



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2022

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/22/3290296

154 Oatlands Drive, Weybridge 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 Andrew Meatyard against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/2340, dated 28 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is amendment to planning permission 2018/0522 to include alterations to 2 South facing bay windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my visit, I saw works and demolition had taken place at the site. However, as I cannot be sure these related to the scheme before me, I have assessed it as a proposed development on the basis of the plans before me.
3. I have taken the description of development from the application form. Although different to that on the decision notice, no confirmation that a change was agreed has been provided.
4. Planning permission was granted¹ for extensions and alterations to convert existing single-storey house into two-storey house following partial demolition of existing house. The principal difference from that to the scheme before me is the introduction of 2 additional bay windows to the south elevation. While the whole scheme is part of the appeal before me and therefore to be determined, the earlier permission provides a fallback position. Consequently, I have focussed my attention on the additional elements.

Main Issue

5. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. Oatlands Drive is characterised by residential houses of varied design and scale and includes an array of building styles. Nonetheless, I did not see any similarly proportioned front elevation projections or bay window features that extended the full height of the property.

¹ 2018/0522

7. Plans of the building prior to the works being undertaken and approved schemes at the site retained the single storey appearance of the building. First floor accommodation was contained within the roof space using relatively discrete dormers that sit comfortably in the roof, set up from the eaves, and down from the main ridge height. The roofscape and single storey appearance are the only features prominent in the streetscene despite the building being closer to the road than many nearby.
8. While the footprint increase would be small, the proposed 2-storey bay window would break the eaves of the main roof. In addition, it would extend the full height of the property, above the dormer windows on the same elevation and would be of a full 2-storey appearance. This would be discordant and jar with the predominately single storey proportions of the property. Although not extending forward of the building line, the 2-storey bay would be the most prominent feature at the property from the street given its height and position.
9. The eaves of the additional single storey bay window would align with the main roof and be smaller than the one on the west facing elevation. It would assimilate into the property, be low level and unassuming.
10. Nevertheless, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to the design and character protection aims of Policies CS4 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy, Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan and the SPD². It would also fail to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

11. Even if I were to agree with the appellant that there was no harm from the scheme to other issues, this would be a neutral factor and not weigh in favour of the proposal. The previous permission represents a fallback position. However, as this would not have the same 2-storey bay window, it would not result in the same harm as the scheme before me and is not a reason to allow the appeal.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
13. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR

² Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document