would be significantly heightened with the dwelling's roof pattern altered to accommodate the new roof sections overlying the first floor accommodation created.
 5. In this particular 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, and the prevailing pattern of development. Further, the latter policy, along with CS Policy CS7, indicates that new development should enhance the streetscene. Here, I consider that, rather than showing subordination to the host dwelling – a usual requirement for residential extensions – the proposal would appear more as a rather fragmented, uncohesive development whose roof form would interrupt and distort the clear and distinct design lines which typify the dwellings along Moseley Park Close. In this regard the proposal also runs contrary to more specific guidance set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Design and Character' (SPD) which advises that new extensions should harmonise with the dwelling's original appearance and should not be detrimental to the streetscene.

6. In light of the above I cannot agree with the appellant's view that the proposal provides continuity of design which is in keeping with the local design characteristics. The proposed introduction of a small, circular window at first floor level to match that below, or the use of matching external materials, are hardly of such materiality as to render the overall design acceptable in its setting.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and its surrounding area, and this would materially conflict with the aims and requirements of DMP Policy DM2, CS Policies CS7 and CS17, and relevant advice within both the Council's SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR