
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2023

by Elaine Benson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/22/3308248

79 St. Marys Road, Weybridge, Surrey KT13 9PZ

- 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 Alister and Alison Jenkins against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 2022/1385, dated 3 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'increase in ridge height, roof alterations and dormers to front and rear roof slopes - to facilitate loft conversion.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling (No 79) and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a double fronted detached house with plain, rendered elevations beneath a shallow, hipped roof. The proposal includes substantial roof level enlargements, resulting in a flat ridge/crown top. The dormers would not be set down from a traditional ridge as seen in examples in the locality and would contribute to the massing at high level. The development would have a bulky and inelegant appearance which would overwhelm and harm the character and appearance of No 79. This prominent and incongruous form of development would be clearly visible in the street scene.
4. Properties in the surrounding area are varied in architectural styles and ages. This design variety affords a greater tolerance for design alterations. However, for the reasons set out the proposal would result in a jarring, discordant roof design that would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Although the appeal property is unlisted and does not stand within a conservation area, the proposal does not satisfy the requirement for high quality design which fits well into its surroundings.
5. As the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings, it conflicts with Policies CS10 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan Policies, which in summary and relevant to this proposal

require high-quality design, including appropriate scale, mass and height. The scheme fails to accord with similar guidance in the Council's 'Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions' which also states that roof extensions should not 'dominate the roof by being over-large'. There would also be conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and the National Design Guidance 2019.

6. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR