



# Elmbridge Borough Council

... bridging the communities ...

To: Clare Adamson

Date:

From: Jon Kilner

Re: 2022/3796

Location: 16-18 Oatlands Drive, Weybridge

---

## Site and Background

The site is located outside of a conservation area, but there are a number of listed buildings nearby, including 1 Oatlands Drive, 3 Oatlands Drive, 9 Oatlands Drive, 11 Oatlands Drive and 13 Oatlands Drive.

## Reason for Consultation/ Significance

Potential impact on the setting of the nearby listed buildings, plus design considerations.

## Comments on proposal

This application seeks to erect two residential blocks over three and four storeys plus the provision of vehicular access, parking, cycle and bin stores, landscaping, and associated works.

**Layout** – The layout proposes a side vehicular access with one block at the front of the site and a second behind, totalling 33 units (3 x 1 Bed, 28 x 2 Bed, 2 x 3 Bed). This layout mimics the development next door at 8-14 Oatlands Drive and whilst the frontage building is slightly further forward the principle of such an arrangement has been accepted. Gaps are retained between the site and its neighbours which in my view helps to preserve an element of the current character. Courtyard parking located between the blocks with further parking at lower ground floor level under the front block is provided (32 spaces in total). The layout of the parking is acceptable, and I will leave it to others to consider whether there is a sufficient number of spaces. Bin and cycles stores are provided within each block.

**Height and Massing** – The overall height appears to be greater than the neighbouring development, but the increase is minimal and, in my view, would be unnoticeable. There is also an increased massing and scale to both of the proposed blocks. They are wider than the blocks at 8-14 Oatlands Drive but take advantage of the application sites plot width. The increase provides a different massing to the neighbouring scheme, but it would not, in my view be out of place within the street scene.

**Appearance** – The design is little more than a copy of the neighbouring scheme which I have noted from the start as having a common and unremarkable aesthetic that in my view does not enhance the character of the area or reach the high standards of the Governments 'Build Beauty' notion. Nonetheless, the neighbouring development has been consented and has set a precedent for the design of developments nearby. This development could be considered to exacerbate the overall impact of both developments and therefore harm the character of the area. However, it is my view that the addition of one additional building (along the street) is not sufficient to cause harm. In approving the development at 8-14 the Inspector changed the character of the area. Therefore, given this new context, I consider the proposals to be acceptable.

**Heritage** – There is no impact on the setting of the nearby heritage assets.

Summary

In summary the works are considered acceptable in design terms

The proposal would result in:

No harm to heritage or in design terms	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Unacceptable in design terms	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Less than substantial harm to the heritage asset(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<del>considerable/significant/moderate/limited</del>
Substantial harm to the heritage asset(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	

If permission is granted, no specific heritage or design conditions are suggested.

**Jon Kilner**

BA (Arch), MSc (HistCon), DGDip (UrbDes), IHBC  
Senior Conservation and Design Officer