



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2017

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 25 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/17/3176588

56 Arch Road, Hersham, Walton-On-Thames, KT12 4QR.

- 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 Aitchison against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/0729, dated 5 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side/rear extension following demolition of existing detached garage and outbuildings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property, the street scene and the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the residents of 60 Arch Road, in terms of the potential for it to have an overbearing impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The property the subject of this appeal, number 56 Arch Road, is a two-storey dwelling located at the north-western end of a terrace of four properties. This terrace like that to the south-east, separated by a passageway through to the road behind, Marlborough Close, is in contrast to the terrace of vernacular cottages (60 to 66) to the north-west of the appeal site overly modern, probably dating from the early to mid 1960's. The street is characterised by two-storey semi-detached and terraced properties of a variety of dates and styles.
4. In addition to its rear garden with a garage and outbuilding, number 56 has an uncharacteristically wide side garden between it and number 60.
5. Following the demolition of the existing garage and detached outbuilding, the appellant proposes the construction of a two-storey side and rear extension.

When viewed face on from Arch Road the proposed extension, due to its height, relationship to the host property, fenestration and choice of materials, would appear as a well-mannered addition. However, the property as extended would also be open to view from Marlborough Close to the rear. In addition, due to the property's relationship with number 60, the flank wall of the extension would also be viewed obliquely from the street to the north-west of the site. As a result, all three facades of the extension need to respect the character and appearance of the host property and the terrace of which it is part.

6. The appellant proposes that the rear part of the extension would have a flat roof. While in principle a flat roof might well be an acceptable design solution, that proposed here would be uncomfortably set above the eaves line of the existing property. Despite the extension's distance from the kerb and even if, as suggested by the appellant, the existing conifer were retained, the extension, as designed, would appear as an overly dominant feature when seen from the public domain to the rear.
7. Furthermore, because the flank wall of the projection to the rear would align with that to the side, the flat roof would have an unfortunate unattractive relationship with the pitched roof of the side extension. This would, in my judgement, further serve to exacerbate what would already appear as a bland unattractive and un-modulated side elevation.
8. I therefore conclude, in respect of the first main issue, that the proposed development, as designed, would cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the street scene and the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies CS5 and CS17 of Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 (Adopted July 2011) (CS), Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan - *Development Management Plan* (Adopted April 2015) (DMP), the Elmbridge Borough Council - Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document: Home Extensions (April 2012) (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as they relate amongst other things to the quality of development and the need for it to both integrate with and enhance local character.

Living conditions

9. The neighbouring property to the north-west, number 60 Arch Road, has two windows facing the appeal site. I understand from the evidence that one is a secondary window to a kitchen and the other serves a living area. The Council has stated the proposed extension, that would be off set from the boundary by just over 3.0 metres or so, would not result in a significant loss of either daylight or sunlight. Based on what I have seen and read I would not disagree with its findings in this respect.
10. I note from the Council's evidence that the separation distance between the south-east facade of number 60 and the flank wall of number 56 as extended would be about 4.3 metres. As I observed, and as would not be uncommon between neighbouring properties, there is a 1.8 metre or so high close boarded boundary fence. Accordingly, the outlook from the window to the living area is already compromised to some extent.
11. I appreciate that the only source of outlook from the living area is towards the appeal site. However, given the proposed separation distance and the

likelihood that a 1.8 metre high close boarded fence would in all probability be maintained between the neighbouring properties, on balance I am not persuaded that the proposed two-storey extension would have a significant harmful overbearing impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 60.

12.I therefore conclude, in respect of the second main issue, that the proposed two-storey side and rear extension, by reason of its size, scale and proximity to the boundary with 60 Arch Road, would not be so overbearing as to cause harm to the living conditions of present and future residential occupiers of 60 Arch Road. The proposal would therefore accord with CS Policy CS17, DMP Policy DM2, the SPD and the Framework as they relate to the protection of residential living conditions.

Conclusions

13.I have concluded that the proposed development would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of number 60 Arch Road. However, I consider that this factor is outweighed by the unacceptable harm that would ensue to the architectural integrity of the host property, the street scene and the character and appearance of the area if the development were to go ahead. To my mind, this is a compelling objection.

14.I have considered all the other matters raised, including the appellant's contention that the proposal would provide what he understands to be a much needed 4 bedroom family home in a sustainable location. In addition I have also taken account of the appellant's assertions in relation to his fall back position. However, none change my overall conclusion, reached on the quality of the design and the planning merits of the proposal before me, that the appeal should not succeed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR