

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2017

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/17/3181832

13 Kings Close, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey, KT12 2RF

- 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 & Mrs Andrew Stocks against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/1170, dated 8 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is single and two-storey rear extensions; first floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for single and two-storey rear extensions; first floor front extension at 13 Kings Close, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey, KT12 2RF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2017/1170, dated 8 April 2017, subject to the conditions set out in the accompanying Schedule.

Preliminary matters

2. For the reasons provided in the officer report on the original application the Council raises no objection to the proposed extensions intended at the rear of the property. Indeed, since the submission of this appeal, the Council has granted planning permission for the rear extensions (*Ref 2017/1957, dated 2 August 2017*).
3. Accordingly, since planning permission has already been granted for the proposed work to the rear and the Council's concerns centre on the proposed works to the front of the dwelling, I shall concentrate in my decision on the proposed works to the front.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed front extension on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling - the adjoining dwelling being No.12 King's Close. The pair was originally built with protrusions at the front at
-

ground floor level, used as garages. A pair of dormers punctuated the tiled, mono-pitched roof above the garages. The property is set within a cul-de-sac, forming part of an established residential area displaying a variety of house types of no particular architectural merit.

6. In 2014, planning permission was granted at the appeal property for a single storey extension to the front and the conversion of the garage to living accommodation. That permission has been implemented, and the appellants now seek to infill the gap above the front ground floor extension.
7. The Council's objection is centred on its concerns that the proposal would harm what is described as the '*balanced symmetrical frontage of the property with 12 King's Close*'; that the proposal's appearance would contrast with others in the locality and would result in a contrived roof design; and on account of its alleged prominence, the first floor extension would prove incongruous harming not only the appearance of the host property but the character of the surrounding area.
8. I do not share the Council's concerns. The pair's original symmetry has already been materially affected by the development arising from the grant of planning permission for a front extension, and its subsequent implementation. To my mind, the extension proposed now would assist in improving the appearance of the host property in that the clumsily designed flat roofed gap between the main elevation and the false roof at the front would be in-filled. The fenestration proposed would be in the same plane and would match that of the extant dormers. The proposed extension, in my opinion, would fit in seamlessly with the character and appearance of the host property and its residential surroundings, and would be barely noticeable within this relatively secluded, cul-de-sac location.
9. Accordingly I conclude that the proposed development is acceptable on its merits and no conflict arises with those provisions of policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan - Development Management Plan (2015) directed to design.

Conditions

10. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. The Council's suggestion as to matching building materials is necessary, in the interests of visual amenity.

Other matters

11. All other matters referred to in the representations have been taken into account including the Council's references to the *National Planning Policy Framework* and its' Supplementary Planning Document on Design & Character. No other matter raised is of sufficient strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: the OS location and block plans and Drawing Nos. M2467-01 & M2467-02.
3. 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.