



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2024

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/23/3330379

5 Rutherwyke Close, Stoneleigh, Surrey, KT17 2NA.

- 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 Attig against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00716/FLH, dated 13 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear and double storey side extension with rear roof dormer extension and pitched roof skylights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property, the street scene and thereby the character and appearance of the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 5 Rutherwyke Close, is a two-storey semi detached dwelling. It is located in an area characterised by mainly similar semi-detached two-storey dwellings. Although many of the properties have been extended and altered over time there is still a degree of consistency in their appearance in the street scene, including significant visual gaps between the dwellings.
4. The appellants propose a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension including a rear dormer, roof lights and solar panels.
5. The Council found the single storey rear extension, rear box dormer and street facing solar panels acceptable. From what I have seen and read I have not formed a contrary view on these elements of the proposal.
6. The existing two-storey side extension is, like the existing garage built right up to the boundary of the neighbouring dwelling to the north. However, the proposed two-storey addition would be set back from the boundary by about 0.6 metres or so. Further, the semi-detached pair, of which number 5 is one half are the last pair set square on to the street. The neighbouring semi-detached pair to the west face the corner of Rutherwyke Close and Glenwood

Road, and therefore, despite number 5 being built up to the common boundary, there would still be a significant visual gap between this pair of dwellings.

7. However, the proposed two-storey side extension would have the same ridge and eaves lines of the host property. Accordingly, the extension as designed would add significantly to the overall mass and three-dimensional form of the dwelling as extended. Resulting in a bulky addition that would not appear as a subservient and well-mannered addition.
8. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would cause significant harm to on the architectural integrity of the host property, the street scene and thereby the character and appearance of the wider area. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS5 of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted 2007) and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Development Management Policies Document (Adopted September 2015) and the guidance outlined in the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Borough Council's Householder Applications Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004 as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of development and the need for it to relate to local distinctiveness that complements the attractive characteristics of the area.

Other Matters

9. The appellants have drawn to my attention other full height two-storey side extensions in the local area, including 19 Rutherwyke Close, 141 Waverley Road and 59 Courtland Drive, similar to that proposed here. Whatever the background to those cases, the existence of large and unattractive additions on nearby sites is not an appropriate justification for permitting another here.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR