



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025

by **J Heppell BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/24/3355663

21 Oatlands Drive, Weybridge, Surrey, KT13 9LZ

- 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 James Norman against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1879.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension comprising dressing areas and en suites plus new entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension comprising dressing areas and en suites plus new entrance porch at 21 Oatlands Drive, Weybridge, Surrey, KT13 9LZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/1879, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted location plan and drawing nos 2401.1_2.3_01, 2401.1_2.3_02, 2401_2.3_03, 2401.1_2.3_04, 2401_2.3_05, 2401_2.3_06, 2401_2.3_07, 2401_2.3_08, 2401_2.3_09 and 2401_2.3_10.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown in drawing nos 2401_2.3_07, 2401_2.3_08 and 2401_2.3_09.
 - 4) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the first floor windows on the north-east elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscure glass that accords with level three obscurity as shown on the Pilkington textured glass privacy levels (other glass suppliers are available) and only openable above a height of 1.7 metres above the internal floor level of the room which it serves. The windows shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated in a residential area characterised by detached single and two storey dwellings along with flatted developments. The properties are typically set back from the road, often with parking in front and well defined front

boundaries. The area benefits from mature landscaping which gives the road a verdant quality.

4. The appeal property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings constructed of facing bricks and plain tiles. It includes a two storey rear projection and a single storey side projection, both of which have hipped pitched roofs. The single storey side projection is set back from the front elevation of the main house.
5. The appellant proposes to construct a first floor extension above the existing single storey side projection. Its eaves height would match the eaves of the main house, and its ridge height would be set below that of the main dwelling. A juliet balcony would replace a window on the existing rear projection of the house, matching a juliet window proposed on the rear of the extension. A gable fronted porch would be added to the front of the house. The proposed extension and porch would be rendered, along with the existing single and two storey projections.
6. The proposed first floor extension would be set back from the front elevation of the house which, together with the proposed lower ridge line, would ensure that the extension appears subordinate to the main dwelling. The appellant's plans show, and the Council's Report confirms, that the proposed extension would be a minimum of 1 metre from the site boundary, which given the generally close relationship between dwellings nearby, is a sufficient separation distance to prevent a terracing effect. As a result, the proposed development would comply with the Council's Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (SPD), which guides that extensions to semi-detached houses should be set back from the front wall of the house and that a minimum of 1 metre should be maintained to the site boundary.
7. The proposals would alter the appearance of the property compared with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, but as the two dwellings are separated by substantial boundary treatment at the front, the change in appearance would not unbalance the appearance of the pair of dwellings to a harmful degree. The ground floor window on the front of the single storey side projection is existing, and therefore its lower cill level compared with the windows on the main house is an already accepted element of the street scene and is not detrimental to it. The proposed juliet balconies at the rear of the dwelling would not be widely visible and would not be incongruous in their setting.
8. A number of nearby properties successfully combine brick with render, and I am therefore satisfied that the use of render on the extension and porch would be in character with the area, and that flexibility can be applied regarding this aspect of the SPD. It is necessary for the roof tiles of the extension to match the existing house, which can be achieved via a planning condition.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposals would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would not conflict with Policies CS4 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy, Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan or the SPD. Together these policies seek well designed new development which integrates sensitively with the locally distinctive townscape and which preserves or enhances the character of the area.

Conditions

10. In the interests of certainty, I have attached a condition listing the approved plans. To ensure that appropriate materials are used, I have attached a condition requiring that the external surfaces of the development shall be constructed of the materials shown in the approved drawings.
11. The local planning authority has requested a condition requiring that the first floor en suite windows be obscure glazed and partially non-opening, in order to protect the privacy of the neighbouring residents. Whilst it is probable that the windows would have these characteristics in any event, to prevent this harm from occurring it would be prudent to impose the condition requested by the local planning authority.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

J Heppell

INSPECTOR