



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2020

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/19/3243479

1 Everest Road, Stanwell, TW19 7EA

- 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 Sonu Dhiman against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01024/HOU dated 23 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a part single storey, part two storey, front side and rear extension, including the installation of an additional dormer and roof light in the roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the proposal as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the impact of the proposal upon the character of the host dwelling and the character of the area.

Reasons

4. The appellant's submission seems to suggest that the Council have concerns over the principle of the proposal, however, I do not find this to be the case. The matters before me within this appeal are those outlined as the main issues above. The Council's concerns are related to the proposed two-storey side and rear extension and the rear facing dormer. The principle of the development being acceptable as a starting point is a neutral consideration.
5. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey, detached, garage to the side and a driveway to the front of the property. I note, from both the plans and my site visit, that the property already benefits from a single storey rear extension which projects six meters from the original rear elevation. There is also an existing dormer in the rear elevation. Both of these elements were constructed under permitted development and/or prior approval notification.
6. The two-storey side extension I find, as a result of its restricted width, to present as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling itself. Despite this the Council's Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development

Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD) is clear in its requirement for a one-meter set-back for two-storey extensions. Without this required set-back I find that the proposal, as submitted, would mean that the pair of semi-detached properties would look unbalanced as a result of the two-storey massing on the same building line at the appeal site thus impacting upon the character of the area.

7. The two-storey side extension would also contain a rear dormer in addition to the already prominent dormer in the roof of the host dwelling. The dormer within this appeal would not meet any of the dimension criteria which are set out in the SPD. It would also include a flat roof which presents as unsympathetic compared to the existing pitched roof of the host dwelling. I acknowledge it would be, to an extent, a continuation of the existing dormer but this was constructed without design control from the Council and I find that the cumulative impact would result in an incongruous, overly dominant, feature in the rear of the property in which the original roof is, visually, completely lost.
8. The second storey rear extension I find presents as awkward in its design. The use of a crown roof, with an area of flat roof at the ridge, does not relate well to the proposed dormer. Additionally the extension does not expand for the full width of the property, presumably to not to encroach past the 25-degree line for the neighbouring property. The second storey extension appears to have been designed in a contrived manner which does not relate well to the host property and would overall result, with the existing extension, in a two-storey extension 6 meters beyond the original rear wall of the host dwelling.
9. The cumulative impact of the proposals I find completely engulfs the host dwelling resulting in an unacceptable impact upon the character of the host dwelling. Given that the property is at the end of Everest Road, with Wellington Court being to the East, the rear and side elevation is relatively open in views from this area and within the street scene. The scale, bulk and massing of the extensions combined I find would have an unacceptable impact upon the character of the area where, despite some extensions, the properties are all relatively modest with their original form not having been lost to extensions as would be the case with this appeal proposal.
10. Photographs of properties along Everest Close have been provided by the appellant and I acknowledge that properties have been extended in varying forms, however, I have no evidence before me to suggest that the extensions come close to the volume which is proposed within this appeal. Other development does not set a precedent, each case should be considered on its own merits.
11. The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework) is acknowledged to seek effective use of land however, this is not at the expense of appropriate or high-quality design with emphasis being that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. The harm identified is not reduced because the estate is of no special or interest, or in a Conservation Area or subject to any special protections.
12. The proposal would be contrary to Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009 Policy EN1 which requires a high standard in the design of new development and that development should make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area paying due regard to

scale. The proposal would also be contrary to the SPD which sets out expectations for residential extensions to ensure good design.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has submitted examples of other development within the area. The schemes granted consent at 5 & 7 Everest Road were for a single storey front, rear and side extensions/conversion of a garage and are materially different to that proposed within this appeal. The schemes, as a single storey extensions, were subservient and not comparable in scale meaning they carry very limited weight.
14. I noted no. 9A Everest Road when I parked opposite at the time of my site visit. The property was granted consent for a two-storey side extension following removal of the existing garage. It is notable in the plans, and as built, that the extension is both stepped back from the front elevation and has a lower ridge height making it appear subservient to the original dwelling as required by the SPD. This is not the case for the appeal site and, again, the proposal is not comparable to the combined impact of proposals within this appeal meaning it carries very limited weight.
15. 11 Everest Road was granted consent for a two-storey side extension which bears some similarities to the two-storey side extension within this appeal, however, similarly to the other examples submitted this is only one element of what is proposed within this appeal. I would attribute limited weight to the scheme at 11 Everest Road.
16. A number of photographs have been submitted as appendix D to the appellant's appeal bundle, however, I have no information such as location in comparison to the appeal site or evidence of consents granted so can attribute little weight to the properties photographed. None the less, none of them appear to have been extended to the extent the host property would be in the event this appeal was allowed.
17. A large volume of neighbouring support is noted for the proposal, however, support for a scheme which I have found to be contrary to policy is of very limited weight. I note that comments have been made about noise, disturbance and burning of rubbish but these are matters which fall outside the scope of this appeal. The Council have not raised any issues with parking or privacy and have not included these matters within their reasons for refusal. I have no evidence before me to conclude differently on these matters.

Conclusion

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

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR