



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2025

by **E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 DECEMBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/25/3374740

4 Elm Court, Grange Close, West Molesey KT8 2PX

- 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 Panganiban against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1217.
 - The development proposed is single-storey rear extension and rear dormer window following demolition of existing rear conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single-storey rear extension and rear dormer window following demolition of existing rear conservatory at 4 Elm Court, Grange Close, West Molesey KT8 2PX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/1217, and the plans submitted with it, 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. 2389-CS-ZZ-00-DR-A-0001 Rev P2 Location/Site Plan, 2389-CS-ZZ-00-DR-A-0013 Rev P5 Site Plan Proposed, 2389-CS-ZZ-GF-DR-A-1000 Rev P4 Ground/First/Roof Floor General Arrangements, 2389-CS-ZZ-XX-DR-A-2000 Rev P4 Proposed Elevations General Arrangements and 2389-CS-ZZ-XX-DR-A-3000 Rev P3 Axonometric Views General Arrangements.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal proposal includes a single storey rear extension which is not part of the Council's reasons for refusal. The Council does not identify any conflict with the development plan in relation to this aspect of the application. Based on the plans before me and my observations on site, I see no reason to disagree. Therefore, the focus of this appeal is the proposed rear dormer.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms part of a terrace located within an area which is residential in character. The terrace is formed of dwellings of one and a half storeys in height, with first floor accommodation set within the roof. The terrace has a broad uniformity and rhythm when viewed from Grange Close. To the rear, some dwellings, including the appeal property, have been altered from their original form at ground floor level. The wider surroundings comprise a mix of two and one and a half storey dwellings, some of which have been extended through rear dormers.
5. The proposed development would alter the rear roof of the appeal property through the addition of a dormer. The Council raises concerns regarding the scale of the proposed dormer with reference to the Design Code 2024. However, this document is not before me.
6. Based on the plans before me, the proposed dormer would respond positively to the proportions of, and appear subservient to, the existing roof form. Due to the size of the dormer and its siting, set in from both sides and below the ridge line, it would be a sympathetic addition to the roof. The use of materials to match the existing property would ensure the proposed dormer reflects and complements, rather than dominating, the existing roof form.
7. There are no other rear dormers on properties within the terrace or within the immediate surroundings. However, my attention has been drawn to properties within Grange Close where rear dormers have recently been approved and constructed, including at Nos 30, 37 and 38. While each case must be assessed on its own individual circumstances, from my observations on site such dormers now form part of the character of the area. In this regard, and taking into account the limited visibility of the proposed rear dormer from the wider street scene, the proposal would not detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed rear dormer would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, it would accord with the relevant provisions of Policies CS7 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015). These policies, amongst other matters, seek development which responds to the positive features of individual locations and preserves or enhances the local character of the area.

Other Matters

9. It has been brought to my attention that the appeal property does not benefit from permitted development rights relating to dormer extensions and that, consequently, there is no fallback position to be considered. Notwithstanding this, I have reasoned above why I have not identified harm with the proposed development. Therefore, the lack of a fallback position does not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.

Conditions

10. To meet legislative requirements, I have imposed a condition to address the period for commencement. A condition requiring compliance with the submitted plans is

also necessary for reasons of certainty. A further condition requiring the materials to match those of the existing building is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

E Everitt

INSPECTOR