

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5TH December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/22/3305102

72 Manor Road North, Esher, Surrey KT10 0AD

- 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 Andrew Meatyard against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/1173, dated 12 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front extension, first-floor rear extension, front porch, roof extension incorporating increase in ridge height and front/rear rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the application form; I note that the Appellant also uses this on the appeal form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached property fronting a well-used road and with a driveway alongside to a small cluster of homes to the rear. The range of homes locally come together to present an established neighbourhood of residential character with pleasing suburban appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 5. In summary, the Council is concerned about the overall planned scale and crown element of the main roof and also the flat roofed form of the rear first floor extension.
 6. I found the existing property to be something of an anomaly locally in that it is gable-ended rather than hipped and has a somewhat bland set-back front elevation and overall appearance. To my mind the proposed extension work on the frontage would be a visual improvement as would the introduction of a
-

hipped roof approach. I would not read the proposed scale of the roof to be excessive within the wider context. I would agree with the Appellant that the use of a crown roof here would be outweighed by overall architectural enhancements and would be neither jarring on the eye nor out of sync with some other roofs found locally.

7. Regrettably I would not be so sanguine about the planned first floor rear extension. The flat roofed form here would look ill at ease and lack any sense of good design. Properties locally make good use of pitched roof original or new adjuncts and this partly defines local character. The planned scheme would not be visible from the main road but would be visible to local residents and in any event whatever the degree of visibility I could not condone poor design. I do appreciate the Appellant's thinking on minimising bulk to neighbours but I do not find that argument over-riding. Similarly, whilst some local flat roofed bays are cited, I would not see those modest and subtly shaped and fenestrated projections in the same light as this ungainly box-like rear extension.
8. Policies CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015 are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that new development embodies high quality design, contributes positively to local character and appearance, and exemplifies local distinctiveness. For the reasons given above I conclude that there would be conflict with these policies.
9. The policies have objectives that are also reflected in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document on 'Design and Character' 2012. In my opinion the scheme would run contrary to its main aesthetic aims albeit this publication cannot be expected to cover every eventuality.

Other matters

10. I sympathise with the wish to extend and re-model this dwelling and recognise that the scheme would improve the internal accommodation available. I note that neighbours did not raise objection on design grounds to the proposal.
11. I have given thought to the 'fall-back' 'permitted development' argument. However, it is not in my remit to determine the bounds of any such allowance as they might apply to this property; the appeal scheme would not be permitted development; and I have no evidence that any permitted development, if applicable, would be implemented. In any event I have an appeal relating to a refused planning application before me which I must determine against planning policies and other material considerations.
12. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
13. The National Planning Policy Framework has been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR