
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2017

by Daniel Hartley BA Hons MTP MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 03 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/17/3180145

14 Locke King Road, Weybridge, Surrey KT13 0SY

- 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 and Mrs Stubbs against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/2587, dated 3 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, front bay windows and alterations to fenestration following partial demolition of the existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice rather than from the planning application form as this more succinctly describes the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached house positioned within a corner plot at the junction of Locke King Road with Edge Close. It falls within a predominantly residential area including mainly detached and semi-detached dwellings where the use of brick is the dominant building material. In the main, the dwellings are set well back from roads and there is a sense of space between and around such properties. The area includes trees/vegetation in both garden areas and within land opposite the appeal site. Collectively, these attributes add positively to the character and appearance of the locality.
5. It is proposed to erect a two storey side extension with matching brick and roof tiles. The front of the two storey extension would include two storey bay windows with a pitched roof to match the existing. The two storey side extension would be sited close to the boundary with Edge Close. It is also proposed to erect a timber clad single storey rear extension with a mono

pitched metal sloping roof projecting between approximately 4.5 and 6.0 metres from the rear wall of the existing dwelling. The proposal also includes fenestration alterations to the dwelling including a new front entrance which would incorporate a two storey glazed feature.

6. The main parties have drawn my attention to an appeal proposal (Ref APP/K3605/D/15/3136279) for the host property which was dismissed on 15 January 2016. This proposal was not identical to the subject appeal development and was for a front, side, rear wrap around single storey extension. Unlike this appeal, the aforementioned development included only a single storey side extension. In dismissing the appeal the Inspector commented that there was *"potential for the enlargement of the property"*, but had concerns about such a proposal in terms of footprint, materials, glazing in the rear extension, the miscellany of shapes and angles for the rear extension and overall considered that *"an extension of this size and wrap around form would be unduly prominent and intrusive, and result in harm to the street-scene of both Locke King Road and Edge Close"*.
7. I do not disagree with the views expressed by the Inspector who considered the previous appeal. I have taken the decision into account, as a material planning consideration, in so far that it is relevant to this appeal.
8. The two storey side extension would be positioned about 0.8 of a metre from the boundary with Edge Close. The Council's adopted Design and Character (Home Extensions) Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) states that *"a minimum of 1 metre should be maintained between any extension above ground floor level and the boundary. This will also have the benefit of leaving room for maintenance. Where space will allow and to accord with the rhythm of the streetscape, more than 1 metre should be left at the boundary, particularly in areas of low density characterised by a spacious layout where existing houses are sited a good distance from side boundaries. In such areas the minimum of one metre between boundaries and two storey extensions may be inadequate, and significantly more space should be provided to preserve the character of the area"*
9. The two storey side extension would fall short of the minimum 1.0 metre standard. I acknowledge that this is a corner plot and hence that there is not a dwelling which is adjacent to the side elevation. In this sense, the proposal would not have the effect of linking properties and hence terracing. However, the effect of erecting a two storey extension so close to the boundary with Edge Close would be such that it would unacceptably detract from sense of space that currently exists around the residential plot. Given the height, position and length of this development, coupled with the length of the rear extension, I consider that this part of the proposal would appear dominant and intrusive when viewed from Locke King Road and Edge Close.
10. I acknowledge that the appellant does not want to reduce the width of the side extension as this would have an effect upon the desire to achieve a sense of design symmetry in respect of the host dwelling. However, this is not a detached dwelling. It is semi-detached and the combined effect of the two storey and single storey extensions would be such that they would appear disproportionate and out of scale with the host dwelling. Furthermore, given the overall scale, bulk, width and height of the two storey development, this would have the effect of causing harm to the overall balance and symmetry of

the pair of semi-detached dwellings. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to replicate the bay windows, but the two storey extension would not appear ancillary in scale or appearance to the host property and would appear dominant and intrusive in the street-scene. I reach this conclusion in the knowledge that there is a difference in land levels between the site and Edge Close.

11. I acknowledge that the appellant has made some efforts to reduce the roof angles and shapes associated with the rear extension when compared with the previous appeal proposal. Nonetheless, the proposed roof angle would be at odds with the more traditional roof pitches that exist in the immediate area and extent of the rear glazing would be excessively large in relation to its surface area. In these respects, I consider that the rear extension would be poorly designed.
12. The appellant considers that the aforementioned extension would not be as noticeable in the street-scene as it would be to the rear of the site. However, the rear of the site is conspicuous when viewed from Edge Close despite the existence of boundary treatment. The use of timber cladding for the walls of the rear extension would not reflect the predominant building material in the immediate area (i.e. brick) and the use of a metal or sedum roof would compound my concerns relating to the choice of materials. Furthermore, and as was the case for the previous appeal, the rear extension would be built across almost the full width of the rear garden thereby failing to appear ancillary in scale on the rear of the dwelling. Consequently, it would appear dominant and discordant when viewed from the public realm.
13. The appellant has suggested that he would accept a planning condition which required all walls (including the rear extension) to be built in brick. Had materials been the only issue, then I would have pursued this matter further including also a consideration of the roofing material for the rear extension. However, and for the reasons outlined above, the combined effects of the two storey side and single storey rear extension in overall design and street-scene impact terms would be significantly adverse. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not accord with the design aims of Policies CS4 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011; Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015; the SPD and Section 7 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

14. I have taken into account representation made by other interested parties including letters of support. Many of the comments made have already been addressed in the reasoning above.
15. There is no doubt that the rear extension would be noticeable when viewed from the rear garden and conservatory of No 16 Locke King Road. I have considered the representations made by the occupiers of this property, but do not consider that the rear extension would have a materially adverse impact upon the occupiers of this property in terms of light, privacy or outlook. Nonetheless, there would be some impact. There would be opportunities to consider re-designing this extension including a reduction in height and/or altered roof form. This would address my concerns about the size/design of such an extension and would seek to further minimise the impact of such development upon the occupiers of this neighbouring property.

16. I note the comments made about two storey developments at Nos 12 and 32 Locke King Road. However, these developments are not identical to the appeal proposal. I do not know the exact circumstances which led to these developments being allowed and, in any event, I have determined this appeal on its individual planning merits.
17. The appellant has referred to buildings elsewhere where timber cladding has been allowed including 19 Amber Lane, Esher. Again, I do not know the exact circumstances which led to these developments being allowed. No 19 Amber Lane, Esher is in a different area and I have considered the appeal proposal in the context of the immediate environment. The appellant's references to other extensions and the use of materials elsewhere do not alter my conclusion on the main issue.
18. Like the previous Inspector, I also recognise the appellant's desire to increase floorspace. I do not doubt that it would be possible to increase floorspace in a sensitive and appropriate manner without material harm being caused to the character and appearance of the area. However, for the reasons outlined above the appeal proposal is not acceptable.
19. None of the other matters raised alter or outweigh my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Daniel Hartley

INSPECTOR