

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2017

By Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3164541

154 Oatlands Drive, Weybridge, Surrey KT13 9EZ

- 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 Philip Meatyard against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 2016/2989 dated 13 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is renovation and extension of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a single storey dwelling in an L-shaped form set close to the front and side boundaries of its plot on the north side of Oatlands Drive. It is the subject of current works and alterations. The proposal would incorporate a deeper floor plan and extend to include first floor accommodation over this extended floor plan, under a pitched roof.
4. There is considerable variety in the dwellings styles and plot sizes in the local vicinity of the appeal site, with a broad mix of traditional and more modern developments. However, and although the distances vary, most of the properties are generally set back from the road frontage and this pattern of development contributes to the generally verdant character and appearance of the local area and street scene. Although sited close to the road frontage, given its single storey form and the boundary hedging, the property, as existing, is not a dominant feature in the street scene. By comparison, the proposed extended building with its first floor accommodation under a pitched roof would extend two storey built form across most of the width of the plot and would present a heavy and bulky elevation close to the road frontage.
5. I consider that the building, as proposed to be extended, given its height, bulk and massing in relation to the plot size and the proximity of two storey development to both the southern and the side boundaries, would appear

cramped within the plot. The extent and massing of two storey built development so close to the front boundary would also appear visually intrusive in the street scene.

6. I have taken into account the attempts to retain and follow some of the existing design detailing and features of the existing property in the proposed extension, but the bulk and massing of the two storey development across much of the frontage width would be over bearing in the street scene. It is my view that the proposal would, as a result, detract from the predominant pattern of development in the local area and its local distinctiveness.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the local area. This would conflict with Policy DM2 of the Council's adopted Development Management Plan 2015, Policy CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy 2011, the adopted Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework all of which seek, amongst other things, a high quality of design which respects the local context and local distinctiveness. The decision notice also refers to Policy DM10 of the Development Management Plan 2015 although this was not cited in the Officer's report, and has not been referenced by the Appellant, and I have not considered this policy further.
8. I have been provided with the previous appeal decision relating to alternative proposals to extend the property under references APP/K3605/D/16/3142307, APP/K3605/D/16/3147297 and APP/K3605/D/16/3149210, which were all dismissed in July 2016. Each decision must be based on its individual merits, which is the basis of my assessment in this case. Nonetheless, I have found nothing in those decisions which conflicts with the assessment I have reached in this case. I have also been provided with the appeal decision, reference APP/K3605/D/16/3158855 dated December 2016 which was allowed and issued a certificate of lawful development in respect of a proposed rear extension and loft conversion. Given the particular nature of that appeal decision as to whether or not a particular form of development would be lawful, it has limited bearing on my decision in this case.
9. I agree with the Council that the proposal, given its siting in relation to neighbouring properties and the proposed fenestration arrangement, would not materially harm the living conditions of immediate neighbours, with particular regard to loss of light as well as overlooking and loss of privacy. However, this finding does not outweigh the harm I have concluded under my main issue.
10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR