
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2026

by K Crutchfield BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/25/3377119

1 Four Wents, Cobham, Surrey KT11 2NE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Zaki Sharif of Prudential Properties Ltd against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1809.
 - The development is described as “New portico porch and reconstruction of garden room. Insulation and render to external walls. Alteration of window sizes. New garage (not yet constructed)”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for portico porch, reconstruction of garden room, insulation and render to external walls, alterations to fenestration, and garage at 1 Four Wents, Cobham, Surrey KT11 2NE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/1809, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The garage hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The garage hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 001 PL04, 002 PL05 and 012 PL01.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading is taken from the application form. However, the Council has used different wording in relation to the fenestration on the decision notice which is more accurate, and therefore I have used it in my formal decision. Furthermore, I have removed words not relating to acts of development.
3. The portico porch, reconstruction of garden room, insulation and render to external walls and alterations to fenestration, had been completed by the time of my visit. Therefore, I will deal with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is being sought retrospectively for these elements. The garage had not been commenced at the time of my visit.
4. The proposed block plan (002 PL05) shows block paving to the front (southwest) of the dwelling. The block paving had been completed by the time of my visit. However, this is not included in the description of development on the application form and is not part of the appeal development.
5. The proposed garage is not part of the Council’s reason for refusal, nor does the Council identify any conflict with the development plan in relation to the garage.

Following my site visit I see no reason to conclude otherwise. Therefore, the focus of this appeal is the portico porch, reconstruction of garden room, insulation and render to external walls and alterations to fenestration.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the portico porch, reconstruction of garden room, insulation and render to external walls and alterations to fenestration on the character and appearance of Four Wents.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is located on the entrance to Four Wents and adjoins Freeland's Road to the southeast and properties on Tartar Road to the northeast. Four Wents is predominantly characterised by semi-detached two-storey dwellings which are similar in appearance. Within this context, 1 Four Wents is an anomaly as it is a detached bungalow. The majority of dwellings in Four Wents are constructed with yellow or sand coloured bricks, red or brown roof tiles and white windows. Properties on Freeland's Road and Tartar Road vary in type, style and materials.
8. The materials used on the appeal development are different from the prevailing materials used on the dwellings in Four Wents. However, the appeal property is on the entrance to Four Wents and the materials are in keeping with the wider palette of materials used in the adjoining Freeland's Road and Tartar Road. Furthermore, the appeal property which is a detached bungalow, is already anomalous to the predominant character of semi-detached two storey dwellings in Four Wents, therefore the use of different materials does not significantly change the effect of the property within the street scene.
9. The flat roof of the reconstructed garden room and porch are both higher than the eaves height of the bungalow. However, this height increase is minor and does not result in significant bulk to the existing roof. Being set back from the road, these alterations are not prominent or dominant in the street scene.
10. Given the above, I conclude that the portico porch, reconstruction of garden room, insulation and render to external walls and alterations to fenestration are not harmful to the character and appearance of Four Wents. As such, the development accords with Policies CS10 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011); and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015). These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that new development preserves or enhances the character of the area. Whilst there is a degree of conflict with the design of the new roofs, overall, there is no conflict with the objectives of the guidance within the Elmbridge Design Code Supplementary Planning Document (2024), which, amongst other matters seeks to achieve high quality and well-designed places with proposals responding positively to the local context.

Conditions

11. The erection of the portico porch, reconstruction of garden room, insulation and render to external walls and alterations to fenestration has already taken place. Therefore, conditions relating to time limit for construction and compliance with plans are not necessary.

12. The standard time condition is necessary for the garage as this has not been commenced. I have also imposed a condition specifying the approved plans for the garage as this provides certainty.
13. The Council recommends a condition that the garage remains ancillary to the host dwelling to prevent it from being used as a separate dwelling or business. I am satisfied that the description of development is precise in describing development that would be incidental to the use of the dwelling, therefore I conclude that such a condition would not be necessary.
14. The County Highways Authority (CHA) recommends a condition regarding a modified vehicular access to Freelands Road; this does not form part of the appeal development and is therefore not necessary.
15. The CHA recommends a condition for further details of parking for vehicles and cycles. The garage plans show the proposed new parking. The development does not include any other changes to the existing parking spaces accessed from Freelands Road. I therefore conclude such a condition would not be necessary.
16. The CHA also recommends a condition to secure an electric charging point. I have no evidence before me to demonstrate that this is necessary or relevant to the development.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons, the appeal development accords with the development plan. Material considerations do not indicate a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude the appeal should be allowed.

K Crutchfield

INSPECTOR