

Report on Planning Applications Decided since the Last Planning Meeting

Applications Refused by Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) excluding LDCs

No.	Address	Details	CPC
2021/3507	16 Gordon Road	Part single/part two-storey side/rear extension, first floor extension and raised patio following partial demolition of existing house.	No Obj • Request to assess 45% sightlines
<p>EBC refused on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed rear/side extensions, by reason of their height, proximity to the side boundary and infringement of 45% sightlines, would adversely impact the residential amenity of No. 18 Gordon Road in terms of light and outlook contrary to Policy DM2, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF. The proposed first floor side extensions, by reason of their proximity to the side boundaries, would adversely impact the character of the area and visual amenities of the street scene due to the creation of a harmful terracing effect contrary to Policy CS17, DM2, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF The proposed rear raised patio, by reason of its depth, height, proximity to the side boundary and lack of screening would adversely impact the residential amenity of 18 Gordon Road in terms of overlooking and privacy contrary to Policy DM2, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPP 			
2021/3419	29 Hare Lane	Part two/part single-storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing rear projection.	No Obj • Request to assess closeness of first floor extension to No 31
<p>EBC refused on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The two-storey element will be approximately 5.2m deep and have an eaves height of 4.9m. It intrudes within a 45% angle to this nearest neighbour's rear elevation windows, within 8m, contrary to the guidance contained within the design and character SPD. Given its proximity and scale, and that the orientation of the extension is to the west of this neighbouring property there would be some loss of light in the evenings and some overshadowing. The height and depth of the proposed side wall would be unduly dominant and appear overbearing to the detriment of the amenities of the adjoining property. This would be exacerbated by the rearward projection feeling enclosed. <p>EBC Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The two-storey element will be approximately 5.2m deep and have an eaves height of 4.9m. It intrudes within a 45% angle to this nearest neighbour's rear elevation windows, within 8m, contrary to the guidance contained within the design and character SPD. Given its proximity and scale, and that the orientation of the extension is to the west of this neighbouring property there would be some loss of light in the evenings and some overshadowing. 			

Other Applications Decided:-

No.	Address	Details	CPC
2021/3134	1 Hermitage Close	Two-storey front extension, two-storey rear infill extension, single-storey side and rear extensions and hip-to-gable roof extension with rear dormer windows following demolition of existing side projection.	No Obj <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to review whether the combination of the two previously consented application would be considered to be an overdevelopment of the site Request to review whether obscure glazing should be considered as in application 2020/2885
<p>EBC Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With regards to the potential loss of privacy from the proposed rear dormer windows the views afforded from rear dormer windows are considered to be similar to those from the first-floor rear windows. They would not result in such a degree of loss of privacy over and above the existing situation so as to warrant a refusal on these grounds. In light of the above, it is not considered reasonable to request a reduction in the number of dormer windows or to request for them to be obscurely glazed and non-openable. With regards to the single storey rear extension granted under a Lawful Development Certificate, it must be noted that the proposal meets all the relevant criteria under permitted development, and this is now a material consideration in the assessment of the current application. Given that there are no changes to the proposed rear extension and that it can be built independently from the granted householder application it is not considered reasonable to refuse this application by reason of overdevelopment as it is a valid fallback position. With regards to the impact on No.2 Hermitage Close, given its siting to the east of the application site, the proposal would not result in loss of sunlight/daylight or undue overshadowing The windows on the northern elevation at this property, and therefore towards the application site are all serving non-habitable rooms as such, the 25-degree rule does not apply To protect the privacy of 2 Hermitage Close, it is considered reasonable to impose a condition ensuring that the second floor side window towards this property would be obscurely glazed and fixed shut unless 1.7m above the finish floor levels of the rooms it serves. It is not necessary to impose this condition for the ground floor side windows. 			

Appeals Decided:-

NONE