



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2023

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31ST January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/22/3308845

5 Summer Road, East Molesey, KT8 9LX

- 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 and Mrs Hanline against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/1504, dated 12 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear roof extension incorporating raise in ridge height, installation of side roof lights and alterations to rear fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear roof extension incorporating raise in ridge height, installation of side roof lights and alterations to rear fenestration at 5 Summer Road, East Molesey, KT8 9LX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/1504, dated 12 May 2022 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 4117135-5 Summer Road - Site and Location Plan; 4117135-5 Summer Road Rev C Split 01; 4117135-5 Summer Road Rev C Split 02; 4117135-5 Summer Road Rev C Split 03; 4117135-5 Summer Road Rev C Split 04; 4117135-5 Summer Road Rev C Split 05.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, unless stipulated in the approved plans.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the determination of the application, the council made a minor alteration to the description of development to more accurately reflect the development proposed. The appellant used the revised description on their appeal form. I have therefore used the revised description of development included on the decision notice.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposals on the character and appearance of the area.
4. Summer Road is a pleasant residential street, with a suburban character, where the appeal property (No5) backs on to the River Ember. The street has a mix of semi-detached and detached two storey houses with small front gardens and good-sized rear gardens all designed in a variety of styles. All appear to have been constructed around the turn of the century. At the site visit, I noticed a significant number of dwellings within Summer Road had been subject to a variety of extensions and alterations.
5. No 5 is flanked by similar dwellings, which are characterised by gable frontages which creates a strong 'serrated' roof pattern along this part of the street scene. The appeal proposals would result in a substantial rear extension of the full width of the host dwelling to create a fourth bedroom and bathroom. The extension would also add a section of roof with a higher ridge to the rear, but mirroring the same pitch as the existing.
6. Policy CS17 (Local Character, Density and Design) of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) (CS) requires development proposals to account for established character, density and design within an area.
7. Policy DM2 (Design and Amenity) of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015) (DMP) seeks development that preserves or enhances the character of the local area.
8. The Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (2012) (SPD) provides advice and general guidance on the design principles for residential extensions. It seeks to avoid unsightly extensions which ignore the style and character of the original house, where it would adversely affect the appearance of the street scene.
9. The proposed raised ridge of the extension would add 1.3m to main roof and would be set back approx. 4m from the front elevation, behind the existing chimney stack. Whilst the proposed extension and alterations would be significant, I consider that the view of the principal elevation would not be dramatically different as a result of the raised ridge line of the rear extension.
10. At the site visit, I viewed No22 Summer Gardens, which had with a similar extension to that of the appeal proposals, although it was difficult to view in its entirety from a pedestrian perspective. The appellant included details of appeal decision APP/K3605/D/17/2184710 which was the appeal proposal for No22. I have considered the Inspector's views on this. However, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
11. From the rear, many of the properties along Summer Road have clearly been subject to enlargement and extension. The proposed extension subject to this appeal would add additional volume and bulk to the host dwelling, but without any further addition to the footprint. I consider overall, the proposed additions would not result in harm to the character and appearance as the majority of the extension would be viewed from the rear and within the context of adjoining dwellings who have already been subject to significant enlargement. Moreover, I consider the additions when viewed from the street at the front would be difficult to see, significantly limiting the impact.

12. I therefore do not consider the proposals would result in offence to policy CS17 of the CS, policy DM2 of the DMP, nor the relevant parts of the SPD or NPPF.

13. Other Matters

14. I have considered issues of living conditions raised by the neighbours at No7, but given the council's refusal reason, it appears that they were satisfied that there would be no harm in this respect and I agree.

15. I have also considered the points raised in respect of character and appearance, but for the reasons given above this does not alter my conclusions.

Conditions

16. In addition to the standard commencement condition (1), a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans (2) in order to provide certainty.

17. A condition relating to materials (3) is also necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusions

18. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR