



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: 3 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5635/D/21/3287894

29 Saxonbury Avenue, Sunbury-on-Thames TW16 5EY

- 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 Chris Draper against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01142/HOU, dated 12 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'Erection of a part two storey, part single storey side and front extension, two storey rear extension following demolition of garage and car port'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and,
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring property.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a detached dwelling located in Saxonbury Avenue, a predominantly residential road. There is some variation of dwelling types and sizes within Saxonbury Avenue, however, there remains a strong sense of uniformity arising from the spatial pattern of development, predominance of detached two storey dwellings, use of common materials and a limited number of building styles. The appeal site is typical of the dwellings within Saxonbury Avenue and as such, it makes a contribution to the characteristic uniformity of the streetscene.
4. The appeal proposal would introduce a substantial part single-storey, part two-storey side and rear wrap-around extension. Generally, large extensions are not uncharacteristic of the locality as several dwellings in Saxonbury Avenue have substantial side extensions.
5. The appeal proposal would have no set-back from the front elevation and no set-down from the main ridgeline of the roof. Many of the extended dwellings

within the vicinity have a similar arrangement, however, they maintain a sense of subordination to the original dwelling by making sympathetic use of materials, a hipped roof style and a low eaves forward sloping roof element, which articulates the design and reduces the appearance of mass. This roof design also resembles a different dwelling type prevalent within Saxonbury Avenue, meaning that the design of the extended dwellings integrates well with, and reinforces, the local character.

6. However, whilst the appeal proposal would seek to replicate the forward sloping roof element, it would have a mostly flat roof at the original ridge height of the host dwelling. Further, the low eaves level of the host dwelling and surrounding dwellings would not be reflected in the design and the roof would not be hipped on its southern flank. The southern flank would have a discordant massive appearance as a result.
7. This mass, combined with the depth and overall scale of extensions close to the site boundaries would overwhelm the host dwelling and would create an incongruous massive form of development. The building line makes a stepped change at the appeal site, which results in the southern flank of the host property being visible within the streetscene. The appeal proposal would therefore have a dominant and prominent appearance within the streetscene. In contrast, the flanks of other extended dwellings are generally not so massive and are shielded from view by adjacent buildings.
8. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would not represent a high-quality of design and would not integrate well with, or positively contribute to, the character of the area. Therefore, the appeal proposal would not accord with policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD), adopted in 2009, and the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, development of a high-quality design which is sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

9. The front elevation of the host dwelling is broadly aligned with that of its closest neighbouring property, no. 31 Saxonbury Avenue. The rear elevation no. 31 Saxonbury Avenue is staggered and projects beyond that of the host dwelling. The extended host dwelling would have a greatly increased depth at full two-storey height, abutting the shared boundary with no. 31 Saxonbury Avenue. However, the extended dwelling would project beyond only the recessed parts of the staggered rear elevation of no. 31 Saxonbury Avenue and would generally align with the rest of the rear elevation. As such, the buildings would retain a flank-to-flank arrangement by virtue of the relative positioning of the buildings. Further, the only side-facing windows within no. 31 Saxonbury Avenue already face directly towards the flank wall of the host property and the extended dwelling would not breach a 45 degree sightline from the closest rear elevation windows. Therefore, the appeal proposal would not result in any unacceptable adverse overbearing or overshadowing impacts on no. 31 Saxonbury Avenue.
10. The front elevation of the host dwelling is set significantly forward of its other neighbouring dwelling, no. 27 Saxonbury Avenue. The rear elevation of no. 27 Saxonbury Avenue projects beyond the existing two storey element of the host dwelling; though the single storey car port and garage of the host dwelling extends beyond the rear elevation of no. 27 Saxonbury Avenue. Due to this

arrangement, the rear extension would only project marginally beyond the rear elevation of no. 27 Saxonbury Avenue, and it would not breach a 45 degree line from the nearest facing windows. It would therefore create a flank-to-flank relationship between the properties as is typical of the area.

11. However, the existing host dwelling projects significantly beyond the front elevation of no. 27 Saxonbury Avenue, and the extended dwelling would be in much closer proximity with the shared boundary. Whilst no. 27 Saxonbury Avenue is situated to the south of the appeal site and thus potential for significant overshadowing by the extended dwelling would be limited, the massive southern flank wall would have an overbearing impact on the front of no. 27 Saxonbury Avenue, particularly at the currently open-aspect first-floor level.
12. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of occupiers of a neighbouring dwelling, contrary to policy EN1 of the DPD, as well as the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, development of a high-quality design which avoids harmful impacts on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Conclusions

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

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR