



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2022

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/22/3305412

1 Willowhayne Drive, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey KT12 2NJ

- 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 Sam Sclater-Brooks against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/1414, dated 6 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side and rear extension to the existing house and 1.8m high brick wall along the boundary.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side and rear extension to the existing house and 1.8m high brick wall along the boundary at 1 Willowhayne Drive, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey, KT12 2NJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/1414, dated 6 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location Plan P01

Existing Block Plan: Roof P01

Existing Floor Plan: Ground & First Floor P01

Existing Elevations: South-East, South-West, North-West P01

Existing Street Elevations: South-East & South-West P01

Proposed Block Plan: Ground Floor P02

Proposed Floor Plan: Ground & First Floor P02

Proposed Block Plan: Roof P02

Proposed Elevations: South-East, South-West, North-West P02

Proposed Street Elevations: South-East & South-West P02
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey end of terrace dwelling on the corner of two sections of Willowhayne Drive. The surrounding area is characterised by predominately two storey terraced residential dwellings set back behind front driveways and gardens, a variety of distances from the pavement.
4. Whilst the siting of the proposed side extension would be closer to the drive than the building line of 26 Willowhayne Drive (No 26), given their perpendicular relationship, this comparison relates to different building edges. Additionally, there is limited consistency in the siting of the side building line of dwellings located on corners adjacent to highway junctions. Given this, the existing gaps between terraces, and the stepped nature of frontages in some terraced sections, no prevailing building line is present in the surrounding area.
5. The proposed single storey side and replacement rear extension would be subservient to the existing dwelling, maintaining the front building line and with matching design and materials. Due to its corner location, the appeal site is visible in long views along the drive from the junctions with Montague Close and Egmont Road. Whilst the single storey side extension would be located in the existing gap between the site boundary and the existing side elevation, its height and sloping roof design would maintain the openness in this part of the streetscene.
6. I note the Council's reference to the side extension being located within 1m of the pavement. However, the need to meet this dimension, as set out in the Council's Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (2012) (the SPD), relates to extensions above ground floor level. In respect of single storey extensions, a minimum of 300mm between the side wall and property boundary is recommended. This requirement is fulfilled by the proposed development.
7. My attention has been drawn to a previous appeal¹ relating to a two-storey side extension on the site. Whilst the main issues between these appeals are comparable, given the reduced scale of the appeal proposal before me, the adverse loss of openness found by the Inspector on the previous appeal would not be applicable on this case. Therefore, the effect of the side extension on the character and appearance of the area would be substantially different. As such, it would not result in an incongruous or dominant form of development.
8. The proposed development would replace part of the existing side boundary hedge with a brick wall and would inevitably lead to a loss of landscaping. However, given the existing trees and hedgerows on and surrounding the appeal site, combined with small areas of grassed verge, the presence of greenery in the views along Willowhayne Drive would remain. In closer views, despite the limited replacement planting, the short section of wall with matching materials, would replicate the height and design of similar boundary treatments found elsewhere in the area. As a result, the height of the wall, with

¹ APP/K3605/D/15/3097719

trellis above, would not be excessive nor result in a jarring feature in the streetscene.

9. The Council have referred to a previous planning application² on the site which was refused with the same reason as this appeal. Further, the Council highlight the only difference between the previous application and the appeal proposal is a reduction in height of the trellis above the wall. However, I have found the height of the wall with trellis above acceptable and my decision is based on the planning merits of this case before me alongside my observations of the site.
10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would accord with Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) (the Core Strategy) and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015). These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure new development enhances the public realm and is designed to maintain local character. Whilst the Council refers to Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy, as this relates to the strategic approach to the location of development, it is not determinative in my decision.
11. I also conclude that the proposed development accords with the principles and guidance set out in the SPD and the design principles set out Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure development maintains, and is sympathetic to, local character.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard conditions imposed above, the Council have suggested a condition relating to the approval of a landscaping scheme. Given that the details requested as part of this condition are already shown on the approved plans and I have found the proposed development is not harmful to the character and appearance of the area, this condition is not necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and, taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR

² Ref 2022/0183