



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **L Gardner MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 DECEMBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/25/3372823

12 Parkwood Avenue, Esher, Surrey KT10 8DG

- 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 Laura Anthony against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1327.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing conservatory. Proposed rear ground, first and loft extensions with garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for removal of existing conservatory. Proposed rear ground, first and loft extensions with garage conversion at 12 Parkwood Avenue, Esher, Surrey KT10 8DG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/1327, 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 drawing nos 2517_00; 2517_01 Rev. B; 2517_12 Rev. A; 2517_13 Rev. A and 2517_15 Rev. A.
 - 3) No development above ground level shall take place until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the second-floor window on the side elevation has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.
 - 5) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in full accordance with the mitigation measures outlined within the Flood Risk Assessment by ARK Environmental Consultancy Ltd. Dated June 2025.

Preliminary Matter

2. In its officer report, the Council refers to inconsistencies with the proposed roof and loft level plan in relation to the side facing dormer. Whilst I agree that the roof plan appears to omit the proposed obscurely glazed window which would be

visible at the apex of the roof, I also agree with the Council that the plans are sufficient to make a determination on the application. I have therefore proceeded on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and;
- whether the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on flood risk and incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage measures.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is within a relatively sub-urban residential context, comprised predominantly of detached two storey properties set within spacious plots. The form and design of dwellings within the immediately surrounding area are not consistent with frequent variations in scale, design and materials. Whilst there remains a general cohesiveness to the character of the street scene, this is not achieved through any specific design feature. Roof dormers, including those such as the one present on the appeal property, are not an uncommon feature in the immediate street scene.
5. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling with a projecting two storey gable to the front. The rest of the front elevation notably features low eaves down to single storey with the first floor served by a roof dormer window. The materials used in the existing dwelling conform with the surrounding area, with brick to the front elevation and white render elsewhere. The rear elevation features a large flat roofed box dormer.
6. The appeal property is broadly interpreted within the street scene as a handed version of the adjacent property at 14 Parkwood Avenue (No 14). However, it appears that No 14 has been previously extended, in a form similar to that presented through the appeal proposal (albeit there would be minor differences including a side facing window in the appeal scheme). The side and rear dormers of No 14 are not dominant features within the street scene but are nevertheless visible.
7. The Council's concerns with the appeal proposal relate specifically to the proposed roof enlargement. The proposed roof alterations would form a considerable alteration to the existing roof, even in acknowledgement of the existing rear roof dormer. The result of the proposals would be a complex roof form with varying elements, albeit the elements would be visually interpreted together, particularly given the apparent intention to use matching roof materials.
8. Rather than being more visually disruptive than the existing alterations at No 14, I find that the appeal proposal would visually be very similar in appearance and would maintain the established handed appearance of the two properties. The presence of the existing development at No 14 therefore forms a material consideration in my assessment.

9. Views of the proposal would be limited from a wider view given the development would largely be contained to the rear of the property. Nevertheless, where it would be visible, it would be almost entirely viewed in the context of the similar roof additions at No 14. The proposal would therefore give the appearance of a consolidated form of development which would assimilate well with the established character of the surrounding area.
10. Based on the above, I find that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (ECS) (2011) and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (ELPDMP) (2015) which collectively require new development to deliver high quality design, including that which responds to the positive features of individual locations, and which takes account of the prevailing pattern of built development.

Flood risk and drainage

11. The appeal site is at risk of flooding, located within Flood Zone 2. Policy CS26 of the ECS seeks to reduce the overall and local risk of flooding including through requiring flood resistance and resilience measures for development which takes place in flood zones 2 or 3.
12. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that information provided within a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) should be proportionate to the degree of flood risk and appropriate to the scale, nature and location of development.
13. The application was accompanied by a comprehensive FRA. Rather than being generic in nature, the FRA explicitly outlines flood resilience measures and sustainable drainage measures which are site specific and have been incorporated into the proposal.
14. I find that the submitted FRA is proportionate to the scale and form of development proposed. Subject to its recommendations which could be secured by condition, I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on flood risk and incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage measures. I have therefore identified no direct conflict with Policy CS26 of the ECS.

Other Matters

15. Letters of representation have been received objecting to the proposal, partially in relation to the effect on neighbouring living conditions. The predominant outlook from the rear windows of the proposal would be towards the garden serving the appeal property. Whilst there may be some oblique lines of sight into neighbouring gardens, I do not consider that this would be materially different to the outlook from the existing rear windows. There is also a window proposed to the side elevation, but this is intended to be obscurely glazed which would safeguard neighbouring privacy.
16. Given the positioning of neighbouring building lines, and the distances between built form and shared boundaries, I do not find that the proposal would impose harm to neighbouring outlook, with particular reference to overbearing impacts. I therefore see no reason to disagree with the Council that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on neighbouring living conditions.

Conditions

17. I shall impose a condition specifying the relevant drawings to provide certainty for all parties.
18. There is some disagreement between the main parties as to whether the submitted details are clear in relation to the proposed material finishes. Whilst the plans and application form make some inference to the materials proposed, they are not entirely clear for all parts of the proposed development. I therefore find it reasonable and necessary to seek confirmation of the precise materials through condition in order to maintain the character and appearance of the area.
19. A condition is necessary to ensure that the proposed side window is obscurely glazed in the interests of neighbouring living conditions.
20. Based on my findings above, a condition requiring compliance with the submitted FRA is necessary to ensure that the development complies with Policy CS26 of the ECS.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Gardner

INSPECTOR