



Appeal Decisions

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 A Ref: APP/K3605/W/21/3277476

Alassio, Fairmile Park Road, Cobham KT11 2PG

- 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 Jeremy Arnold against Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/1163, is dated 31 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a detached 5 bedroom home with integral double garage, following the demolition of the existing dwelling.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/K3605/W/21/3286604

Alassio, Fairmile Park Road, Cobham KT11 2PG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr Arnold against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/2748, dated 28 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a detached 5 bedroom home with integral double garage, following the demolition of the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have been presented with an amended plan for Appeal A which was not before the Council at the time that they made their decision. This includes an amendment with the proposed ground level annotated to be 49.02. The ridge height and height AOD of the proposed house do not change. Therefore, the amendments provide clarity but do not alter the proposed development. Consequently, the parties would not be prejudiced if I were to consider these plans, and therefore the appeal is assessed on the basis of the amended plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue for both Appeal A and B is the effect of the proposed developments on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Alassio is in the Fairmile Character Area for the purposes of the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Cobham, Oxshott, Stoke D'Abernon & Downside (2012). The property sits within a row of

detached dwellings with pitched roofs and similar footprints, although its bulk is slightly less than neighbouring properties. It is opposite modest single and two storey cottages, including Dairy Cottage which is locally listed due to its importance to the character of the area. These cottages are an integral feature of this locality. The broadly shared relatively moderate scale of Alassio and the adjoining properties therefore contributes to the attractive, modest, character of this part of Fairmile Park Road.

6. The design of the properties in the wider area is varied. They include larger houses some of which have crown roofs with similar detailing to the proposed dwellings. However, these do not form part of the immediate context of the appeal site.
7. Appeal A would incorporate a crown roof and would be taller than the neighbouring buildings. The proposed dwelling would be across a large footprint with significant bulk to the rear of the house including a large quantity of development at first floor.
8. Appeal B would have a smaller footprint, with a reduced amount of development at the rear compared with Appeal A. The overall height has also been reduced and the eaves height would be broadly level with the neighbouring Mayflower House. The garage would be located to the east of the site. However, the proposed dwelling would still be a large property with considerable bulk and a significant amount of development at first floor as well as a crown roof, albeit that this is smaller than that proposed at Appeal A.
9. The extent of development in both Appeal A and Appeal B results in a bulk and massing to the proposed dwellings which would be notably larger than those nearby, including at roof level. As such, in this respect the proposed houses would be overly dominant, incongruous in the streetscene and would result in dwellings which would be discordant in their surroundings.
10. The proposals include the retention of a tree lined verge and mature screening to the eastern boundary. However, even when the trees are in leaf the property would be clearly visible in the streetscene in views through the access, as well as in views from neighbouring properties. As such the harm identified above would be experienced.
11. There is no dispute between the main parties that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the locally listed Dairy Cottage, and I am not presented with evidence that leads me to conclude otherwise.
12. Consequently, both Appeal A and Appeal B would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, in this respect they would be contrary to Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011. Together these seek high quality design with particular regard to Cobham. They would also be contrary to the advice in the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 which provides further detail as to how this high quality development can be achieved.

Conclusion

13. Both appeals would not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations to indicate that the appeals should be determined

otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR