



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2024

by H Miles BA(hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/W/24/3344293

Daljarrock, East Road, Weybridge, Surrey KT13 0LG

- 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 Mr I Grimshaw of Claremont Finesse against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2023/2912.
 - The development proposed is two detached two storey dwellings and detached garage with associated hard and soft landscaping and replacement vehicular entrance gates, following the demolition of the existing dwellinghouses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. East Road is within the WEY16 St Georges Hill Sub area in the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Weybridge (2012). This comprises a private residential estate and its important characteristics include the large, gated, detached dwellings set in generous grounds. Vegetation including to front gardens and boundaries provides a spacious and landscape dominated appearance. Properties are in an informal layout with a varied mix of styles.
4. The existing building originally formed a single house, but has been subdivided into two dwellings. They each have separate garden areas but share an access and driveway with landscaping to the frontage which provides screening to the road. The existing building is run down, nevertheless, the generous size of the dwellings and garden areas result in the existing site making a positive contribution to the character of the area as set out above.
5. The proposed development would demolish the existing building and replace it with two dwellings. One would be a generous five bedroom dwelling (the house). The second dwelling would be a more modest three bedroom house (the lodge). Although it is not indicated on the plans, a private garden area could be provided to the side and rear of the lodge. A detached single storey four bay garage is also proposed. The buildings would be arranged around a driveway with a turning circle, in common with the existing arrangement. The

house would be set centrally in the plot, with the garage and lodge set forward of and perpendicular to the house.

6. Even if the lodge could be used as an annexe, the appeal before me is for two separate dwellings. If the development were not built or used as proposed, or if there were a material change of use in the future such as that would involve the loss of a dwelling, then a separate grant of planning permission would be required.
7. As such the development proposes a separate smaller dwelling which would be in a much more limited plot than others nearby. This would be harmfully at odds with the substantial dwellings set in large grounds which characterise this area. The proposed development would therefore unacceptably erode this clear pattern of development and sense of spaciousness which are important features of this area.
8. The positions of the buildings would be similar to other main houses with smaller ancillary buildings around them within St Georges Hill and I am provided with examples where planning permission has been granted for the erection of a main house and ancillary outbuildings¹. However, the appeal scheme proposes two separate dwellings, and therefore is clearly different to these arrangements. I am also provided with detail of planning permission at Blue Barn Farm² where permission was granted for two dwellings to be demolished and replaced with two dwellings. However, in that case the officer comments that the existing buildings have a subordinate relationship, therefore those circumstances are not similar to the appeal scheme. Nor is the resultant development so common as to form an important part of the character of the appeal site.
9. Therefore, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, in this regard, it would be contrary to policies CS4 and CS17 of the Core Strategy (2011) and policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan (2015). Together these seek high quality design which responds to local character, including with regard to Weybridge, amongst other things.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR

¹ 2012/1741 – Warren House & Warren Lodge, Warreners Lane, 2012/2257 – Long Mile & Langleys, Old Avenue, 2015/3110 – Crickets Hill & Single Oak, Golf Club Road.

² 2023/0149