

Appeal Decision

Site: 21 Cullerne Close, Ewell, KT17 1XY

Proposal: Garage conversion to habitable room, extension over existing garage to form new bedroom and side extension to provide new garage

LPA Ref: 17/00165/FLH

Decision: Appeal dismissed

Grounds for Refusal:

- 1. By reason of its scale, massing, layout and roof form, the proposal would form an incongruous addition which would be at odds with and overwhelm the character of the host building, have a harmful impact on the visual appearance of the street scene and would fail to make a positive contribution to the quality of the built environment. The application therefore fails to comply with the requirements of Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS5 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies (2015) and Supplementary Planning Guidance on Householder Extensions 2004**
- 2. The proposed side extension and garage, by virtue of their resulting size, width and siting will have an adverse overbearing impact upon the outlook and amenities of neighbouring occupants at Number 22 Cullerne Close contrary to Policy CS5 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies (2015) and Supplementary Planning Guidance on Householder Extensions 2004.**

The Inspector assessed the proposal and decided that the proposed extension would make the dwelling appear more prominent and further enclose the area in front of the existing group of houses. Nevertheless, this prominence and enclosure would not result in material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The Inspector decided that the external appearance of the proposed extension would reflect that of the remainder of the property and the proposed extension would appear subservient to the main dwelling in some views.

The Inspector therefore decided that the proposed extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

However, the Inspector decided that as the proposed extension was located close to the boundary with the neighbouring property at no. 22 and No.22 only has a small rear garden, the proposal would result in a two storey extension

comprising a blank wall at first floor level along most of the rear boundary of no. 22, which would dominate the outlook of the rear windows and garden of no.22.

Conclusion:

Design is very subjective and therefore Inspectors do not always support concerns raised by Planning Officer's. Notwithstanding this, it is the duty of a Planning Officer to assess a proposal with regard to all its impacts and recommend the refusal of an application where it is felt by the Officer that a proposal would cause significant harm to the streetscene.