



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/25/3364136

1 Courtleas, Cobham, Surrey KT11 2PW

- 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 & Mrs Gary White against the decision of the Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/2871.
 - The development proposed is described as extensions and alterations to convert existing single storey house into a two-storey house, two-storey front extension; single storey rear extension with rear patio/platform; alterations/enlargement of the side roof; front porch extension; hard/soft landscaping and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extensions and alterations to convert existing single storey house into a two-storey house, two-storey front extension; single storey rear extension with rear patio/platform; alterations/enlargement of the side roof; front porch extension; hard/soft landscaping and alterations to fenestration at 1 Courtleas, Cobham, Surrey KT11 2PW in accordance with the terms of the application, 2024/2871, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan - 24 CL LP; Proposed Block Plan - 24 CL PBP; Tree Location and Protection Plan, Revised October 2024; Existing and Proposed Site, Block Plans and Street Scene - 24 CL 101 Rev A; Proposed Plans Elevations Sections - 24-CL-P21 Rev A
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the application form.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from that referenced on the application form; in the interests of clarity, I have adopted the revised description of development. I note that the Appellant also uses this on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modestly sized bungalow with simple, unassuming elevations. It forms a subdued architectural presence, consistent with the character of nearby properties. The appeal site is positioned at the entrance to Courtleas. The land slopes southward down the road towards No. 2 Courtleas and properties beyond; however, due to more excavation at the appeal site, the ridge heights between no's 1 and 2 are broadly consistent.
5. The appeal property three vehicle garage block creates a significant visual dominance, notable for its visible bulk which is positioned on elevated ground. Opposite the site stands 'Tudor Court,' a substantial and locally listed building. While its scale is prominent, this effect is mitigated by its position and the presence of mature vegetation. Collectively, the surrounding buildings, landscaping, and topography contribute to a well-established residential setting with a coherent visual character.
6. From the information provided I am aware of the history of the appeal site in terms of seeking planning permission for extensions and alterations to the property, which included an allowed appeal for a first-floor addition¹. Whilst this was allowed under a different set of policies I am mindful that the visual context of the appeal site in relation to the streetscene of Courtleas and the imposing Tudor Court would not be substantially different.
7. I am aware of two dismissed appeals which confirm that *it might not be unreasonable to consider increasing the height and bulk of the appeal property*², and that *schemes to enlarge existing bungalows upwards, such as ... at 1 Courtleas could be acceptable*³. The Council draw my attention to the latter dismissed appeal relating to the prior approval for an additional storey at No. 9 however as noted in the appeal decision No. 1 is very different to the location to No. 9, as would be its effect on the character and appearance of the area. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
8. I understand that a 2024 planning application was refused for a revised design for extensions and alterations to the appeal site⁴. The development before me has been modified from the 2024 refusal largely comprising a reduction in scale of the extensions and alterations including removal of a previously proposed link to the garage.
9. Properties in Courtleas vary in terms of form some have a garage beneath the main built form created by the change in topography. Whilst No's 1-3 are of a similar height, No. 3 has a two-storey feature comprising a garage beneath the main property. The adjacent property no. 4 has a stepped down roof ridge which does not look alien in the context of No. 3's two storey feature.

¹ APP/K3605/A/00/1047086

² APP/K3605/D/22/3304586

³ APP/K3605/D/23/3317253

⁴ 2024/1930

10. Due to the topography, the height of the existing garage block, and the existing height of the appeal bungalow which is at a similar height to No. 2 raising the height of the appeal property in the proposed form would not be incongruous within the streetscene. A step down in roof heights on a sloping street such as this would not be unusual.
11. Materials vary in terms of built form within the immediate area. The existing appeal property has a light buff brick, similar to others in the street. The materials proposed for the development would include brown roof tiles and hanging tiles which would assimilate the development with the existing prominent garage block and would not appear out of keeping with materials of the red brick Tudor Court and No. 2 which is a red/brown brick bungalow.
12. I find that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.
13. The proposed development would not conflict with Policies CS10 and CS17 of the of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan, Development Management Plan (2015), which amongst other things seeks to support well designed, high quality development which preserve or enhance the character of an area.
14. There is also no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.
15. There is no conflict with the Elmbridge Local Plan, Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which seeks amongst other things for developments to be high quality that respects local character.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.
17. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development. I have included a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty.
18. In the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area I have imposed a condition relating to details of the external materials.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR