

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/17/3168516

418 Hurst Road, West Molesley, Surrey, KT8 1QS

- 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 Ms Clare Fitzpatrick against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/2774 dated 18 August 2016 was refused by notice dated 16 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension and extending hip roof to cover new extension with newly formed en-suite and bedroom within up and over pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house which is situated on the corner of Hurst Road and Berkeley Drive. Many of the properties in the vicinity of the site are semi-detached dwellings although these are of varying styles. The buildings are set back from the road behind garden and parking areas on generally consistent building lines, although I was able to see that some properties had been extended. This layout and arrangement, together with the presence of grass verges contributes to the open and pleasant character of the area.
 4. The proposal is for a first-floor side extension to the property, above an existing single storey addition that would be flush with the front elevation of the main property and continue the ridge line across. It would have a width of around 4.2m and would be set away from the side boundary by around 2.65m at the front corner and 1.8m at the rear corner. I appreciate the existing single storey side extension, which runs along the length of the house, already projects beyond the building line along Berkeley Drive and I have also noted the presence of a wide public footpath. However, I do not agree with the appellant that the proposal would only reduce visibility in views along the streetscene by a small margin. The introduction of the first-floor element towards Berkeley Drive, would emphasise its positioning forward of the building line along this
-

road. Given the prominent corner location of the appeal site, and the height and width of the development proposal, it would appear as an obtrusive addition that would harm the spacious character of the area.

5. The appellant has made reference to a number of other properties in the area where similar developments have been undertaken on the side of semi-detached houses. Whilst some details of these referenced extensions have been provided and I note some of the similarities with the appeal proposal, I am not aware of the full circumstances of those cases. In relation to the specific references to No. 350 Hurst Road, I was able to see at the time of my site visit that there is a bend in Wilton Gardens which runs to the side of this property and there is also the presence of dense vegetation along this side boundary, which reduces the visual effects of the side extension's positioning forward beyond the building line. In any event, I am required to determine the appeal proposal before me on its merits.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies CS7 and CS17 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policy DM2 of the Council's Development Management Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, high quality design that enhances the local area. It would also be contrary to the Design & Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

7. I note the appellants' concerns relating to the Council's handling of the application, reference to pre-application consultation and what they state, with reference to the Planning Practice Guidance, is the lack of any contact to discuss and amend the application. These matters do not however have a bearing on the planning merits of the proposal before me and I can confirm that I have dealt with the appeal on its own merits.
8. No objections or concerns were raised by surrounding residents and the proposal would not give rise to a loss of amenity or parking. I have also noted the preparation of a Flood Risk Assessment that addresses matters relating to flood risk. These are however neutral factors and not ones that weigh in favour of the development.
9. Reference has been made to a previous refusal on the appeal site by both parties. I have not been provided with the details of that scheme, and as set out above, each application and appeal falls to be considered on its own merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including reference to the side canopy, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR