



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

by Hilary Orr MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/19/3232312
77 Woodland Grove, Weybridge KT13 9EQ

- 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 and Mrs Sweeting against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0629, dated 6 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension and roof extension with 2 No dormers and 2 No side dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The description of the development has changed from that taken from the application form, although I note that the appeal form states that it has not changed. The description used by the Council better describes the development applied for, so I have used this for the purposes of determining the appeal.
3. I note that the Applicants for the planning application were Mr and Mrs Sweeting. However, only Mr Philip Sweeting is named on the appeal form and is therefore the sole Appellant for this appeal.
4. The parties agree that the submitted plans do not accurately reflect the change in ridge height when compared with adjoining properties. I have taken this into account when determining this appeal.

Main Issue

5. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. Woodland Grove comprises a number of small primarily residential roads. The appeal site is a detached two storey dwelling house on the corner of two of these roads. The area is residential in character and is located within the Weybridge settlement area. The existing dwelling has a single storey wrap around extension and is set within a generous sized garden.
7. From my site visit I could see that the properties in the area vary widely in

their scale, design and size. I saw that there were front gable features and a number of properties had roofs with dormer windows of various sizes and designs. The appeal site lies within a line of three dwellings that appear to have been built to a similar scale and design. However, they all differ in appearance and with their external detailing, one being timber clad, the second rendered and the appeal site which is tile hung.

8. The proposal would provide a first floor side extension, a roof extension which would result in an approximately one metre increase in the height of the ridge, together with front and rear dormer windows. As part of the proposal the existing chimney would be removed.
9. I recognise that the area has a diverse character and that there is little uniformity in design. However, the appeal site is in a prominent location on this junction. The original dwelling is sited towards the eastern boundary of the plot. This means that despite the single storey wrap around extension, there is a significant gap between the side elevation and the side boundary. This gives the site a pleasant and open feel and it makes a positive contribution to the character of this diverse area.
10. The two storey element of the proposal would reduce this gap at first floor level. This together with the increase in roof height and the addition of the large dormer windows to front and rear, would significantly increase the scale and mass of the roof. These additions would, cumulatively result in the roof appearing top heavy and unbalanced when viewed in the context of this prominent site. This would be particularly apparent when the side elevation is seen from viewpoints on all three adjacent roads.
11. Overall, I find that the combined reduction of the side gap, the substantial increase in the width and height of the roof, together with the large dormers would result in the dwelling appearing dominant and incongruous in the street scene. Consequently, it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015). In summary these policies seek to ensure that new development integrates and responds to local character, with particular regard to, amongst other things, appearance, scale, mass and height.

Other matters

12. My attention has been drawn to other examples of roof extensions and dormers in the area. These include No 16 Woodland Grove, although I note that the dormers differ in their design and so are not directly comparable. However, I have insufficient evidence before me to confirm the full planning history or circumstances for any of these sites. In any event, I have to determine this appeal on its own planning merits, and their presence would not justify granting this appeal.

Conclusion

13.I have had regard to all of the matters raised, but for the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Orr

INSPECTOR