



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2022

by H Miles BA(hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 APRIL 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/21/3286164

Shorwell, Oakshade Road, Oxshott, Leatherhead KT22 0LE

- 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 Adam Cocks against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/2824, dated 2 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garages, and construction of proposed single storey ground floor extension, to include inbuilt garage. External timber cladding and sedum green roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Shorwell is sited on the corner of Oakshade Road and Steels Lane. This part of Steels Lane is characterised by a group of large dwellings set back from the road behind generous driveways and front gardens. This results in a pleasant sense of separation between the street and the buildings.
4. The appeal property has a similar relationship with Steels Lane with the main dwelling set back from the street. There were previously two detached garages in this location. Although these had been removed at the time of my site visit, nevertheless, they appear to have been secondary outbuildings set back from the boundary. As such they would have preserved this characteristic sense of separation. The host property makes a positive contribution to the streetscene in this respect.
5. The proposed development would extend the built form of the property very close to the boundary with Steels Lane. The extension would be single storey, with the part closest to Steels Lane at a lower height than the previous garages and it would have a green roof. However, even with these features, the height and proximity to the road would result in a prominent form of development. The introduction of built form in this area would undermine the relationship between the host dwelling and the street and would harmfully erode the sense of spaciousness and pattern of development in this location.

6. The boundary treatment in this area is a fence with a gate, with some low level bushes either side of the gate. Even when the planting is more mature the gap for the gate would exist. Furthermore, the extension would be visible from nearby properties. As such the harm described above would be experienced.
7. Therefore, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such it would be contrary to Policy CS10 and CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015. Together, in summary, these seek high quality design with regard to local character and with specific reference to development in Oxshott. As well as the advice in the Companion Guide Homes Extension SPD 2012 which provides further advice as to how to achieve high quality design for residential extensions.

Other Matters

8. A previous application had been granted for the erection of a link from the main dwelling to the garages. However, this footprint would not extend the built form any closer to Steels Lane. As such the proposed development is more harmful in this respect and therefore this does not justify the proposed development.
9. The appeal scheme would increase the amount of living space for this property, although this is mainly a private benefit. It would also use renewable energy sources and eco-friendly building materials and although the proposal would demolish existing buildings it is put to me that a large quantity of raw materials would need to be used to adapt them. Nevertheless, given the scale of the development any benefits in these regards would be minor. Consequently, this does not outweigh the notable public and permanent harm to the character and appearance of the area set out above.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR