

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2017

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/17/3181895

31 Mead Road, Hersham, Walton on Thames, Surrey KT12 4PF

- 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 David Cole against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/1338, dated 25 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extensions, increase in non habitable loft space incorporating roof windows, replacement entrance canopy (existing canopy to be removed) outbuilding at rear to be demolished.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end terraced house. The terrace comprises four properties with No 31 at one end and No 25 at the other end. The two end properties are of the same design with the middle two being a different design. The terrace as a whole has a symmetry and is visually cohesive. Other properties in the street are semi-detached and of different designs. Another terraced row, Nos 13 to 19 are similar to the terrace that the appeal site is within.
4. Core Strategy Policy CS5¹ requires all new development to be well designed and to integrate and enhance local character. Core Strategy Policy CS17 indicates that new development should integrate sensitively with the locally distinctive townscape. Local Plan Policy DM2² establishes that all development should achieve a high standard of design and be based on an understanding of local character. The Elmbridge Design and Character SPD³ provides detailed guidance

¹ Elmbridge Borough Council Elmbridge Core Strategy, July 2011.

² Elmbridge Borough Council Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan, April 2015.

³ Elmbridge Borough Council Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions, April 2012.

for house extensions and amongst other things, advises that consideration should be given to the style and character of the original house and any adverse effect on the street scene or the character of the area.

5. I consider that the proposal would involve a large and unsympathetic extension to the existing dwelling. It would be disproportionate to the original dwelling and out of keeping with the appearance of the terrace. Viewed from Mead Road it would be harmful to the symmetry of the terrace and would not be sensitive to or integrate with the character of terrace. This would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with policies CS5, CS17 and DM2 as well as the advice in the SPD.
6. Other extensions in the area have been referred to but these do not alter my conclusion. I have also considered the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties but do not consider that they would be unduly harmed. The planning application was also accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which I am satisfied addresses any concerns regarding flooding.
7. I have considered all other matters raised but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with the policies referred to. Therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR