



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2024

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/24/3338564

1 Havers Avenue, Hersham, Walton-on-Thames KT12 4NB

- 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 Anthony Ferlisi against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/2471, dated 6 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension following demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Companion Guide: Home Extensions 2012 requires the roof of an extension to be similar to that of the existing house, in scale, design and the angle of pitch. Where houses have pitched roofs the extension should not have a flat roof. A small pitch roof is proposed on each of the sides of the development but the proposed roof form would be mostly flat. This would not be a roof form that would reflect that of the fully pitched roofs of the host dwelling.
5. The SPD Companion Guide does not specify what width single storey side extensions should be in comparison to the host building. In this case the side extension would be approximately the same width as the host dwelling. Although being subordinate in that the addition would be single storey, it would nonetheless be a large extension to the side of the dwelling. Given its width it

- would visually compete with the host dwelling and create a development of unbalanced appearance. This would be visually harmful to the host dwelling.
6. Being sited on a corner plot and projecting closer to the highway the visual harm of the extension could be prominently visible. However, being single storey and taking into account the existing fenced boundary, this would screen the visual prominence of the development when viewed from the north and east. Nonetheless, the visual harm arising from the extension would be clearly visible in public views from the south and west. Consequently, the proposal would be visually harmful to the area.
 7. The development does not fall within a conservation area and is not within the curtilage of a listed building. The proposal would be constructed of matching materials and the fenestration would align with that of the host property. It would not project beyond the front building line of the host dwelling and would be set in from the boundary of the site retaining adequate outdoor amenity space. Whilst these may be merits of the proposed scheme they do not outweigh my above concerns or justify the proposed development.
 8. A two storey extension has been constructed at 41 Havers Avenue which projects beyond the rear building line of the main dwelling. Whilst the appellant acknowledges this is a historical addition it highlights changes to dwellings have been made within the vicinity of the appeal site. However, that development is quite different to that proposed here and, therefore, it offers limited weight in favour of the proposal.
 9. I note that the occupiers have mobility issues and the proposal may bring about mobility benefits by providing a ground floor WC, shower room and gym. However, the harm I have identified would be permanent and is not outweighed by the appellant's particular circumstances.
 10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policies CS5 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, the SPD Companion Guide and the provision of the Framework. These policies and SPD seek, amongst other matters, development to be of high quality design.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR