



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2023

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/22/3310791

10 Hollingworth Close, West Molesey KT8 2TW

- 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 Watson against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/2256, dated 19 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer loft conversion and installation of front roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. From both the appellant and council's submissions, the appeal property does not benefit from permitted development rights, where these were removed via a planning condition as part of the original permission for the development. I have proceeded to determine the appeal on that basis.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area.
4. Hollingworth Close is a residential cul-de-sac of modern, detached houses with front and rear gardens and driveways. There are a mixture of designs throughout the cul-de-sac, all appearing to originate from around the early 1990s, however all of the dwellings within the immediate vicinity of the appeal property are two storey.
5. No10 is a 3 bedroomed house which backs on to an area of public open space and further modern housing development. It has been subject to a ground floor extension which 'wraps around' part of the dwelling.
6. Policy CS17 (Local Character, Density and Design) of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) (CS) requires development proposals to take account of established character, density and design within an area.
7. Policy DM2 (Design and Amenity) of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015) (DMP) seeks development that preserves or enhances the character of the Do local area.

8. The Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (2012) (SPD) provides advice and general guidance on the design principles for residential extensions. It seeks to avoid unsightly extensions which ignore the style and character of the original house, where it would adversely affect the appearance of the street scene.
9. The appeal proposals would result in the addition of a very large box dormer window on the second floor which would be added to the rear of the host dwelling. The front roof elevation of the dwelling would have a number of rooflights installed. The proposed development would result in the addition of a 4th bedroom and shower room.
10. The flat-roofed box dormer would take up much of the width of the existing roof and would, in my view add a highly visible and substantial new feature which is not typical of this part of the estate. This would be at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
11. I have considered (and visited) Weldon Drive, which was one of the examples cited by the appellant. However, I agree with the council's position that there are differences in character (particularly in terms of design) between Weldon Drive and Hollingworth Close. In any case, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
12. The proposed floor to ceiling windows within the scheme are also, in my view, particularly incongruous and harmful.
13. I therefore find there would be harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policies CS17 of the CS, DM2 of the DMP and the relevant parts of the SPD and NPPF.

Conclusions

14. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR