



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2023

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/22/3310135

22 Viner Close, Walton-on-Thames, KT12 2YE

- 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 Hunter against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/3683, dated 19 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is two-storey side extension and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two-storey side extension and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing porch at 22 Viner Close, Walton-on-Thames, KT12 2YE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/3683, dated 19 October 2021 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: Existing Plans and Elevations 1409 SAP V1 XX DR A 00010 SO 05; Proposed Site Plan 1409 SAP XX 00 DR A 10101 SO 07; Proposed Block Plan 1409 SAP XX 00 DR A 10100 SO 06; Existing Site Plan 1409 SAP XX 00 DR A 00001 SO 04; Location Plan 1409 SAP XX 00 DR A 00000 SO 07; Proposed Plans and Elevations 1409 SAP V1 XX DR A 10110 SO 06.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the determination of the application, the council amended the description of development to add more detail to the proposal. This was repeated by the appellants on the appeal form. I have therefore used the description of development on the decision notice and appeal form.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area.

4. Viner Close is a modern cul-de-sac of terraced two storey houses and maisonettes fronting parking courtyards with small areas of front garden. The character of the area is residential and suburban, and the terraces are arranged in small blocks.
5. No22 is an end of terrace two storey house which benefits from a front, side and rear garden, bounded by hedges and a fence. At the site visit I noticed that the house at the other end of the same terraced block (No25 Viner Close) had been subject to a significant modern extension, following an appeal which the appellant has supplied as part of their submissions. I note however that No25 was not as visible as No22 and I have proceeded to determine this appeal on its own merits.
6. The approach to No22 via the street entrance shows the property having a blank rendered façade, which adds very little to the character of the area. The property overall has a simple form with a box bay to the first floor and a pyramid roof design.
7. Policy CS17 (Local Character, Density and Design) of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) (CS) requires development proposals to take account of established character, density and design within an area.
8. Policy DM2 (Design and Amenity) of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015) (DMP) seeks development that preserves or enhances the character of the Do local area.
9. The Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (2012) (SPD) provides advice and general guidance on the design principles for residential extensions. It seeks to avoid unsightly extensions which ignore the style and character of the original house, where it would adversely affect the appearance of the street scene.
10. Given the extension already in place at No22, I consider these appeal proposals would be of a similar quality and would have a similar impact to that of the extension at No25. The roofline would be subservient insofar as the ridge would sit lower than that of the host dwelling. The materials would be similar to those of the host dwelling and the window frames would be similar to those used on No25.
11. I consider that the design of the appeal proposals would be beneficial insofar as they would introduce new window at ground floor level, which would 'break up' the side elevation. Having regard to the sympathetic roof design, the size of the windows and redesign of the main entrance would align with the designs within the street itself.
12. I therefore do not consider that overall the proposals would appear incongruous or dominant within the street scene. Nor do I consider the proposals would have a harmful nor adverse impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, surrounding area and street scene. I therefore consider the proposals to be aligned to policies CS17 of the CS, DM2 of the DMP, nor the relevant parts of the SPD and NPPF.

Other Matters

13. I have considered the representations made by the neighbour at No15 during the determination of the application relating to potential overlooking, loss of

parking, concerns over boundary detail, noise and harm to character and appearance.

14. The issue of ownership and boundaries are not matters material to a planning application, but I am satisfied that the proposed development can be incorporated within the red line plan supplied. I do not agree that there would be a loss of car parking as a result of the development, nor do I agree that there would be a discernible increase in noise resulting from the development.
15. In terms of overlooking, the property already has windows at a first floor level, so I do not agree that any more overlooking would result from the appeal proposals that does not already exist. I have already addressed character and appearance in my reasoning above and therefore do not repeat that here.

Conditions

16. In addition to the standard commencement condition (1), a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans (2) in order to provide certainty.
17. A condition relating to materials (3) is also necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusions

18. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR