
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/W/17/3167116

31 Glebeland Gardens, Shepperton TW17 9DH

- 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 Hackland against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01803/FUL, dated 31 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of new 1 bed maisonette on land adjoining existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (1) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and (2) the adequacy of the proposed parking arrangements.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal relates to an end of terrace two storey cottage. There is a unified appearance to the terrace in respect of its external materials, a brick buttress to the front of each dwelling, a white band over the frontage door and window openings and a regular rhythm to these openings between areas of brickwork. Originally the terrace comprised six dwellings, but two additional dwellings have been added to the opposite end of the terrace. These reflect the size and design of the other dwellings. All have a small rear yard backing on to a park, and a long front garden beyond a path providing access to the front doors.
4. The proposal would resemble other dwellings in the terrace in relation to its width and window design at first floor level. However, at ground floor level a different design approach would be followed to allow for a right of way that crosses the site. The ground floor accommodation would be of reduced width and set back from the frontage to create an undercroft for bins, cycles and possibly a small car. The first floor and roof would be supported on three columns. A single bedroom would be located within a rear dormer to match that built at no.31 under permitted development allowances.

5. The character and appearance of the maisonette would contrast starkly with that of other dwellings in the terrace. Many of the features I have identified such as the rhythm of window and door opening that help to formulate the present strong unified character of the terrace would be absent in the proposal. The new dwelling would also be conspicuous, being the first property in the terrace when approaching from the main carriageway to Glebeland Gardens. The plans show that it would have a rear patio garden of only 7 sq.m. but unlike others in the terrace no long front garden; it would be cramped by comparison.
6. Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (adopted February 2009) requires a high standard of design and layout to new development and that it should make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area. The differences in the design and layout of the proposal in relation to other dwellings in the terrace are such that they would undermine its unified character and its pleasing appearance in the surrounding area. The proposal would not make a positive contribution to the street scene and would thereby be in conflict with Policy EN1.

Parking

7. The undercroft parking space would be only some 4 metres in length, below the standard size for a parking space. If a car is driven into the space in forward gear, the driver would have poor visibility when reversing out. A large car parked in this space would project across the footpath access to the other cottages, inconveniencing pedestrians. No information is provided on the plans on how a car in this space would manoeuvre in relation to other parking spaces along the access from the main carriageway of Glebeland Gardens where other cottages in the terrace have their parking spaces.
8. Policy CC3 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (adopted February 2009) requires appropriate provision to be made for off street parking in development proposals. The proposed parking space is of inadequate size and of poor design. It is in conflict with Policy CC3.
9. The appellant has pointed out that the proposal would make a contribution to the local housing need and that the dwelling would meet accessibility criteria in the Building Regulations. It is also suggested that in view of the site's location near to a town centre, that a parking space is arguably not necessary for a one bedroom dwelling. However, one has been proposed and these factors do not outweigh the clear harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified and the sub-standard nature of the parking space indicated. As the proposal would be in conflict with the development plan, it would also be in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework as a whole.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the development would have a significantly adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, and that the proposed parking arrangement would be unsatisfactory. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR