



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/19/3239573

22 Montford Road, Sunbury On Thames TW18 6EJ

- 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 A Watford against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01079/HOU, dated 1 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Procedural Guide Planning Appeals – England states that only the person who made the planning application can make an appeal. In this case, the appeal was lodged by Mr Adam Watford. The applicant subsequently provided clarification in writing that they are the same person. Nevertheless, as the appeal cannot technically be transferred to another person, it must continue in the original name of the applicant. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The appellant has suggested an alternative scheme for the extension of the appeal property, which would reduce the extent of the forward projection. However, the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that I determine this appeal on the basis of what was considered by the Council, and on which interested parties' views were sought.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is situated in Montford Road, a residential street primarily formed of semi-detached dwellings of a coherent form, scale and layout. In particular, the dwellings are positioned parallel with the street along largely continuous building lines. Although there have been numerous alterations to the ground floor footprint of dwellings to the front, these have not necessarily diminished the rhythm created by the façades of dwellings in the street being largely uninterrupted above ground floor. Taken together these features make

a significantly positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposal is for a two-storey extension that would project forward of the front façade of the appeal property. I appreciate that the extension has been designed to be subordinate to the house, with its ridge set down from the ridge of the existing dwelling and could be constructed to a high standard using a sensitive palette of materials to match the existing dwelling. Nonetheless, the scale and design of the extension would be inharmonious with the consistent rhythm of the façades of dwellings found within the street. The proposal would therefore be significantly at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
7. I have been referred to several approved developments in Montford Road¹, but as the proposals are for two-storey side extensions and single storey front extensions they are not comparable with the appeal scheme before me. Moreover, as I have alluded to above, the extensions to the side and the scale and form of the single storey extensions to the front do not interrupt the street scene to the extent of the proposal.
8. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a significantly detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. Hence, the proposal would not accord with Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (Adopted 26 February 2009) and the Supplementary Planning Document 'Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development (April 2011). Together the policy and guidance require that new development should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which it is situated, paying due regard to, amongst other things, scale, height, layout and building lines. In particular, front extensions should be behind the prevailing building line, whether they are single or two-storey, unless they clearly do not detract from the street scene.

Other Matters

9. I note that the additional accommodation proposed is required to meet the needs of the appellant and his family. However, this would be a compelling reason to allow development that I have adjudged to be harmful. This matter does not therefore lead me to a different conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR

¹ The applications relate to Nos 2, 3, 7, 10, 13, 19, 33 and 41.