
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/17/3174974

1 Falaise, Egham TW20 0BB

- 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 G Dolden & Associates against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RU.16/1560, dated 19 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to the front of the property.
-

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 property is a detached single storey dwelling that occupies a prominent and elevated corner position at the junction of Falaise and A30 Egham Hill. It is located at the end of a small well-established residential cul-de-sac, typically characterised by detached two storey dwellings set back from the road behind front gardens/driveways. No. 1 Falaise (No.1) being situated on a corner plot has even more expansive grounds, which add to the open character and appearance of the street scene.
 4. The proposal would involve the construction of a single storey pitched roof extension incorporating the existing flat roof kitchen area at the front of the property. The extension would project forward from the existing kitchen up to the back edge of the footpath extending across the frontage and about 4.5m from the side of the property towards the A30. Two car parking spaces would be provided at the front.
 5. The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale and siting, would impact on the openness and character of the plot in relation to the surrounding area. Such positioning, on what is a characteristic open gap between No. 1 and the adjacent road, would compromise the sense of space and openness. These shortcomings are exacerbated by the extension's prominent and elevated position, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Falaise and Egham Hill. As such I consider that the proposed extension would
-

result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition to the street scene that would adversely harm the character and appearance of the area.

6. I have considered the appellant's statement that the design of the proposal has been carefully considered in order to take into account the character of the host property and the area and to create additional accommodation to meet the modern requirements for larger families. I note that the proposal has been redesigned following the previously refused application at the appeal property in June 2016¹. Whilst the use of matching materials, fenestrations and the pitched roof design would assist in integrating the proposal with the area, they would not overcome the adverse effects outlined above. I therefore accord these matters limited weight.
7. I have noted the other development in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. The single storey extension built on the enclosed garden area at the side of the existing two storey dwelling at No. 6 Falaise has different development characteristics to the appeal scheme. I therefore accord this limited weight as precedent in this case.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Saved Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alterations 2001 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Document: Householder Guide 2003. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that extensions to existing dwellings are sensitively designed so that they respect the scale and form of the original building, character of established residential areas and the townscape character including the existing buildings, street pattern and the streetscene.
9. In addition, it would not accord with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework that development should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 17); to respect the local character (paragraph 58); and that poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should be refused (paragraph 64).

Other Matters

10. I have noted the objections from local residents to the proposal. However, in light of my findings on the main issue of the appeal, my decision does not turn on these matters.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR

¹ RU.16/0326