



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2022

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24TH February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K33605/D/21/3286489

32 Blair Avenue, Esher KT10 8BQ

- 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 Pavel Sandhu against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/2263, dated 21 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 09 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'Part two/ part single-storey side extension, part two/part single-storey rear extension, rear patio and alterations to front driveway and fenestration following demolition of existing rear projection, detached garage and removal of chimney stack and shed'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form was amended following submission of the application. I have referred to the amended description for the purposes of this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area; and,
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, specifically the effect on no.52 Cranbrook Drive.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling located to the north-east end of Blair Avenue. The eastern side of the site bounds the rear gardens of properties fronting Cranbrook Drive. Blair Avenue and Cranbrook Drive are part of a wider planned estate. There is a variety of building types in the vicinity, however a sense of uniformity arises from the regular spatial pattern, modest building scales, as well as the use of common architectural features, building types and

materials. Blair Avenue has a particularly open character arising from the setback of buildings from the road and spaces between plots, especially at either end of the road.

5. The appeal proposal would introduce sizeable side and rear extensions to the appeal site. The Home Extensions Companion Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) seeks to avoid development which would result in a terracing effect on semi-detached buildings. Whilst the proposal would result in a terraced effect, terraced dwellings are not out of keeping with the area. However, the combined width, depth, height and siting of the proposal would dominate and overwhelm the proportions of the host dwelling and semi-detached pair and would appear incongruous with the modest scale of development in the area. The proposed set-down from of roof from the ridgeline of the host dwelling and the proposed set-back from its front elevation would not create subordination, due to the overall scale of the extensions.
6. Whilst the proposed setback from the front elevation and set-in from the boundary would respect the openness and overall spatial pattern of the area, the dominant extensions would be visible and prominent within the streetscene, partly due to the large gap between the appeal site and the properties fronting Cranbrook Drive.
7. The appeal documents drew my attention to extensions at various properties in the vicinity. Although extended properties are not uncommon, the characteristic scale of buildings within the area remains modest and extensions are generally proportionate in scale to their host dwelling. There are some sizeable extensions to semi-detached properties, however these are generally not as prominent or dominant as the appeal proposal would be.
8. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would fail to respond to local character and standards of design, contrary to policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan (DMP), adopted in 2015, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These policies seek, amongst other things, development of a high-quality design which takes account of local character.

Living conditions

9. The appeal proposal would bring the flank wall of the host dwelling closer to the rear elevation of no. 52 Cranbrook Drive. The appeal proposal would maintain a flank-to-rear distance of 12 metres and would be viewed in the context of the existing dwelling. As such, it would not have an overbearing impact on no.52 Cranbrook Drive.
10. To assess the potential for loss of light into neighbouring properties, the SPD advises that extensions within 12 metres of the neighbouring property should not intrude on a 45-degree angle sightline drawn from the centre of the windows in neighbouring properties. The appeal proposal would intrude on this line. The SPD provides helpful guidance to be considered in the context of the individual circumstances of each site, including siting and aspect. The appeal proposal would not result in any significant loss of light to no.52 Cranbrook Drive by virtue of its distance, the siting and orientation of the properties, and the open outlook afforded to the rear of no.52 Cranbrook Drive by the spatial pattern of the area.

11. The only window within the flank wall would be obscure glazed and non-opening, thereby overcoming any potential additional overlooking of no. 52 Cranbrook Drive.
12. Therefore, the appeal proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring property, in accordance with policy DM2 of the DMP, and the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, development which protects the amenity of adjoining and potential occupiers, and which is designed to offer appropriate outlook, daylight, sunlight and privacy.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons stated above, the appeal proposal would be contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan, in so far as those policies are consistent with the Framework. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR