



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/19/3241361

6 Copsem Lane, Esher KT10 9EU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Heywood against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1791, dated 20 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a garage building incorporating a front boundary wall; alterations to existing pavement crossing and additional pavement crossing giving "in/out" access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this detached house which is set within a generously sized plot. The surrounding area comprises mainly of residential properties of a similar scale.
4. The proposal envisages the construction of a large detached garage and store within the frontage of the plot. The garage wall would form the front boundary of the property (set 1m off the boundary) and walls would extend either side to the 2 proposed entrance/exits. The submitted details indicate that the building would have a flat 'living garden' roof. The maximum height of the building is indicated as being 2.2m with the gate piers being 2m.
5. The natural ground levels fall across the front of the plot and the existing frontage is also lower than the pavement and road level. Notwithstanding that there may be the opportunity for planting within the 1m strip of land at the plot frontage, I consider that the proposal would have a considerable visual impact, when seen from the road/pavement. Whilst I acknowledge that the ground levels may mean that the proposal would have a reduced height, when compared to its presence on a level site, I consider that the proposal would appear as a solid building, rather than just a boundary wall. The side walls and the likely views of the roof from the higher level of the pavement would betray

this. For this reason, I consider that the proposal would appear as a large building within the frontage of this property. In my judgement, it would have a considerable a negative visual effect on the locality.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to boundary walls and fences in the area and I had the opportunity to view these at my visit. However, none of these accommodate large out-buildings within the frontage of the plots and so are not comparable, in my view.
7. I have also taken account of the appellant's desire to provide planting with a 1m wide strip at the site frontage. I have no comments from the Council on the likelihood of achieving a successful scheme within a constricted area, against a wall but it seems to me that it would take some time for any such scheme to mature. I am not satisfied that this would overcome the visual harm that I envisage.
8. The appellant makes reference to improved security for his home and I have taken this into account. However, I am not satisfied that this is the only way of enhancing security and find that this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusions

9. I conclude that the proposal would appear as a significantly sized building within the frontage of this house. It would appear obtrusive and out of place, having a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the locality. As a result, the proposal would conflict with Policies CS9 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015. I also note that it would be contrary to the advice set out within the Elmbridge Design and Character SPD. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

ST Wood

INSPECTOR