



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2024

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/24/3339898

11 St Georges Close, Weybridge, Surry KT13 0DS

- 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 Miss E Scott against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/2850, dated 17 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a single storey extension following the demolition of the existing single storey porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. There is uniformity to the appearance of the dwellings within this terrace. Although this is a relatively short terrace, the uniformity to the rhythm of its appearance is visually pleasing and provides a distinctive quality to both its character and appearance. There is a break in the terrace with the adjoining property stepped back from the appeal property. However, this does not alter the rhythm to the uniformity of the appearance of the terrace.
5. The proposal, although modest in size, would alter the appearance of the host property and create an extension visually discordant with the distinctiveness of the terrace. Being out of keeping it would stand out as being an insensitive development within the street scene. Consequently, the proposal would be detrimental to the visual appearance of the area. Although not a visually prominent street scene the proposal would nonetheless bring about harm to the locality.

6. The neighbouring terrace hosts projecting garages to the front of properties. I saw that that terrace has its own distinctive character and appearance that is different to that to which the proposal forms part. This offers little weight in favour of the proposal. Therefore, the proposal can and should be considered on its own merits.
7. There is local support for the proposal and other residents have expressed a desire to undertake similar development. Whilst this may be so, this does not make an unacceptable development acceptable or justify the proposed development.
8. The proposal would provide additional living space for the occupiers providing study and storage space. Whilst this would provide a benefit to the occupiers well-being and living environment, this does not outweigh my above concerns or justify the proposal.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policies CS4 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and the provisions of the Framework. These policies and Framework seek, amongst other matters, development to integrate sensitively with locally distinctive landscape and to preserve or enhance the character of the area.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR