



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2022

**by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 28th November 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/22/3305754**

**14 Woodland Way, Weybridge, Surrey, KT13 9SW**

- 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 Mike Drew against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 2022/1050, dated 1 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2022.
  - The development proposed is a single storey side extension, first-floor rear extension, first floor front extension, front porch, rear dormer windows, side rooflights, replace side wall and gate and alterations to fenestration following demolition of chimney.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension, first-floor rear extension, first floor front extension, front porch, rear dormer windows, side rooflights, replace side wall and gate and alterations to fenestration following demolition of chimney at 14 Woodland Way, Weybridge, Surrey, KT13 9SW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/1050, dated 1 April 2022, 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: HA/1873/P3/1; HA/1873/P3/2; and HA/1873/P3/3.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

### Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of development in the above banner heading as it concisely and accurately describes the proposal.

### Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling located at the end of a short cul-de-sac comprising of detached houses of various architectural styles

- and designs. The dwelling has a steep hipped roof form with two dormer windows on its rear roof slope.
5. The proposed first floor rear extension would have a depth of about 3.05m and would extend across width of the main part of the existing dwelling. The dwelling would have a crown roof which would enable additional accommodation to be provided within the roof space. Two new dormer windows are proposed on the rear elevation of the proposed extension.
  6. The proposed rear extension would be of the same eaves and ridge height as the host dwelling and in this regard, it would not appear subservient. However, in my opinion due to its design and limited depth, the extension would integrate sensitively with the design of the host dwelling and would not be harmful to its character. Furthermore, the proposed rear dormer windows would be modest in size and would not overly dominate the rear roof slope.
  7. Limited views of the crown roof of the extended dwelling would be obtainable from Woodland Way due to the gaps in between adjacent dwellings and the splayed nature of the plots. However, in my view, the rear extension and its associated crown roof form would not be unduly prominent in the street scene. Moreover, I noted on my site visit that there are other examples in the immediate area of dwellings with crown roof sections and accordingly, this aspect of the appeal proposal would not be out of character with the street scene.
  8. The proposed single storey porch extension and first floor front extension would be of modest scale and would be subservient in appearance to the host dwelling and would not be harmful to its overall character and appearance. Furthermore, the proposed single storey side extension would be of a similar width to an existing side extension and would result in a balanced front elevation. Other alterations to the appearance of the dwelling, including its fenestration would be in keeping with the original style and design of the host dwelling.
  9. I acknowledge that the existing dwelling would be significantly enlarged however, given the overall size of the plot and the distances that would be maintained to the boundaries of the site, I do not agree that the proposed development would amount to an over development of the site.
  10. For the above reasons, the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. It would comply with Policies CS4 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015. These policies seek amongst other matters to ensure that new development preserves or enhances the character of the area and integrates sensitively with the locally distinctive townscape. For the same reasons, the proposal would accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (April 2012).

#### *Other Matters*

11. Due to the generous separation distances involved, I am satisfied that the appeal proposal would not result in any significant overlooking of dwellings to

the rear of the site in Oatlands Close. In addition, I am in agreement with the Council that the extensions would not result in any significant harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers at 11 and 12 Woodland Way due to their design and siting in relation to the side boundaries of the site.

*Conditions*

12. In addition to the standard 3 year implementation condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the extensions to be constructed in matching materials to ensure a satisfactory external appearance. The approved plans condition is imposed for clarity.

**Conclusion**

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*J Davis*

INSPECTOR