



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2025

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/25/3367778

13 Merton Way, West Molesey, KT8 1PG

- 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 Daniel Conant against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0626.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey side/front extension (following demolition of the front bay window projection and part of the dwelling), hip to gable end extension and increase in ridge height (following removal of chimney).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side/front extension (following demolition of the front bay window projection and part of the dwelling), hip to gable end extension and increase in ridge height (following removal of chimney) at 13 Merton Way, West Molesey, KT8 1PG in accordance with the terms of the application, 2024/2844, subject to the conditions set out below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a revised block plan which corresponds to the depth of the front extension shown on the floor and elevation drawings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A101, A103, A104, A105, A106, A107, B101, B102 and B103.
 - 3) The materials and finishes to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development permitted by virtue of Classes A, B, C and D of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Order shall be undertaken unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Preliminary matters

2. The submitted block plan, reference A102 is clearly incorrect. It shows the proposed front extension as being 1.3 metres deep, whereas the other drawings and appeal statement all show and refer to it as being some 1.9 metres deep. As this is a matter that could be satisfactorily dealt with by condition, it has not affected my ability to determine this appeal.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within an area that is primarily characterised by a mixture of symmetrically designed semi-detached houses and similarly designed bungalows from a limited range of designs and palette of materials. The bungalows and dormer bungalows are traditionally designed and have a variety of hipped and gable roofs, single storey front projections, and varied front building lines and ridge heights. They have brick and/or rendered walls under brown plain tiled roofs. In some areas some of the bungalows and dormer bungalows have had a variety of front and roof extensions and alterations, which has resulted in a more diverse character, and this includes where the appeal property is located. Conversely there is a greater sense of uniformity and rhythm along the northern section of Merton Way.
5. The appeal property is located within a row of three similarly designed bungalows, with staggered front building lines and hipped main roofs. The appeal dwelling and the dwelling at 11 Merton Way (No.11) both have similar projecting bay windows in their front elevations and projecting side gables on their east roof slopes. However, the appeal dwelling has a flat roofed dormer on its western roof slope and white rendered/painted walls. Conversely the dwelling at No.11 has no dormer addition on its west roof slope and has red brick walls.
6. On the other side of the appeal dwelling, the dwelling at 15 Merton Close (No.15), has a deep single storey front projection with a gabled roof, which projects forward of the appeal dwelling. It also has a tall flat roofed dormer extension facing the appeal site, a large full height side extension and white rendered walls.
7. Opposite and beyond the junction of Merton Way and Third Close the roofscape and building lines are also varied. This is due to the variety of front projections, the mixture of full and part width gables and some flat roofed side dormer extensions. These changes have resulted in greater individuality in the character and appearance of the dwellings, whilst they still respect the more varied character of dormer bungalows within the immediate street scene.
8. Amongst other things policies CS7 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (CS), together with policies DM1 and DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 (DMP), require new development to be of high quality. It should maximise the efficient use of land while taking account of the appearance, scale, height, massing, layout and character of the host building and the prevailing pattern of development. Within East and West Molesey new development should preserve or enhance the character of the area.

9. Sections 6.5 and 6.6 of the Elmbridge Design Code 2025 (EDC), advise that roof extensions and dormers should help maintain the style and appearance of the host building and should avoid dominating the roofscape from a wider view. Fenestration should be in a vertical and horizontal rhythm, and external materials should be of a similar appearance to those of the host property. New roof extensions should reflect and respond to the existing proportions, roof pitch and façade and its openings.
10. Currently the roof of the host dwelling is dominated by the side facing gable and flat roofed dormer, which due to their height dominate the roof and make it appear squat and unbalanced. With the proposal the front half of the building would be slightly wider. Despite this, its roof pitch and materials would match those of the host dwelling, and it would retain the theme of hipped and gable roofs in the immediate area. The existing projecting side gable and flat roofed dormers would both be set further back from the front of the dwelling and below the ridge line. As a consequence, they would be visually softer and would no longer dominate or materially detract from the form and appearance of the roof of the dwelling.
11. The large triangular front first floor window with its vertical lines would reduce the perceived width of the gable and would be in keeping with the contemporary design of the front entrance. The detailing of the new ground floor window would be proportionate to the resultant front elevation and would pick up on the vertical lines of the existing bay window that it would replace.
12. Although the resultant front building line of the host dwelling would project forward of the dwellings at No.11 and No.15, the bungalows and dormer bungalows in the immediate area include a combination of broken and slightly staggered building lines. The area also includes a mixture of hipped and gable roofs of various sizes fronting the street. Opposite the appeal site at 4 Merton Way there is a similar gable fronted extension, which projects forward of the original bungalow by one metre. It sits forward of the low front projections of the bungalows on either side and has large full height gable extensions on both side roof slopes. The dwelling at 8 Merton Way has full height flat roofed dormer windows on both side roof slopes. In addition, the appeal dwelling and the dwellings at No.11 and No.15 sit at the end of a row of taller two storey dwellings some of which have side gables.
13. Overall, whilst the appearance of the front of the dwelling would change, the resultant dwelling would appear balanced and would pick up on the proportions and some of the main characteristics of the host and other dormer bungalows in the immediate area. Whilst the extension would project close to the side boundary with No.15, it would have a low eaves height, and the roof would be hipped away from that property. The resultant gap between the two dwellings would not be uncharacteristic in the locality, and there would be a good-sized gap between the appeal dwelling and the dwelling at No.11.
14. For these reasons the resultant dwelling would not appear cramped. Its design takes account of the design and detailing of the host dwelling, the adjacent dwellings and the street scene as a whole.
15. I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would respect and blend in readily with the host dwelling, the street scene and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would comply with CS Policies CS7 & CS17, DMP Policies DMP1 & DMP2 and the EDC.

Other matters and conditions

16. Whilst the council did not suggest the imposition of any conditions, I consider that conditions relating to adherence to the approved drawings, the use of matching external materials, and the submission of a revised block plan are necessary. This is to ensure that the proposal respects the host dwelling, to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene, and in the interests of certainty.
17. I also consider that a condition that removes permitted development rights relating to all further alterations and additions to the appeal dwelling is necessary and reasonable. This is because such works would have the potential to result in the over-development of the dwelling, and the potential to unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and/or harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings.
18. Both the council and the appellant have been consulted regarding the above conditions, and neither party has raised any concerns regarding their need for and reasonableness.
19. The council has confirmed that the adjacent side windows in the dwelling at No.11 either serve non-habitable rooms or are secondary windows. Taking this into account and having regard to the distance between the appeal dwelling and the dwelling at No.11, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a materially harmful impact on the living conditions of No.11, due to visual impact, or loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight. Similarly, having regard to the juxtaposition between the resultant dwelling and the dwelling at No.15 and their side facing windows, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a materially adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of that property due to visual impact, or loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight.

Conclusion

20. Having regard to my conclusions on the main issue and all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR