



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021 by Alex O'Doherty LLB(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/20/3259783

Fanling, Moles Hill, Oxshott, Leatherhead KT22 0QB

- 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 Ken Pang against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1407, dated 15 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is part ground floor rear/side extension and part first floor rear/side extension, alteration of rear fenestrations and façade.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Fanling is a chalet-bungalow with a hipped roof which contains several dormer windows at both the front and the rear. A large box-like dormer is present on one side. It is set within a large plot and tall hedgerows along the boundaries ensure that the property is very well-screened from wider views. It is situated within a private estate which predominantly consists of large detached dwellings in generously-sized plots, many of which are also obscured from wider views by trees and hedges.
5. The proposed extensions would create a substantial change to the rear of Fanling, most notably by creating wide spans of flat roof. The result would be a bulky box-like appearance, with an overly-dominant set of flat roofs, which would harm the appearance of the rear of the property. The design ethos with respect to creating a contemporary rear in juxtaposition with the more traditional frontage is recognised, but the proposal would greatly diminish the current legibility of the property as a chalet-bungalow, to its detriment. Although the proposal would not increase the ridge height of the property, and

the new central balcony would add some architectural interest, this would not be sufficient to off-set the harm identified.

6. It is recognised that views of the rear of the site are significantly restricted from nearby vantage points, and that the appearance of the front of Fanling would be mostly unchanged, such that the proposal would not impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, but this would not off-set the harm caused by the rear elements of proposal to the host property itself.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property. The proposal would conflict with Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (adopted 2015) and Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (adopted 2011) which collectively require that all new development should achieve high quality design. The proposal would also conflict with the advice given in the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (adopted 2012) that houses with a pitched roof should not have flat-roofed extensions, and with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which provides that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Other Matters

8. The proposal would improve the living accommodation available to the appellant. However, as this would mainly be a private benefit, this has been given limited weight, and it does not outweigh my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex O'Doherty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR