

Report on Planning Applications Decided since the Last Planning Meeting

Applications Refused by Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) excluding LDCs

No.	Address	Details		CPC
2021/4037	31 Stevens Lane KT10 0TD	2 detached two-storey houses with rooms in the roof space, one with integral garage and one with detached garage, and alterations to fenestration on existing house.	No Obj	Noted Observation from No 9 relating to height of proposal and proximity to the boundary
<p>EAPS refused permission against the Case Officer's recommendation on the grounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development, by reason of the loss of trees, in particular the semi-mature Oak tree and without clarity of suitable replacement siting would be contrary to policy DM6 and the revised NPPF 2021. The proposal would, by reason of the lack of a legal agreement to secure a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing, be contrary to the requirements of Policy CS21 and the Development Contributions SPD 2020. <p>EBC Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The two additional dwellings would all be located in the 0.076 hectares at the front of the site giving a density of 26.31dph for that section of the site. In this instance following the refusal of the previous scheme (2021/0988), one of the reasons for which was the siting, contrived design and quantity of the built form, it is acceptable for a lower density development to be constructed The proposed dwellings would be of a size and scale that would not be considered to be overly dominant or out of keeping within the street scene. The massing would be broadly similar to other dwellings within the street scene. The separation distance of 4.5 metres between Plots 1 and 2 and the separation distance of 2.75 metres between Plot 2 and No. 1 Raymond Way at ground floor level and 5.7 metres at first floor level would ensure that the buildings are read as separate, distinct buildings with sufficient separation distance between them to break up the massing. It is noted that the character of Stevens Lane is quite varied with no predominant building style, features or materials. As such it is considered that the proposed development would fit in within the street scene and would add further difference and points of interest within the street. An electric charging point serving each of the dwellings which is a requirement of policy DM7 and the Parking SPD 2020 and a proposed cycle store for each unit is not shown on the plans. However both the electric charging points and the cycle stores can be secured through appropriate planning conditions. The previous application was refused on the basis that the semi-mature oak tree would be lost, the current application sought to maintain it, albeit in a different location. SCC refused to allow the tree to be moved to Highway Land and subsequently once further information was received the Tree Officer raised concerns regarding the tree being transplanted. The replacement of the tree with a minimum of two trees of a similar size is considered by the Case Officer to adequately overcome the previous reason for refusal. 				
2021/4274	21 Woodbourne Drive KT10 0DR	Part two/part single-storey rear extension, part two/part first-floor side extension, single-storey side infill extension, roof extension incorporating increase in ridge height, rear dormer windows and rooflights and metal flue following partial demolition of existing house and garage and removal of chimney stack.	No Obj	Note that the first-floor extension will create the effect of terracing which is out of character with the street scene
<p>EBC refused in part on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed extensions, by reason of their design would result in harm to the host dwelling, the character of the area and the street scene. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies CS17, DM2, the Design and Character SPD and the Companion Guide: Home Extensions. <p>EBC Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Companion Guide: Home Extensions sets out design principles with the aim of ensuring that an extension which 'ignores the style and character of the original house would adversely affect the appearance of the street scene' The application site is located at a prominent location within the street scene close to the junction of Westbury Avenue and Woodbourne Drive. Given its prominence, any development at the application site would have a material impact on not only the character of the host dwelling and the immediate street scene, but the wider character of the area The proposed rear extensions do not accord with traditional rear extensions. The scale, bulk and massing of the proposed development is such that it swamps the host dwelling, completely obscuring the original rear elevation. The proposed roof form of the rear extension appears incongruous, not only with regard to the host dwelling, but also with the neighbouring property. In addition to the overall design of this element, the design of the fenestration proposed, and proposed roof line appear contrived and would not harmonise well with either what remained of the existing dwelling or the proposed additions. As such this element of the proposal is considered to be harmful to the character of the host dwelling, the street scene and is unacceptable in this regard. the first-floor front side extension would leave 350mm distance from the side wall to the boundary so would therefore result in a terracing effect. This is considered harmful to the character of the area and the street scene. 				
2022/0958	151 Hare Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RA	Rear dormer window and front rooflights.	No Obj	Note that changes made to scheme since refusal not significant
