
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2021

by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/20/3260186

30 Manor Road South, Esher KT10 0QL

- 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 Craig Davis against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1695, dated 13 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey front extension, conversion of garage to living space, front canopy, hip to gable roof extension incorporating rear dormer windows, front roof lights and increase in chimney height of 0.93m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey front extension, conversion of garage to living space, front canopy, hip to gable roof extension incorporating rear dormer windows, front roof lights and increase in chimney height of 0.93m, at 30 Manor Road South, Esher KT10 0QL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/1695, dated 13 July 2020, and 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: MA.00; MA.01; MA.02; MA.03; MA.04; MA.05; MA.06; MA.07; MA.08.
 - 3) The trunk protection and tree protection fencing shown on drawing 2020 shall be installed prior to any equipment or materials being brought onto the site for the purposes of the development hereby permitted. It shall then be retained in place throughout the course of the development, and during this period no construction-related activities shall take place, and no construction equipment or materials shall be placed or stored within the fenced area.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 30 Manor Road South is a detached dwelling located within a street characterised by reasonably large detached dwellings of predominantly inter-war date. The appeal property is one such dwelling. Within this context building designs show variation within the stylistic range typical of the period. This includes in relation to roof forms, which are chiefly hipped, often feature gabled elements, and show diversity in terms of their bulk and mass.
4. The appeal scheme would involve enlargement of the dwelling, including the roof. This would see the current hipped roof form modified through the introduction of gables incorporating 'barn hips' to the sides, a steeper roof pitch to the rear, and flat roof to the top.
5. Flat topped 'crown roofs' and barn hips are neither obvious nor typical features of the original design of inter-war dwellings along Manor Road South. The Council has not however raised any objection to their use, either individually or together. In this regard the Council's particular concern is that their use in combination with a steeper roof pitch to the rear slope would create an excessively bulky roof form.
6. It is apparent that even if the pitch of the rear roof slope remained unaltered, the roof form otherwise created would be bulkier than it is at present. More so when also taking into account the proposed addition of large dormers to the rear roof slope, which again did not draw an objection from the Council.
7. It is also apparent that given the narrow gaps between No 30 and the dwellings to either side, the potential for side profile views of the roof would be extremely limited, and then at best oblique and partially obstructed. In this regard, scope for perception of the asymmetry created by the steeper pitch to the rear would be similarly limited, and it would not therefore be generally appreciable.
8. The increased bulk of the roof would nonetheless be noticeable within the streetscene, and from neighbouring properties. However, in view of my findings above, there would be little difference in the overall perception of bulk whether the pitch to the rear was altered or not. As such the effect on the character and appearance of the area would be little different.
9. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the development would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan, which each seek to secure high quality design.

Other Matters

10. A small side window serving the first floor front bedroom of 28 Manor Road South faces towards to the north elevation, and projecting elements of the front elevation of No 30. Its outlook is therefore limited, but its southward facing orientation means that it receives some sunlight. The proposed front extension would further restrict the outlook from the window, and reduce the amount of sunlight likely to reach it. However, the window does not provide the principal outlook from the bedroom, and nor does it provide the sole or principal source of daylight. That being so, no unacceptable harm would be caused.

11. Concerns have been raised that the occupants of No 30 would be able to see into the bedroom at No 28 by looking through the side panels of the proposed bay window. The proposed bay window and side window would not however be located directly opposite one another, and given their differing orientation, there would be little potential for casual views from No 30 into the bedroom at No 28. As such the privacy of occupants of No 28 would not be harmed.
12. Though further concerns have been raised in relation to overbearing of No 28, given the relative positions of the 2 dwellings, and given that the 2-storey front extension would project any further forward than existing elements, no harmful overbearing of No 28 would arise.

Conditions

13. I have imposed conditions setting out the time period for commencement of the development, and identifying the approved plans, for sake of certainty.
14. I have also imposed a condition requiring the installation of the trunk and tree protection fencing specified within the submitted tree protection plan, and restricting activity which may take place within the fenced area. This condition is required in order to ensure that the tree protection measures indicated are both undertaken and effective, in the interests of safeguarding the tree close to the site.
15. Whilst the Council has requested a condition requiring matching materials, this would not be appropriate given that the plans specify change.
16. In view of my findings regarding privacy above, a condition requiring the obscure glazing of the side panels of the proposed bay window is also unnecessary.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Benjamin Webb

INSPECTOR