



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 1 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3155635

7 Icklingham Road, Cobham, KT11 2NG.

- 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 Robin Van Meeuwen against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1354, dated 25 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing single-storey rear extension and pool house. Detached ancillary outbuilding accommodating a garage on the ground floor and ancillary residential studio on the first floor. Provision of courtyard garden with enclosing wall and colonnade.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. Since the application, the subject of this appeal, was determined by the Council planning permission has been granted (Ref: 2016/2563) for part of the proposal before me. This comprises only the single storey rear extension and outshot to the rear of the existing house. However, it excludes the proposed two-storey ancillary outbuilding, accommodating a garage and residential studio, along with a courtyard garden with enclosing wall and colonnade. While I will have regard to this consideration I shall nevertheless determine the appeal on the basis of the overall scheme before me.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The property the subject of this appeal, 7 Icklingham Road, is a large two-storey detached house set in a substantial mature garden plot behind a high dense hedge. Although it is of relatively recent date, the house was designed in a pastiche classical style incorporating, amongst other architectural details, an open entrance portico with a Venetian window over, tall/narrow sash windows

and a mansard style roof set behind a parapet. There is a swimming pool with a contrasting contemporary designed pool house to the rear.

5. The house is located in a private gated residential development, characterised by large detached properties on spacious garden plots. While the houses of more recent date are similarly styled to that here, the neo-classical style is not necessarily the overriding architectural style to be found on the estate.
6. The house is sited towards the south-western end of the plot where there is an attached flat roof double garage. The area to the south east, between the house and the boundary to number 5, is currently an open garden area. The appellant proposes, following the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension and pool house, the construction of a single-storey rear extension. In addition, an ancillary outbuilding accommodating a garage on the ground floor and residential studio on the first floor together with courtyard garden with enclosing wall and colonnade is proposed between number 7 and its boundary to number 5.
7. The proposed extensions have been designed in a contrasting contemporary design to that of the main house. Features include a flat roof, large areas of glazing and the introduction of vertical timber cladding and bronze panelling.
8. The proposed additions as designed would extend the built form over a substantial area of the garden. However, due to their flat roof minimalist design and the inclusion of an open courtyard garden between the host property and the garage/studio block, the proposed extensions would, to my mind, appear as subservient additions.
9. I consider the extensions as designed, in terms of their form and proportion of void to solid, would result in well-mannered additions to the existing house serving to integrate it more with its landscape setting and soften its existing robust neo-classical design. Accordingly, as the Council found in respect of the single storey rear extension and outshot to the rear of the house extension recently permitted (Ref: 2016/2563), I do not consider that these contemporary designed extensions would necessarily cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host building or the character and appearance of the area.
10. However, I do have significant reservations in respect of the introduction of vertical timber cladding and bronze panelling. The vertical boarding represents a significant departure from the horizontal emphasis of the solid material employed between the vertically emphasised voids (window/door openings) in the host property, thereby making the proposed two-storey feature a discordant element of the overall design composition. Furthermore, the timber cladding and bronze panelling would not directly reflect the pallet of materials used in the construction of the envelope of the host property. Accordingly, given the very carefully considered scheme before me, I therefore find the design of the proposed additions unacceptable and one that would result in harm to the visual appearance of the main house. Consequently, although currently set behind a high dense hedge, this would therefore, to some extent, also impact on the character and appearance of the wider area.
11. If the design of the extensions had been vernacular in style it may have been appropriate to address the selection of external materials by way of a planning condition. However, in my judgement, the choice of materials is, in this case, a

fundamental element of the architect's design. This is demonstrated, for example, by the proposed subtle change in the format size of the bricks proposed. Accordingly, I do not consider that it would be appropriate to deal with the selection of materials as a condition. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development, if built as designed, would cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the area.

12. It would therefore fail to accord with Policies CS10 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (Adopted July 2011), Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan- *Development Management Plan* (Adopted April 2015) and the guidance contained in the Elmbridge Borough Council's Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: *Home Extensions* (Adopted April 2012) as they relate to the quality of development and the desire to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is not in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR