

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: 11 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/17/3168778
43 Monks Avenue, West Molesey, KT8 2HD

- 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 Alan Clarke against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/3827 dated 20 November 2016 was refused by notice dated 20 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the alteration of existing side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the alteration of existing side/rear extension at 43 Monks Avenue, West Molesey, KT8 2HD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2016/3827 dated 20 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Existing Ground Floor Plan/Proposed Through Section A-A, Existing Front Elevation/ Existing Rear Elevation, Proposed Roof / Existing Roof, Existing Side Elevation / Proposed Side Elevation (Detached Side), Existing Side Elevation / Proposed Side Elevation (Attached Side), Ground Floor Proposed Plan, Proposed Rear Elevation, Block Plan, Plan View Detail of Roof Abutment, Section View Detail, Existing Ground Foot Print and Property Outline.
 - 2) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, a scheme for a sample of the render material to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the northern wall of the extension hereby permitted shall be submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority and the scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / sample.
 - 3) Within 3 months of the date of this decision a personal flood plan shall be submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority. The plan shall provide details of the procedures for flood warning and evacuation, and a timetable for its implementation. Once implemented, the personal flood plan shall be retained as such thereafter.
-

Procedural Matter

2. An extension was already in place at the time of my visit, although, it was not in a finished condition. The proposed plans indicate that the extension would have a pitched roof to the north and south, either side of a central flat roof element; they also show a proposed water proof render finish to the northern side elevation. For clarity, I am dealing with the appeal based upon the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow located on the western side of Monks Avenue, a cul-de-sac which in the vicinity of the site is formed of detached and semi-detached bungalows. There is some variance in the exterior materials used on nearby properties with render, brick and facing tile materials all evident. However, the buildings have distinct gable features, with the semi-detached properties having forward projecting gables and a symmetrical appearance to each other. This similarity gives the area a degree of coherence and the presence of low front boundary treatments, vegetation in front gardens together with street trees and grass verges, contribute to the open and leafy character of the area.
5. The appeal development consists of an extension to the rear of the property, along the boundary with No. 45 Monks Avenue. Whilst I recognise its long overall projection at around 8.8m, it would partly be situated to the side of the existing dwelling. The projection past the rearward extent of the original dwelling is therefore more limited and I was able to see at the time of my visit, that it is seen in the context of other properties with a range of differing building projections to the rear, including some extensions.
6. The appeal property has a pitched roof with the rear projection on the original dwelling having a hipped roof form. The proposal, seeks to reduce the eaves height of the rear extension and incorporate a part pitched roof to the sides of a flat roof. As the eaves height of the appeal development would be aligned with that of the main dwelling and given that it would incorporate pitched roof, it would have a subordinate and satisfactory appearance in relation to the main dwelling.
7. I was able to see the appeal development from No. 45 Monks Avenue at the time of my visit, where the northern elevation of the extension has been formed of blockwork and have also been supplied with 'before' photos which appear to show this elevation previously partly in brick. I acknowledge that the blockwork wall has an incongruous appearance, but the submitted plans and other information on the appeal submission shows the blockwork will be finished in render. Whilst the remainder of the property is constructed in brick, I was able to see that render is utilised on properties in the area and consider that it would provide a sympathetic finish to the appeal dwelling.

8. I therefore conclude that the appeal development would not have unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property. It would not conflict with Policies CS7 and CS17 of the Council's Core Strategy or Policy DM2 of the Council's Development Management Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, high quality design. There would also be no conflict with the Design & Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions or the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek, amongst other matters, the design of an extension to achieve an appropriate relationship with the existing house.

Other Matters

9. Concerns have been raised in relation to the loss of light and the extension being an intrusive development on the neighbouring property at No. 45. I acknowledge the extension does have a long projection along the common boundary with this neighbouring property and is visible from differing parts of this house. However, given the single storey form and the proposed eaves height of the extension as well as the separation to the side and rear facing windows of this neighbouring property, I agree with the Council that it would not amount to unacceptable harm in this regard or on the use of this neighbouring property's garden.
10. I note that the extension has been constructed prior to obtaining permission and that there have been a number of applications submitted for it. Each application and appeal must be determined on its own merits and I have considered the current proposal on the evidence before me.
11. I have also had regard to all other matters raised in representations, including in relation to maintenance and the serving of notices for building work did not take place, but there is nothing which would lead me to a difference conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

13. As the development has already begun, the suggested condition relating to the commencement of the development is not necessary. It is necessary for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition is also necessary to ensure the appearance of render on the northern wall of the extension is acceptable and is secured within an appropriate time period to be agreed with the LPA, although the standard suggested condition on materials is not required in this instance given the satisfactory appearance of the brick finish on the remainder of the extension. A condition requiring a personal flood plan is also reasonable and necessary given the site is in a Flood Risk Zone 3a.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR