



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2020

by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/19/3240965

1A Avern Road, West Moseley KT8 2JB

- 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 C Holmes against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1696, dated 18 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension and alterations and new boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension and alterations and new boundary wall at 1A Avern Road, West Moseley KT8 2JB subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Plans ahead location plan, 1611 FE10e, 1611 FE11e, 1611 FE12e, 1611 FE13e, 1611 FE14e and 1611 FE15e.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development is taken from the planning application form which provides an accurate description of the development proposed.
3. The boundary wall had been reduced in height at the time of my site inspection similar to that shown on the appeal plans, however, some deviations were apparent between the development and the submitted plans. For the avoidance of doubt, this appeal is determined on the basis of the plans as submitted with the planning application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the first-floor side extension on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

5. Avern Road is a suburban street characterised by close-sited semi-pairs and small detached dwellings set behind short front gardens. In the main, the houses exhibit consistent heights and proportioning with common detailing. The location of the appeal site lies close to an end of the road where development is less consistent. Here buildings include a small terrace, a block of flat-roofed garages, an infill plot and subordinate rear extensions of properties fronting Walton Road.
6. The appeal dwelling appears as an extended and converted former outbuilding to 328 Walton Road. It lies within a shallow plot and with a lower overall height than the original dwellings in the vicinity. The development is set closer to the roadside than the neighbouring building at 2 Avern Road and fills the width of the plot at ground floor level.
7. The proposed first floor extension would extend the building to the common boundary with 2 Avern Road. No.2 sits back from the appeal building on account of the slight bend in the road which gives rise to a minor staggering of development along this part of the street. No.2 has previously been extended at first floor level close to, but short of, the common boundary line. This extension is set back from the front face of no.2 such that it almost aligns with the rear elevation of the appeal building.
8. The Councils adopted Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (2012) (SPD) advocates that extensions above ground floor level should leave a gap to the boundary of at least 1m. This is in order to avoid terracing impacts and retain the character and rhythm of local development.
9. The combination of the gap retained as a consequence of the space to the upper side of no.2 along with the relief arising from the set-back position of the neighbour's extension and the offset position of the buildings would emphasise the visual break between them. The sense of separation would be enhanced by the contrasting finishes of the neighbouring dwellings and lower overall height of the resultant appeal building. Consequently, the disparity in adjacent development arising from its position, materials and scale would avoid it appearing as terracing within the streetscene.
10. Although the development would reduce the space about the upper part of the appeal building as a consequence of filling the plot width at two-storeys, this would not be at odds with the general close spacing of development visible locally. Furthermore, the site lies in a part of the road where development is varied such that it does not continue the stronger sense of rhythm of development along the main runs of houses either side of the road.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would avoid a terracing effect with the adjacent buildings and provide a consolidated form of development within the plot to reflect the mixed character of development on this part of the road. As such, it would be consistent with Policy CS17 Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011), Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015), the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (2012), the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as they seek to protect the character and appearance of locations of new development.

Conditions

12. I have considered the suggested conditions from the Council and had regard to Paragraph 55 of the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance in terms of the use of planning conditions. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.
13. A condition requiring the use of matching external surfaces is necessary and reasonable in the interest of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, the appeal should be allowed.

R Hitchcock

INSPECTOR