



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: 01 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3155907

1 Woodside Avenue, Hersham, Walton-on-Thames, KT12 5LQ.

- 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 Fergus Campbell against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1129, dated 6 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 1 Woodside Avenue, Hersham, Walton-on-Thames, KT12 5LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/1129, dated 6 April 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings numbered: FEC/15/01B, 02B, 03B, 04B, 05B, 06B and 07B.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the street scene and thereby the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, number 1 Woodside Avenue, is a detached two-storey dwelling located on the corner of Mayfield Road and Woodside Avenue. It is one of a number of similar properties located on the corner of Woodside Avenue to Mayfield Road and West Grove to Mayfield Road. This relatively modern house has previously been extended and altered by the addition of a single storey side/rear extension and first floor extension over the garage.

4. The appellant proposes a pitched roofed first floor extension to be built on the north-east side of the house. Although it would principally face towards Mayfield Road, it would also be open to view from Woodside Avenue and West Grove and therefore, due to its first floor location, it would be prominent in the public realm.
5. The proposed extension, that would project about 3.0 metres from the flank wall of the house, would be set back from the line of the main façade. Further, as a result of this set back the ridge line of the addition, like that of the earlier first floor extension on the south west side of the house, would be set below that of the original dwelling house. The roof of the new addition would also be of a matching hipped roof form. The proposed extension has, as illustrated, been designed not only to reflect the architectural style and form of the host property and its immediate neighbours but also, due to its scale, to appear subservient to it. Overall I consider the proposal would result in a well-mannered addition that would not cause harm either to the dwelling or its setting in the street scene.
6. Given that the proposed addition would not enlarge the footprint of the host dwelling and it would have a hipped roof with a ridge set below that of the main house, I do not consider, even in the context of its proximity to the north eastern boundary of the site, that the proposal would appear as a cramped form of development.
7. As I have identified the dwelling is located on a prominent corner site and therefore a first floor addition here would be visibly noticeable in the street scene. However, in these circumstances, given that the design of the extension would be acceptable, I do not consider the fact that the extension would be more prominent in this established residential area is in itself sufficient to cause harm to either the street scene or the character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed addition, if it were to go ahead, would not cause harm to either the street scene or the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS5 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 design and the need for new development to preserve or enhance the character of an area.

Other matters

9. I have noted the observations of the Council's senior tree officer that the proposed development might, in time, result in pressure to lop or fell trees the subject of a Tree Preservation Order, in particular the tree identified as 'T1'. Although this is not a reason for refusal, I have nevertheless been mindful of the concerns raised. However, based on my observations on site and more particularly the relationship of trees, in particular T1, to the existing house, I do not consider that the proposed addition would in itself necessarily result in any significant additional pressure on a potential desire, in time, to lop or even fell

the trees than would result from the occupation of the existing dwelling as previously extended.

Conditions

10. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I have included a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension. In the interests of certainty, I shall also impose a condition requiring the works to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole, and that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR