



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 October 2021

by H Miles BA(hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 NOVEMBER 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/21/3276514

21 Robert Close, Hersham, Walton-On-Thames KT12 5HA

- 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 Ivan Lomaka against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0849, dated 9 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and construction of new two storey side and rear extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. This appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Robert Close is characterised by pairs of two-storey semi-detached dwellings, many of which have been extended with modest, secondary side extensions and subservient roof extensions. The dwellings and their extensions are similar in their design and appearance resulting in a pleasant sense of unity and consistency. Many of the properties have parking in their front gardens with a notable area of soft landscaping. Whilst houses including nos 11 and 12 have larger areas of hardstanding, such parking areas are uncommon and do not form part of the overriding character of this area.
4. 21 Robert Close is on a corner plot, wider than others in the street and has a single storey garage and lean to at the side, with a notable area of soft landscaping to the front garden. The property shares its semi-detached, two storey character and its overall design and appearance with others in the road. For these reasons it makes a positive contribution to the attractive regular character of this area.
5. The proposed extensions would be very wide compared to the host property and would result in a dwelling much wider than others in the streetscene. Furthermore, although part of the addition at roof level has a gable end and pitched roof, the fenestration and brickwork flush with the floors below creates the appearance of a three storey elevation. Due to its corner location, the proposed alterations would not create a terracing effect. However, taken together, the proposed development would be dominant in relation to the host

building and the streetscene and the width, height and scale of the additions would be harmfully at odds with the attractive, regular pattern of development in this area.

6. The removal of planting and inclusion of hard landscaping to the majority of the front garden area would result in a more developed frontage. This would harmfully erode the soft landscaped character to Roberts Close. Although it may be possible to undertake such works without planning permission, the existing garage, lean to and parking area appear adequately sized to serve the existing property. Therefore, I am not persuaded that this would be likely.
7. Nos 19 and 21 form a semi-detached pair, however 19 is currently wider than 21. Therefore, the proposed alterations would not harmfully unbalance this pair. However, the lack of harm in this regard would have a neutral effect which does not overcome the harm identified above.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies CS5 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy July 2011 and DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan April 2015 which together seek high quality design based on an understanding of local character, with particular respect to development in Hersham, amongst other things. As well as to the advice in the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions April 2012 which provides further detail as to how high quality design can be achieved for residential extensions and includes advice that the extension should not dominate.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR

