
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2021

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/21/3271473

18 Kenyngton Drive, Sunbury-on-Thames TW16 7RX

- 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 Luke Twomley against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00067/HOU, dated 15 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. At the site visit, I saw that there is a ground floor extension in place at the side and rear of the main house, which is not shown on some of the plans or in the photographs provided. It differs in size, position and roof form to the proposal that is before me. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the proposed development as it is shown on the submitted drawings because it was on that basis that the Council withheld planning permission.

Main issue

3. The main issue are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey end terrace house that has an outward projecting entrance porch with a mono pitched roof at the side. No 18 occupies a prominent corner plot on Kenyngton Drive along which residential terraces of similar style and age predominate. As the terrace to which the appeal dwelling belongs is perpendicular to the road, its side elevation and porch are prominent features in the local street scene.
5. The proposal is a ground floor extension at the side and rear of the main house with materials to match those of the existing building. Along the highway frontage of the site to Kenyngton Drive would be a lengthy blank wall right up to and along the back edge of the footway. In this position, the proposed extension would be a conspicuous feature in views from the road.
6. When seen from the highway on the immediate approach to the site, the proposal would draw the eye as the flat roof of the new extension would relate

awkwardly to the mono-pitched roof of the porch to which it would attach and the dual pitched roof of the main house. It would appear as a large 'box like' addition that would be out of proportion with the rest of the appeal building. With no set back from the site's boundary, the proposed arrangement would also be out of keeping with the generally more spacious pattern of existing development on corner plots in the local area where the 2-storey end terrace house is noticeably set back from the road even though in some cases buildings are close to the adjacent highway.

7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development* (SPD) advises that a pitched roof will be required for single storey extensions that are prominent from outside the site. It also states that the design of any pitched roof should follow where possible the style and pitch of the host building's roof. The proposal would be at odds with this advice.
8. The appellant states that the proposal has been designed to match the side and rear addition at 16 Kenyngton Drive, which is situated broadly opposite the site. Few background details of this existing extension have been provided and so I cannot be certain that the circumstances relating to it are the same or very similar to those of the proposal. The Council, for instance, states that the construction of the extension at No 16 predates the adoption of the SPD. From what I saw, No 16 demonstrates that the introduction of new built form in a prominent position when seen from the road can have a significant effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area of which it forms part. The existence of the extension at No 16 is insufficient reason to allow what would be an unacceptable form of development.
9. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it is contrary to Policy EN1 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document and the SPD. This policy and guidance require that new development achieves a high standard of design and layout and positively contributes to the street scene and the character of the local area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR