



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 09 December 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/24/3348695

1 Blundel Lane, Stoke D'abernon, Cobham KT11 2SU

- 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 Darren D'Costa against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2024/0592.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor side extension and ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension and ground floor rear extension at 1 Blundel Lane, Stoke D'abernon, Cobham KT11 2SU subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development shall be carried out with the following plans: P000 - Proposed Site Plan, E000 - Location and Block Plans, E001 - Existing Floor Plans - Sheet 1, E002 - Existing Floor Plans - Sheet 2, P001 - Proposed Floor Plans - Sheet 1, P002 - Proposed Floor Plans - Sheet 2, E003 - Existing Elevations and Section A, and P003 - Proposed Elevations and Section A.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development is taken from the application form, which appropriately describes the development. The Council altered the wording on the decision notice, but there appears to be no agreement to the revised wording.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is part of a staggered row of semi-detached houses to the southern side of Blundel Lane. The properties have the same form, with the left side of the semi-detached pair having a hipped roof projection to the front.
5. No. 1 is the end property with its side boundary extending along Kenilworth Avenue. It has a wide single-storey addition to the side which would be replaced with the proposed two-storey form, inset from the front elevation, and a single-storey wraparound extension.
6. The proposed two-storey element would reflect the design of the other half of the semi, and the integrated design approach to the extension would create a cohesive form. The Council's Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (SPD) advises that a subordinate approach is to be taken for extensions to semi-detached properties, with the objective of retaining symmetry through the extensions having a secondary role.
7. As emphasised by the appellant, while No.1 is a semi-detached property, the two halves have a different appearance and there is no symmetry to the front of the building. Moreover, whilst providing general advice, the SPD is guidance, and each proposal needs to be considered with regard to its specific context and the overall aim of ensuring that extensions are sympathetic to the original house and in keeping with the character of the local area.
8. Whilst there is a consistency and pattern to the group of properties, due to the stagger, gaps or a distinction to the semi-detached pairs are not overly notable in views along Blundel Lane. Additionally, due to its corner position and the proposed setback, the proposed extension would not be a dominating feature and would not disrupt the rhythm of the street scene.
9. The offset from the side boundary is limited, but the single-storey element creates a step in the massing, and the depth of the two-storey element would be less than the existing flank elevation. There is no neighbour to the side to have a terracing effect, and with the road adjacent and a wide verge opposite, I do not find that the extension would be imposing to Kenilworth Avenue, nor would result in a loss of openness.
10. The Council have found the rear, single-storey aspect of the proposal to be acceptable, and I have no reason to disagree. I also concur with their finding that there would be no harm to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.
11. Therefore, in conclusion, I find that the scale and form of the development would be appropriate for the host property and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, the proposal would accord with policy CS10 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan - Development Management Plan 2015. Together these seek that development integrates with the character of the area with particular regard to the attributes of appearance, scale, pattern of built development and character of the host property.
12. For reasons set out, the development would accord with the provisions of the SPD as a whole, and there would also be compliance with the similar design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

13. Conditions are necessary in the interests of compliance with statutory requirements relating to the commencement of development and certainty in relation to the plans. Also, in the interests of the appearance of the building and the character of the area, it is necessary to secure the materials to match the existing building.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out and having regard to all the matters raised the appeal is allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR