



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/25/3365140

23 Meadows Leigh Close, Weybridge, Surrey KT13 8QD

- 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 Mrs Zsuzsanna Vesmas against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0002.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side extension at 23 Meadows Leigh Close, Weybridge, Surrey KT13 8QD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/0002, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P01 and P02 Revision C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey house on the end of a staggered row of linked semi-detached houses within a private court that is beyond the cul-de-sac of Meadows Leigh Close. No 23 is tucked away in a far corner of the estate and there exists a significant area of garden to its side, the front portion of which has been enclosed more recently than as originally laid out.
4. The close is characterised by a variety of house types, some full two storey, others one and a half storey with catslide roof forms either to the front or rear; and no 24 adjoining has first floor accommodation over a double carport area. Consequently, whilst designed and built within the same era, the overall scale and form of dwellings is quite eclectic.

5. The extension would be more than double the width of the existing house although public vantage points of this would be very oblique. Some garden would remain to the side of the extension along with the whole of the existing rear garden retained.
6. I acknowledge that the Council's Home Extensions Companion Guide (HECG) SPD 2012 advises that development should achieve an appropriate relationship with the existing house and harmonise with the streetscape. The width of the extension would be wider than the host dwelling, however, by virtue of its single storey form and the varied architectural forms found within the close, on balance, I find that there would be no demonstrable harm caused to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I consider that there would be no material conflict either with the NPPF or the HECG and the scheme complies with Policy DM2 of the Council's Development Management Plan 2015 and Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy 2011 which together require all new development to achieve high quality design which must be based on an understanding of local character; taking into account design guidance detailed in the SPD.

Other Matters

7. I note the third party concerns raised, however, whether or not there is a need for the extension is not a determining factor in this appeal. Furthermore, the Council states that with regard to the concerns raised about the appellant trying to obtain land around the proposal, and construction noise and disturbance, that there is no evidence to suggest this, and that such impacts would not likely be significant; I have been given no substantive reason to come to a different conclusion on this.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
9. Other than the standard time limit condition, the Council has suggested conditions be imposed that require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and that materials employed in the extension match those on the existing dwelling. I consider these conditions necessary in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR