
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/19/3230077
13 Fortescue Road, Weybridge KT13 8XF

- 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 Alex Palmer against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0379, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as '2 storey rear extension and re-build rear outrigger'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a '2 storey rear extension and re-build rear outrigger' at 13 Fortescue Road, Weybridge KT13 8XF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/0379, dated 11 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan, CC.100A, CC.002, CC.004A, CC.006A, CC.007A, CC.008A, CC.009A, CC.010, CC.011, CC.012, and CC.013.

Procedural Matter

2. At my site visit I saw that development was taking place. I have no evidence as to whether this is associated with the development subject to this appeal. I have therefore determined this matter on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The proposal includes a single storey flat roof structure to the side and rear of this semi-detached bungalow, utilising a contemporary and sustainable sedum roof. The built form would remain set back from the forwardmost part of the host dwelling by several metres. The single storey elements to the side and rear would appear subservient to the host building in scale, form and siting.

Furthermore, due to their siting and location within the street scene they would not be prominent.

5. Attached by a modest glazed link at the rear, it is proposed to erect a 2-storey extension obviating the existing rear dormer window. This would project at the rear by several metres, approximately level with the neighbouring property's rear extension. The 2-storey proposal would have a bespoke symmetrical design, utilising a fibreglass flat roof, flanked by timber clad slopes on each side and timber clad walls. The rear elevation would be a full height, rebated, timber framed glass screen.
6. The 2-storey extension would be lower than the ridge of the host building and the neighbouring property. Due to its siting, scale and height it would not be prominent within the street scene being obscured from view by the host building and neighbouring property. Parts of the side wall may be glimpsed from limited vantage points at the end of the cul-de-sac. However, the host building would continue to appear as one of a number of bungalows in Fortescue Road.
7. The rear extensions would be glimpsed more distantly from the right of way to the rear, on the opposite side of the River Wey. Views from the right of way would be filtered by the intervening landscaping on both banks of the river. Taken together the scheme would form part of a holistic redesign of the dwelling. Whilst appearing as a part 2-storey extension to a bungalow and utilising a more contemporary form and palette of materials, the proposal would be of a good quality design. Furthermore, it is noted that a range of alterations and extensions are evident at the rear of these residential properties and this would further add to that mix.
8. Therefore, I find, due to the siting, scale, bulk and design of the extensions that they would provide a coherent design to the host building, they would assimilate into the context of domestic extensions to the rear of these residential properties, and allow the host building to continue to be read as a brick, semi-detached bungalow when viewed from the street scene.
9. For those reasons, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It would not conflict with the Council's adopted July 2011 Elmbridge Core Strategy Policy CS17 and adopted April 2015 Elmbridge Local Plan – Development Management Plan Policy DM2 which amongst other aims seek high quality design. Furthermore, I find no conflict with the Elmbridge Local Plan – Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document adopted April 2012.
10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. I note the hereby approved plans adequately detail the external materials to be used in the development and so I find a further condition unnecessary in this case.
11. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR