
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2025

by **G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/24/3355617

17 Manor Chase, Weybridge, Surrey KT13 8SE

- 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 Andrew Lovett against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1941.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension over existing ground floor front projection. New 2 storey gable extension to front facade. Alterations to fenestrations. Installation of rooflights to main roof. Internal reconfigurations. Replacement of existing 1.95M tall fence to rear boundary with new 2.2M tall fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

3. Manor Chase is a cul-de-sac fronted by detached dwellings that are constructed to markedly consistent scales, forms and architectural styles. Most have built forms with a gable at one end and a long side facing roof slope at the other, often with a front roof slope that continues over a short forward projecting 2 storey wing. Window apertures tend to be modestly sized with generally narrow proportions, contributing to the traditional appearances of the dwellings' facades. Although a few buildings at the end of the cul-de-sac, referred to as 10 and 11 Manor Chase, do not have side facing roof slopes, they are consistent with the other dwellings in all other key respects. Together, these characteristics give Manor Chase a strongly cohesive and distinctive suburban character and appearance.
4. The appeal dwelling is highly visible in street level views where its scale, form and appearance are strongly reflective of the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, together with 18 and 19 Manor Chase (Numbers 18 and 19), the appeal dwelling forms part of a row of substantially identical dwellings, each built with a main 2 storey core and a forward projecting and subservient single storey front wing. Together they form a distinctive group of buildings with a strong visual sense of uniformity that contributes positively to the distinctive suburban character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed front and side extension above the existing single storey wing would add significant elevated bulk to the appeal dwelling's façade, increasing its scale

and massing in a prominent forwards position. It would erode the subservient relationship between the front wing and main core of the dwelling, weakening the clear hierarchy of its built form, and markedly altering its roof form and facade in street level views. As such, the proposed extension would be an inharmonious addition to the appeal dwelling that would harmfully erode its positive contribution to the strong visual consistency of the built forms of the dwellings in the street scene, particularly its contribution to the distinctive grouping of Numbers 17-19.

6. The proposed 2 storey front gable would relate to the shape of the host property's side gable. However, by extending upwards into the existing front roof slope it would disrupt the longer part of the slope which continues above the existing front projecting wing, and which is a characteristic feature of the property's roof form and the roofscape along this part of the cul-de-sac. Furthermore, the large expanse of glazing to the proposed gable would be at odds with the sizes, proportions and styles of window openings in the host dwelling and those in the street scene. The single storey gabled porches at Nos 6 and 15 are not comparable in scale and appearance to the proposed front gabled extension. They are of limited relevance to my considerations in this appeal.
7. Seen together, the proposed extensions would significantly alter the scale, form and appearance of the host dwelling in the street scene. In its proposed extended form, the appeal dwelling would appear discordant by comparison to the strongly cohesive appearances of the dwellings fronting the cul-de-sac, including the substantially identical grouping of Numbers 17-19, resulting in the harmful erosion of the distinctive suburban character and appearance of the area. As such, the appeal proposal would fail to harmonise with the appearance of the appeal dwelling and those in the streetscape, contrary to the general principles applicable to all forms of extensions in the Elmbridge Borough Council Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions April 2012 ("the SPD").
8. Full details of the circumstances that led to the approval of the double fronted façade to 3 Manor Chase (Number 3), or its appearance prior to being extended, are not before me, and therefore I cannot be satisfied that it is directly comparable to the appeal proposal. Moreover, Number 3 is relatively discreetly positioned at the end of a short cul-de-sac on a different section of road to the appeal property, where its front wings broadly follow the established building line. There is limited intervisibility between Number 3 and the appeal property, which is generally seen amongst similar style dwellings, including Numbers 18 and 19. For these reasons Number 3 does not establish a visual context for the appeal scheme, and I afford it very little weight in my decision.
9. The front gable to Number 12 Manor Walk appears to have a different style of windows to those in the appeal proposal and it fronts a different road to the appeal property with no apparent intervisibility between their respective facades. As such, this example does not provide any useful comparison to the case before me and is of limited relevance to my considerations in this appeal.
10. Taking all the above into account, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and area, contrary to Policies CS4 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy, July 2011, and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan, April 2015, insofar as they require development to preserve or enhance the

character and appearance of the host building and area, with particular regard to its appearance, scale and mass, including taking account of the SPD's design guidance. For the same reasons, the appeal proposal would conflict with Paragraphs 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires development to, amongst others, be sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

11. I have assessed the proposal on the basis of the relevant policies and guidance referred to above and its external appearance in the context of its surroundings. Those policies and guidance do not set floor space thresholds for assessing extensions and therefore floor space calculations are of limited relevance to my considerations and are not determinative to my decision.
12. The planning system is mainly concerned with the development of land in the public interest. In this context, the private benefits of the appeal proposal's enhancement to the living space and conditions of the property's occupiers are matters of very limited weight in its favour and are insufficient to outweigh its harm. The Council's finding of an absence of harm in all other respects is a neutral factor that weighs neither in favour nor against the development.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposal's harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and area, leads to conflict with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to outweigh this finding. Consequently, the proposed development is not acceptable, and the appeal is dismissed.

G Sylvester

INSPECTOR