



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/23/3327340

207 Ember Lane, East Molesey, Surrey, KT8 0BU.

- 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 Neil Bates against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council
 - The application Ref: 2023/0976, dated 28 March 2023 was refused by notice dated 19 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a ground floor rear and side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 207 Ember Lane is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling. It faces on to Ember Lane and is located on the corner of Ember Lane and Orchard Lane. The area is characterised by an eclectic mix of mainly two-storey residential dwellings. They are generally set back from their road boundaries making for a general sense of spacious.
4. Due to its design, in particular its ornate canopied entrance with balcony over and projecting raised hipped roof, its fenestration pattern and the steep pitched gable roof, chimney and two-storey glazed screen of the side elevation this property has a strong vertical emphasis to its design which makes it both a dominant and prominent building in the street scene.
5. The appellant proposes a wrap-around side and rear single storey addition with a lean-to roof to form an enlarged open plan living area on the ground floor. A separate modest single storey side extension, which the Council found to be acceptable due to the wider side garden at this point, is also planned to form a new utility room with a hipped roof.
6. The flank elevation of 207, which already projects in front of the neighbouring properties to the rear facing Orchard Lane, is very close to its side boundary. Further, number 85 opposite is set well back from its Orchard Lane boundary. Accordingly, the lounge extension would significantly reduce the gap formed by the side garden and would thereby serve to denude spaciousness of the area.

more generally. This in my judgement would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The appellant suggests that the larger side extension has been designed to complement the existing architectural features of the property. However, in my judgement, this side addition as designed would, in contrast to the design of number 207 have a contrary dominant horizontal emphasis. This would detract from the architectural integrity of the original design of the property. In addition, the extension would appear to have been designed with little or no regard to its abutment to existing important architectural features of the host property, such as the flank gable projection.
8. These considerations add to my overall conclusion on the main issue that the development as proposed would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of Policies CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Borough Council – *Elmbridge Core Strategy* (Adopted July 2011), Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan *Development Management Plan* (Adopted April 2015), Elmbridge Borough Council Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide-*Home Extensions* (Adopted April 2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of development and the need to preserve or enhance the character of the area.

Other Matters

9. I appreciate the benefits that the proposed development would have for the quality of the family life of the appellant. However, given the harm that I have identified this is not a compelling reason to allow the proposed addition.
10. The appellant has referred me to similar extensions to other properties nearby. Whatever the background to those cases, their existence is not an appropriate justification for permitting that proposed here, which I have considered on its individual planning merits.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR