



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 November 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/23/3325197

4 Greenside Road, Weybridge, surrey, KT13 8PY.

- 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 Alexandros Kontolatis and Raquel Morais de Oliveira against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/0420, dated 10 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as *erection of a second-floor level*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application form was incorrectly completed setting out just the first names of the applicants. In the bullet point above I have given the appellants full names for the sake of completeness.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property, the terrace of which it is part thereby the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider locality.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 4 Greenside Road, is a two-storey terraced dwelling. It is part of a larger modern residential development, which comprises a mix of two-storey properties together with a five-storey block of flats. Despite the variety of designs the architectural detailing and uniformity of materials make for a crisply detailed, well-mannered and attractive development.
5. The terraced houses of which number 4 is one have flat roofs with projecting mono-pitched roof staircase towers. The houses are of a uniform design and appear to have only had some minor alterations to the external cladding, that has not significantly denuded the original design. I noted that some dwellings within the wider development have been extended but this has been done relatively discreetly so as not to detract from the overall character of the estate.

6. The appellant proposes extending the property upwards to create a completely new second floor. The staircase tower would also be extended upwards to serve the additional floor. The fenestration pattern, palette of materials and detailing would also be replicated the existing design detailing.
7. When viewed in true elevation only (as drawn) from the street and rear I consider that the proposal would have some limited architectural merit. However, due to the blank second floor side walls rising above the adjoining flat roofs I consider that the proposed addition would cause significant harm to the original architectural design of the house, resulting in a visually incongruous form of development detrimental to the host property, the terrace and thereby the street scene and the area.
8. For the foregoing reasons I conclude in respect of the main issue that proposed additional floor would cause significant harm to the original architectural design of the house, the terrace of which it is part and therefore the street scene and the wider area. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of Policies CS4 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Borough Council – Elmbridge Core Strategy (Adopted July 2011), Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (Adopted April 2015), Elmbridge Borough Council Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guides-Weybridge and Home Extensions (Adopted April 2012), Elmbridge local Plan–Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted April 2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate, amongst other things, to the need for new development to achieve a high quality of design which in turn preserves and enhances the character of the area.

Other matters

9. In reaching my decision I have been mindful of the benefits that the additional family accommodation for the appellant. However, given the harm that I have identified this is not a compelling reason to allow the proposed addition.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR