



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2019 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/19/3234181

63 Beauchamp Road, West Molesey, KT8 2PG

- 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 Brendan Power against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1148, dated 24 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a roof extension incorporating an increase in ridge height of 1.3m and side roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a roof extension incorporating an increase in ridge height of 1.3m and side roof lights at 63 Beauchamp Road, West Molesey, KT8 2PG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/1148, dated 24 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, Block Plan and Drawing Nos. 00192-ST19-DR-004 Revision P01, 00192-ST19-DR-005 Revision P03, 00192-ST19-DR-006 Revision P02, 00192-ST19-DR-007 Revision P02.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. I have used the slightly amended description of development provided by the Council for accuracy and clarity, which was also used by the appellant in Section E of the appeal form.

Main Issues

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. Beauchamp Road is a lengthy residential road which is characterised by dwellings of varying scale, with large detached dwellings of differing appearance and design on its eastern end and smaller two storey semi or terraced properties on its western end. The appeal property sits centrally along the road and is one of five detached dwellings in a row that are very similar in appearance, detailing and character, with narrow gabled frontages.
6. The new extension would be set back some distance from the front elevation of the property. Although increasing the height of the rear part of the roof, the extension would not be unduly prominent because of its relationship to Beauchamp Road and the tight knit relationship of the neighbouring properties which would screen it to a degree in views up and down the road. Whilst there would be likely to be views of the extension from dwellings on the opposite side of the road, the change in appearance of the host property would not be sufficient to result in harm to its character or appearance.
7. Although the new extension would be more apparent from the rear, it would be viewed in the context of other properties in the locality which have had a range of rear extensions, such that there is no uniformity of design as suggested by the Council. That uniformity belongs to the front of the properties, and the front elevation of the property in this case would not be adversely affected by the proposal.
8. As such, I find that the proposal would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the host property. The contribution that the property makes to the character and appearance of the area would not be diminished as a result. The character and appearance of the surrounding area would be preserved. There would be no conflict with Policies CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) and DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015) which collectively require development to achieve high quality design and preserve and enhance the character of the area. Furthermore, there would be no conflict with the guidance provided by the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (2012) which states that roof extensions should not dominate the roof. The proposal would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 127), which, amongst other matters, requires development to be sympathetic to local character, visually attractive and add to the overall quality of an area.
9. The Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide (2012) is also referenced by the Council, however I have not been directed to a specific part of this document which appears to provide general area character advice and advice on new build development. I have not taken this document into account in my consideration of this appeal.

Conditions

10. I agree with the Council that conditions requiring materials to match are necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the area, in addition to requiring that the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. However, given their central siting and high level, a condition is not necessary to control the glazing of the new windows as it would be unlikely that they would result in any loss of privacy to nearby occupiers.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR