



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2024

by N Bromley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 NOVEMBER 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/W/24/3346514

33 Danes Way, Oxshott, Leatherhead, Surrey KT22 0LU

- 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 D Halstead against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0615.
 - The development proposed is described as "Alterations to the approved detached house (planning reference number: 2023/1137), introducing a double garage to the front of the house and a link connection between existing house and double garage".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form as neither party has provided written confirmation that a revised description has been agreed. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
3. The site address in the banner heading is taken from the application form; however, I have removed the words "Site of" in order for the address to read more accurately.

Main Issue

4. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is occupied by a large, detached dwelling, currently under construction, set within a generous plot along a private road. The existing properties within the immediate street scene are similarly large, individually designed and set within spacious plots.
6. There is some harmony within this part of the street scene arising from the linear built form along the road, as well as buildings being consistently set back from the front boundary.
7. Contrary to this current harmony, the proposed double garage and link extension (the extension) would project significantly forward from the front elevation of the main dwelling, at odds with the linear pattern of development along the road. In addition, it would have a sizeable footprint and occupy a

prominent position on the site frontage, built up close to the front boundary. Therefore, despite the single storey height and flat roof design, it would be a large, dominant, and conspicuous extension, which would be incongruous within the street scene.

8. The juxtaposition of the proposed extension at the end of the linear row of properties on Danes Way would reduce its visual prominence within the street scene. As would its relationship with the built development associated with the neighbouring property, 10a High Drive. I also acknowledge that a frontage hedgerow, of a similar appearance and height to many others within the street scene could be planted to soften the appearance and provide some screening opportunities of the proposal. However, these factors do not overcome the harmful impact that would be caused by the significant forward projection and the highly prominent and discordant appearance of the proposal at the front of the property.
9. Reference has been made to recent precedents for other forward projecting extensions, located close to the road, as well as other examples of various planning applications along Danes Way, some of which include garages. However, very limited information has been provided to enable me to draw any direct comparisons with the appeal scheme before me.
10. There is no question that forward projecting extensions could be acceptable in principle in this area. Inevitably, it is the detail and specific context of any development which determines whether it is acceptable in practice. Having considered the design and layout of this proposal, and its effect on the character and appearance of this area, for the reasons given, I consider that there would be unacceptable harm. Accordingly, as I am required to do, I have determined the case before me on its own merits.
11. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not accord with the identified design aims of Policies CS10 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan 2015, which together and amongst other things, require new development to achieve high quality design that should preserve or enhance the character of the area.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has identified that the Council has raised no concerns with regard to the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring properties. I see no reason to disagree with the parties on these matters.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR