



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/22/3309157

16 Manor Road South, Esher, KT10 0QL

- 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 Donin against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/1846, dated 13 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor side and rear extensions, extensions to roof incorporating side dormer window and front rooflight, changes to fenestration and new solar panels following demolition of chimney stack.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. During the determination of the application the description of development was amended by the council in order to incorporate all aspects requiring planning permission. I have therefore taken the description of development from the decision notice as it is more accurate.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area.
4. Manor Road South is a spacious, tree-lined suburban street. The area of Manor Road South where the appeal property (No16) is located is characterised by traditional, bay-fronted detached two storey houses (some which have loft conversions). Whilst there is some variety in design, many of the dwellings feature Tudor-style timber detailing, clay-tiled roofs and brick chimneys. Most are set in good-sized plots with off street parking and front gardens set behind hedges and low walls.
5. No16 is a detached two storey dwelling which has previously been subject to enlargement and extension, like many other dwellings along the same street. The principal elevation has timber and clay tile detailing, together with brick and render and the rear elevation is rendered.
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 Do 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 extension would add significant bulk and volume to the rear, as well as adding to the overall height of the roof of the host dwelling (facilitated by a crown roof design). On the rear and side elevations I consider this would result in an overbearing addition to the host dwelling that would be harmful to the character of the area.
10. On the rear elevation, there would be additional windows within the second floor/loft extension which would be much larger than those on the first floor. I consider these would appear incongruous and unsympathetic within the overall proposed design.
11. However, I consider there would be far greater impact of some of the proposed additions from the principal elevation from the street. The addition to the roof would be significant, resulting in a dominant and overbearing design when considered against the context of the neighbouring properties, particularly those that flank No16.
12. The appellant has made some changes to a previously refused scheme and it is clear they have attempted to address some of the council's concerns. However, I share the council's view that there remain serious issues with the proposed design, largely as a result of the scale of change to the host dwelling.
13. Taken together with the loss of the chimneys and addition of the (albeit reduced) side dormer, it is my view that the appeal proposals would result in a harmful imbalance which would undermine the character of the host dwelling and wider area.
14. I also note from the appellant's submissions that there are other dwellings in the street which have been subject to enlargement along similar lines to these appeal proposals. I have also considered the points raised by the appellants about side dormers on some of the properties.
15. However, I have considered the appeal proposals on their own merits and in light of the size and character of the host dwelling and its immediate setting.
16. Given the predominant style of the houses along this part of Manor Road South and the incongruous scale of the proposals, I consider the cumulative changes proposed would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling as well as the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policy CS17 of the CS; DM2 of the DMP and the relevant parts of the SPD and NPPF.

Conclusions

17. For the reasons given and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR