

# EAST HORSLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer: Nicholas Clemens  
East Horsley Parish Council Office, Kingston Avenue, EAST HORSLEY, Leatherhead KT24 6QT  
www.easthorsley.info, Telephone: 01483 281148, e-mail parishcouncil@easthorsleypc.org

## Minutes of East Horsley Parish Council Planning & Environment Committee

Held in the Parish Council Office on Monday 11<sup>th</sup> November 2024 at 7.30pm.

**Present:** Robert Taylor (chair), Andrew Franklin, Colin Carmichael, Sylvia Igglesden  
12 members of the public attended for Item 5.1.

1. **To Receive and Accept Apologies for Absence in accordance with the LGA 1972, Sch 12, Para 40.**  
Hilary Gullen
2. **Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests by Councillors on any of the agenda items.**  
None
3. **To Formally Approve the Decisions of the Committee made at the previous meeting held on Monday 28<sup>th</sup> October 2024**  
Approved
4. **To Approve the Date of the Next Meeting of the Committee**  
The next meeting scheduled for the Planning & Environment Committee is on **Monday 25<sup>th</sup> November 2024** at 7.30pm at the Parish Council Office, East Horsley Village Hall, Kingston Avenue, East Horsley KT24 6QT.
5. **Consideration of Applications received since last meeting: -**

### [5.1 Erection of a self build detached two storey dwelling with basement parking and associated landsc...](#)

Planning Application

Stemming, Oakwood Drive, East Horsley, Leatherhead, KT24 6QF

Ref. No: 24/P/01555

**Decision:** OBJECTION

**Reasons:**

**a) The development is out of keeping with local character**

The following aspects in particular may be noted:

- i. Whilst the rear wall of the main building is largely aligned with the building line along the rear of the adjacent properties, the large pool hall projects back a further 10.5m beyond this building line and would therefore be entirely out of keeping with the established character of this area;

- ii. The proposal to construct a large basement garage beneath the main house and access ramp within the front garden is also out of keeping with the local character. It is a fundamentally urban feature inserted into the midst of a semi-rural location. There are no garage basements in Oakwood Drive nor any of the nearby roads. Indeed to our knowledge there is no similar structure anywhere in East Horsley.
- iii. The modernist design style with large areas of galvanized zinc cladding will be wholly out of keeping within this small private road where housing designs, whilst varied, follow more traditional housing styles.

Failure to respect local character is contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy EH-H7(a)i and to Local Plan Design Policy D1(4), providing strong grounds for refusing this application.

### **b) Excessive scale, bulk & mass**

The proposed development would also be excessive in scale, bulk and mass. We note in particular that the proposed ridge line of the roof will be significantly higher than adjacent properties whilst with the high flat roof designs will also appear overly dominant within the local street scene.

### **c) Adverse impact on residential amenity**

The large rear balcony proposed outside the main bedroom will overlook the sitting areas and gardens of the adjacent neighbours at Hogarth and Wolford, adversely impacting their privacy contrary to Local Plan Policy D5(1) on the Protection of Amenity.

The creation of a large garage basement will also require the removal of very considerable volumes of earth which may potentially impact neighbouring houses via subsidence effects to their foundations. No analysis of such potential impacts has been provided by the applicant.

Furthermore the construction work needed to create such a large basement garage will also be considerable, potentially causing damage to the thin concrete surface of this private roadway. There are also likely to be very material disturbances to local residents arising from the excavation and building work involved with its construction.

### **d) Impact on surface water flooding**

The lower sections of Oakwood Drive are classified by the Environment Agency as areas of high surface water flood risk. In times of heavy rainfall, the entire roadway becomes streamed with surface water which flows downhill to the junction with Ockham Road South. Whilst the plot of Stemming is classified as having low surface water risk, the impact of all the basement excavation work may potentially change these water flows. However, no analysis has been presented of such potential impacts.

We also note the basement garage may potentially serve as a channel to feed surface water flows into the lower lying basement area, causing flooding to the garage. However, no analysis of such flood risk has been provided.

[5.2 Proposed new front porch, single storey front infill extension, part single storey rear extension...](#)

Planning Application

Greenbank, Surrey Gardens, Effingham Junction, Leatherhead, KT24 5HF

Ref. No: 24/P/01527

**Decision:** NO OBJECTION

[5.3 Erection of a self build two storey detached dwelling together with associated works following de...](#)

Planning Application

Pippins, Park Corner Drive, East Horsley, Leatherhead, KT24 6SE

Ref. No: 24/P/01507

**Decision:** OBJECTION

**Reason: Frontal positioning of garage is out of keeping with local character**

The proposed double garage protrudes some 10 metres from the frontage of the house in a highly prominent position beyond the established building line running along the southern side of Park Corner Drive. As such it will impact negatively on the local street scene and have a material impact on the local character of the area, contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy EH-H7(a)i and Local Plan Design Policy D1(4).

It is also contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy EH-H7(a)viii which states that “*Garages are normally positioned to the sides of dwellings, not in the front*” and also contrary to Section 3.5 of GBC’s Residential Extensions & Alterations Guide which states on Page 33 that “*A garage should be sited to the side or rear of the property behind the building line.*”

If the applicant were to revise their plans in a way that substantially reduces the forward positioning of the garage, then we would have no further objection to this application.

[5.4 Application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary condition 2 \(Appro...](#)

Planning Application

Land to the rear of, Bishopsmead Parade, East Horsley, KT24

Ref. No: 24/P/01548

**Decision:** NO OBJECTION

[5.5 Erection of single storey front double garage with the addition of new entrance into the property.](#)

Planning Application

Daimar, 18 Parkside Close, East Horsley, Leatherhead, KT24 5BY

Ref. No: 24/P/01538

**Decision:** OBJECTION

**Reason: Frontal positioning of garage out of keeping with local character**

The previously refused application at this site 24/P/00414 had also proposed a frontal garage for this property. In refusing the application, GBC commented that the garage was positioned in front of the prevailing building line, resulting in it appearing dominant within the street scene and impacting negatively on the character of the area. The decision notice also commented that the garage by virtue of its height, bulk, massing and location would have an unacceptable impact on visual amenity in terms of visual dominance.

The limited changes made by the applicant to their revised application are minor and in our view do not materially change either of these two previous reasons for refusal. The width and depth of the garage are unchanged from before whilst the height is reduced by just 0.63m to give a ridge height of 3.54m. As such the garage will still be a dominant feature inserted into the local street scene. Whilst its positioning has been moved back by a small distance it still remains just 3.6 metres away from the carriageway in a dominant position that would be clearly visible above the proposed new hedge screening of 2.4m in height.

The proposed application therefore remains in breach of Local Plan Design Policy D1(4) on the need to respond to local distinctiveness, contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan policy EH-H7(a)viii and contrary to GBC's Residential Extensions & Alterations Guide Section 3.5 and as such should be refused.

#### **6. Recent Guildford Borough Decisions since the previous the meeting: -**

Green Tiles, High Park Avenue, East Horsley, KT24 5DB – EHPC No Objection, GBC Refused  
Ref. No: 24/P/01244

---



