
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2026

by **L Gardner MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 JANUARY 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/25/3372594

Stable Cottage, Brooklands Lane, Weybridge, Surrey KT13 8UX

- 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 L Crook against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1258.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey front and side extension, relocation of front door. Two dormers and two rooflights on the front roof slope. Dormer on side roof slope. Removal of chimneys.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a detached two-storey dwelling with single storey elements positioned close to the roadside of Brooklands Lane. The roof form of the dwelling varies between a half-hipped roof to the two storey element with a more modest pitched roof with a catslide element to the single storey.
4. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, primarily formed of two storey dwellings albeit there are also commercial uses close to the appeal site including a church and a school. There is an overall lack of uniformity to dwelling design in the area with a variety of property styles including both hipped and pitched roofs.
5. The appeal proposal includes a two-storey front and side extension which would have a flat roof. The expanse of the flat roof would be significant in the context of the size of the dwelling and consequently would distort and dominate the overall roof form of the dwelling.
6. Despite its positioning partially to the rear and side of the dwelling, and the presence of roadside vegetation, the flat roof form would still be visible in the street scene, particularly when viewed from the south. Rather than adding to the architectural merit of the area, the extension would appear as a bulky and contrived addition to the dwelling. The incongruous form of the proposal would be further emphasised by the proposed window arrangement, whereby a first-floor window is proposed to sit above the porch, higher than the adjacent window within the proposed roof dormer.

7. The appellant has referred to a previous appeal decision¹ elsewhere in Surrey, where the Inspector gave weight to the presence of vegetation screening the appeal site. Whilst I do not have the full details of that case, in this case the appeal proposal would still be visible from the adjacent road despite existing vegetation. The appeal decision referred to is therefore materially different to the appeal scheme before me.
8. My attention has been drawn to the presence of two storey flat roofs in the wider area, including details of a planning approval at 30 Mayfield Road, which I observed during my site visit. However, none of the examples provided are directly comparable to the design of the appeal proposal.
9. Where I observed two storey flat roofs elsewhere in the residential context, they form a more consolidated overall roof design and are largely imperceivable in the street scene due to their location in the centre of the roof. To the contrary, the two-storey flat roof which forms part of the appeal proposal would sit alongside the existing half hipped roof creating an awkward juxtaposition between the two roof elements.
10. Based on the above, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CS4 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) (ECS) which requires all new development in Weybridge to be well designed, integrate with, and enhance local character. It would also be contrary to Policy CS17 of the ECS which requires new development to deliver high quality design. In addition, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015) which requires proposals to preserve or enhance the character of the area.

Other Matters

11. The appeal proposal includes various elements to which the Council do not raise concern including the proposed use of materials, proposed roof dormers and alterations to doors and windows. Nevertheless, a lack of harm in relation to these aspects of the proposal does not outweigh the overall harm which I have identified above.
12. In addition, no harm has been identified in respect to the effect on a nearby locally listed building, neighbouring living conditions, trees or biodiversity and ecology. Nevertheless, these factors do not specifically weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

13. I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

L Gardner

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/K3605/D/24/3353039