



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/25/3367750

25 Broadfields, East Molesey, KT8 0BW

- 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 Chris Shelley against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0055.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side extension, loft extension, single storey rear extension; install air source heat pumps.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 2 storey side extension, loft extension, single storey rear extension; install air source heat pumps at 25 Broadfields, East Molesey KT8 0BW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 2025/0055, 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 external materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall accord with those set out on the application forms and on the approved plans.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BLO-01, BRO-00, BRO-01, BRO-02, BRO-03, BRO-04, BRO-05, BRO-06, BRO-07, BRO-08, FLO-00, SUR-00, SUR-01, SUR-02, SUR-03, SUR-04, SUR-05, SUR-06, SUR-07.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in full accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.
 - 5) Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, all new side facing windows at first floor level and above shall be fitted with obscured glass and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. The scheme proposes a number of extensions and alterations to the main dwelling including a two storey side extension with hipped to gable end roof extension and rear dormer and single storey rear extension with rear heat pump. The Council's reason for refusal is specific to the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the

character and appearance of the host dwelling. From my site visit and all the information before me, I have no reason to take a different view.

3. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached property on the north side of Broadfields, within a predominantly residential area, with a mix of both detached and semi-detached dwellings, a number of which have been extended and altered. There is therefore a varied character and appearance to the street scene. As existing, the property is sited towards the eastern boundary of the site with a single, flat roofed garage and extension on the western side and to the rear, and a larger gap to the adjoining property on the western side.
5. The proposed two storey extension would be built along the western side and with a single storey extension across the rear of the extended dwelling under a flat roof. The existing hipped roof would become a gable end with a small section of crown roof and rear dormer, and the addition of a front roof light. The proposed dormer would extend both across the existing and the extended roof slope but would be set in from the gable ends and set up from the eaves line. The proposed use of materials for the dormer to match the materials for the existing and extended roof form would assist in integrating the dormer into the roof form.
6. In the context of the overall proposals, I consider that the proposed dormer would appear well balanced and would respect the proportions and scale of the host property and the overall composition would sit comfortably within the scale and dimensions of the existing plot. Given its siting and relationship to the overall roof form, I am satisfied that the proposed dormer would not be an over dominant addition to the property.
7. Although oblique views of the rear dormer would be possible within the street scene, these views would be limited and in the context of the varied designs of the individual houses, with both hipped and gable ends I do not consider that the dormer would appear overly dominant or materially harm the street scene. The property backs onto private sports grounds with the buildings associated with that sports ground being some distance to the north and I have not been advised of any public views that would be affected to the rear.
8. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed dormer would respect the host property and the street scene. There would be no conflict with Policies C7 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
9. I have noted that the proposal would not comply with all of the detailed guidance in the Elmbridge Design Code 2024. However, I have found that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of both the existing house and the local area. In the particular circumstances of this case, and for the reasons set out above, I consider that there would be justification for an exception to be made to these parts of the Design Code.

10. The Council has referred to two recent examples of rear dormers permitted by the Council in the same road and in an adjoining road which were of smaller dimensions than that proposed in this case. Each proposal must be judged on its individual merits but in so far as the Appellant has made the information available to me, I have taken them into account. The Appellant has also referred me to a number of additional examples. However, I do not consider that the decisions reached in respect of different properties with their own bespoke proposals should determine the acceptability of the proposal before me. I have assessed this proposal in the context of the host property and the overall proposals as well as the street scene and these other examples do not persuade me to a different view.

Other Considerations

11. There is reference to a protected tree under the reference EL:158 in the front garden of the appeal property along its western boundary. That tree no longer appears to exist, and the Council raised no concerns in this regard.
12. The Council has referenced the need for a noise assessment but as the proposal relates to the extensions and alterations to an existing domestic property, I do not consider that there is any planning justification for such an assessment.

Conditions

13. The approved plans should be listed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning and the proposed external materials should accord with the approved plans and information on the application forms to respect the character and appearance of the host property and of the local area.
14. The development should be undertaken in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment to protect against flood risk. The new windows at first floor level and above in the side elevations should be obscure glazed to protect the amenities of the neighbours.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR