



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/24/3344209

Chalk House, Park Lawn Road, Weybridge, Surrey KT13 9EU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Edward Forbes Thomas against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0347.
 - The development proposed is described as "Part two/part single-storey side extension, front porch and alterations to fenestration"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development on the application form is for "the construction of a two-storey side extension. The extension of an existing rear extension. Along with the construction of a new front porch, all together with minor internal alterations". As per the appellants statement and the decision notice, there is no proposal for a rear extension. I have therefore used the description of development from the decision notice, as this more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed extension on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) highway safety with specific regard to visibility.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. Appearing to have originally been part of one larger house, the appeal building is a semi-detached two storey dwelling. Its ground floor frontage to Oatlands Drive is partially obscured by planting but its corner location gives the first floor and non-adjoined side elevation as it faces Park Lawn Road a high degree of prominence in both street scenes. It is a symmetrical design with a centralised first floor bay window and a forward-facing gable with attractive fascia detailing.

The side elevation is set at an angle to Park Lawn Road and carries on a traditional appearance with small windows, a single storey side projection and consistent banding part way up the walls. These design elements and features, the front elevation particularly, contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The appeal scheme would be narrow but bulky due to its length. This, and the use of a flat roof at first floor level, would jar awkwardly with the traditional feel to the existing building and unbalance its pleasant symmetry. The raised eaves height owing to the use of a flat roof and fanned out floorplan, would add to the extension's incongruence with the host dwelling.
7. The proposal would thus cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) (CS), Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan (2015) (DMP), the Design and Character SPD (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Highway Safety

8. The parking provision for the dwelling is to the front of the appeal site and there is a dwarf wall and metal fencing siding the boundary adjacent to the vehicular access. Park Lawn Road is narrow and close to single width, the speed limit is 30 miles per hour. An access to a private parking court is almost opposite the vehicular access. There are parking restrictions close to the appeal site, which are lifted further north.
9. The existing boundary wall and alignment of the building relative to Park Lawn Road allows adequate visibility to the left for exiting vehicles. By virtue of the height and placement of the outer wall of the new extension, this line of sight would be completely obscured. Exiting drivers would therefore have to pull out into Park Lawn Road to be able to see sufficiently to the left, at a time when their bonnet would be all but blocking the road. This would not only cause a hazard but also risk vehicular collision.
10. Current residents may be aware of a number of other site accesses along the road, the private parking court and the entrance to the appeal site itself. However, neither this nor the resulting low speed that vehicles might be travelling at on their approach to the junction with Oatlands Drive would be sufficient to make up for the potentially dangerous situation I have explained.
11. The proposal would therefore result in an unacceptable impact to highway safety. It would thus conflict with Policy CS25 of the CS, Policy DM7 of the DMP and the Framework which together seek to ensure that highway safety is secured for the users of new and existing development.

Other Matters

12. It is not sufficiently clear that the proposed development is the only way of meeting the increased internal space requirements of the incumbent family. I therefore attach moderate weight to this personal need. I am also unaware of the precise detail as it relates to a previous planning application on the appeal site and specifically therefore what bearing it would have on the scheme before me. I therefore ascribe it only very limited weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan and I have been given no compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR