



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2024

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/23/3335889

1 Kenwood Drive, Hersham, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey, KT12 5AU.

- 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 Katie and Tom Lister against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/2210, dated 3 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear extension, roof replacement from pitched roofs to flat roofs over existing side and front projections, conversion of garage into living space, front porch, rooflights and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, roof replacement from pitched roofs to flat roofs over existing side and front projections, conversion of garage into living space, front porch, rooflights and alterations to fenestration at 1 Kenwood Drive, Hersham, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey, KT12 5AU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/2210, dated 3 August 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: 0194.KTL.2001, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2020, 2021, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2120 and 2121

Procedural Matters

2. I have adopted, in the bullet point above the description of development used by the Council in its decision notice, rather than that set out on the application form as this more accurately describes the proposed development.
3. As I saw the development as proposed has already been substantially carried out. I also noted that, amongst other things, the flat roof to the rear extension appears to be higher than illustrated on the application drawings. Nevertheless, as the Council did previously, I will consider the scheme design based solely on the application drawing before me being: 0194.KTL.2001, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2020, 2021, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2120 and 2121.

Main Issue

4. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property, the character and appearance of the street scene and thereby wider area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, 1 Kenwood Drive, is a detached two-storey house. It is located in a residential area characterised by an eclectic mix of residential properties.
6. The appellants propose a single storey rear extension, replacement of sloping roofs over existing side and front projections, conversion of garage to habitable accommodation, new porch, rooflights and alterations to the fenestration.
7. The Elmbridge Local Plan-Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (Adopted April 2012) (SPD) is a material; consideration but it is only guidance, and it should not be applied to each and every property prescriptively to the exclusion of all other factors, including physical circumstances and context of a site. At paragraph 1.19 of the SPD it states that *facing materials of any extension should ideally match as closely as possible those of the existing house*.
8. By reason of their three-dimensional form and choice of contrasting materials, including black vertical timber boarding and off-white render the extensions and alterations have clearly been designed to contrast to the host property. In my judgement given the age, three-dimensional form and design of host property this is a legitimate design approach in this case.
9. Accordingly, in this context I consider that the contemporary design proposed for the rear extension along with the alterations to and re-cladding of the playroom, garage and study along with the formation of porch would result in well-mannered alterations to and extension of the host property.
10. I therefore include in respect of the main issue that proposal would not result in harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the character and appearance of the street scene or the wider area. It would therefore accord with the objectives of Policies CS5 and CDS17 of the Elmbridge Borough Council-Core Strategy (Adopted July 2011), Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Borough Council-Development Management Plan (Adopted April 2015), the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate along with other things to the quality of development the need for new development to integrate and enhance the local character.

Conditions

11. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council.
12. In the interests of certainty, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans. As the development is substantially complete, and the materials are in any case indicated on the application drawings, I do not consider that conditions relating to materials are necessary in this case.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR