
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2017

by R J Jackson BA MPhil DMS MRTPI MCMI

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

Decision date: 20 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/17/3177081

11 Springfield Grove, Sunbury-on-Thames, Surrey TW16 6NT

- 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 Miss T Holloway against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00288/HOU, dated 14 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is first floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor front extension at 11 Springfield Grove, Sunbury-on-Thames, Surrey TW16 6NT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00288/HOU, dated 14 February 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, DOK/16/TH/01, DOK/16/TH/02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matter

2. In the grounds of appeal reference was made to the London Plan. However, the appeal site lies outside London and as such the policies within that plan are not relevant to the consideration of this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Springfield Grove is a cul-de-sac with a loop at the end. The properties on the southern side and at the end of the loop are similar in design being two storey detached houses with hipped roofs although there is some variation as to the materials. The properties on the northern side are of a different design character addressing the street differently.

5. As originally constructed the properties on the southern side had a forward single storey element, which I am informed, was a garage. Above this was a reasonably tall parapet wall which created an area where an oil tank was located, but due to the parapet walls this was not visible from the street.
6. Some of these front extensions have been the subject to alterations. Most have been converted to habitable accommodation, and some have had the roofs replaced with lean-to roofs. One has been made double width, and another has had the front parapet wall replaced by a railing creating a balcony. The overall effect of all these changes is to provide variation to the street scene, but I noted that none had had an enclosed first floor. The proposal is to enlarge the front extension by adding a first floor with a gabled roof above.
7. Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (the CS) makes clear that development should meet a high standard in design, making a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area, paying due regard to scale, height, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings.
8. Pursuant to this policy the Council has published a Supplementary Planning Document entitled "Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development" (the SPD). This document states it is intended to assist designers and home owners to create acceptable schemes which fit in with the character of a locality, are well designed and have no significant unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties. This is in accord with paragraphs 17 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which indicate that development should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, and should aim to respond to local character and history reflecting the identity of local surroundings and materials. In light of this I am able to give the SPD significant weight.
9. The SPD notes that front extensions are prominent and can have a significant impact both on the street scene and the appearance of the host building. The SPD continues that front extensions should be behind the prevailing building line, whether they are single or two storey, unless they clearly do not detract from the street scene or cause problems to neighbouring properties. It states the roof form should reflect the design of the host building and overall the proportion, symmetry and design detail in relation to the host building will be particularly important.
10. In this case the proposed extension would be no further forward than the existing front element. By utilising a gable front element this would not follow the existing hipped roof detail of the building. However, the eaves of the gable would line up with the host property providing a sub-servient element. This variation in design would maintain the existing variety shown within the houses on this southern side of Springfield Grove. In addition it would maintain a coherent design approach as a number of the properties already have Classically inspired design features. It would make a positive contribution, and subject to the materials matching the existing building which can be controlled by condition, would pay due regard to scale, height, materials and other characteristics of the area.
11. As such the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policy EN1 of the CS, the SPD as set

out above, and paragraphs 17 and 58 of the Framework, again as set out above.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the national Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the materials used are to match the existing property to protect the appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

RJ Jackson

INSPECTOR