<p>EBC refused on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the rear dormer's width reduction from 6.6m to 5.6m, is insufficient to overcome the harm arising from the excessive width that would negatively affect the host dwelling. This proposed rear dormer is still considered to be unsympathetic and uncomplimentary to the host dwelling. The proposal would be of an unacceptable scale appearing dominant in its context. This is contrary to policies CS11, CS17, DM2, the Design & Character SPD (Home Extensions Companion Guide) 2012 and the NPPF Home Extensions Companion Guide recommends that the roof of an extension should be similar to that of the existing house, in scale, design and the angle of the pitch. In particular, houses with a pitched roof should not have flat roofed extensions. The replacement of rear hipped to flat roof is not considered good design, it would appear as an unsympathetic form of development to the detriment of the appearance of the host dwelling and would adversely impact the character of the area and the host property. This is contrary to policies CS11, CS17, DM2, the Design & Character SPD (Home Extensions Companion Guide) 2012 and the NPPF 				
2021/1139	2 Giebelands KT10 OLF	Attached two-storey house with associated parking, widening of existing access and associated works following demolition of existing garage	No Obj	<p>concerned of overdevelopment of the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is not clear what parking provision there is as the plans are conflicting or whether it is possible to both enter and exit the site safely in forward gear it is not clear where the cycle storage is, whether there is adequate bin storage nor whether electric charging points have been included Request permitted development rights are removed due to the reduced amenity space
<p>EBC refused on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development, by reason of its inadequate amenity space for future occupiers, would be contrary to policy DM10, the Design and Character SPD 2012 and the revised NPPF 2021 The proposed development, by reason of its layout and design, would result in the proposal appearing as a cramped form of development that unbalances the resulting pair of semi-detached dwellings contrary to policies CS17, DM2 and DM10, the Design and Character SPD 2012 and the revised NPPF <p>EBC Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the width of the proposed single storey front projection and the single storey side projection would unbalance the proposed semi-detached pair and would be only 0.15m away from the side boundary with the pavement which would increase the prominence of the single storey projection and result in the proposal appearing somewhat cramped within the plot. This would be amplified as views from the street would be possible from the front, side and rear. A tree protection plan would be required to ensure that the willow tree is adequately protected before, during and after works the proposed development has not indicated where a bin store could be positioned. There would be space in the position indicated for a bin store and such details could reasonably be secured through an appropriate condition It is unclear from the plans what the layout of the parking area would be as the proposed site plan and the proposed ground floor plan show different layouts which potentially would require different access arrangements to that shown on the proposed site plan 				
2022/0874	11 Stevens Lane KT10 0TD	Part two/part single-storey side extension and front porch following partial demolition of existing house.	No Obj	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the design is contrived in so far as the boundary position with No 9 contrary to DM2 and CS17 the proposed porch projects beyond the current building line of Stevens Lane
<p>EBC refused on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed side extension would provide distances from first floor level to the side boundary shared with No. 9 Stevens Lane of less than 1m, creating a terracing effect that would result in unacceptable harm to the character of the area and street scene contrary to Policy CS17, DM2, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF. <p>EBC Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal differs from the refusal of 2021/2987 by stepping in and increasing the distance of the first floor side extension to the side boundary. Although the distance to the side boundary would be increased, the first floor side extension at its closest point would only be 0.616m away from the boundary which continues to be insufficient to prevent a terracing effect from occurring. Additionally, given that the first floor side extension is stepped in to follow the direction of the boundary line, this results in a very contrived and unacceptable appearance. It is noted that concern has been raised in representation regarding the porch projecting forwards of the building line however, given the presence of the existing porch and the permitted development rights provided under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class D, it is not considered that the harm arising would be sufficient to refuse the application on these ground alone. 				

Other Applications Decided:-

No.	Address	Details		CPC
2022/0552	8 Oaken Lane KT10 ORE	Single-storey side extension, alter roof of existing rear elevation from flat to pitched and alterations to fenestration.	No Obj	No comment
<p>EBC Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed single storey will be approximately 7m deep and approximately 4m high. It intrudes within a 45° angle to the nearest neighbour No. 6's ground floor patio door within the adjoining house rear elevation. However, the patio door and two rear facing windows at this property serve an open plan area that serves their living room. Considering that the patio door serves as a secondary source of light to the room and that the extension would be to the north of this neighbouring property, the loss of light would not cause harm to their living conditions as such as to warrant refusal on this basis. The extension would be set in 1.2m from the shared boundary which would reduce any overbearing impact. 				
2022/0803	29 Torrington Road KT10 0SA	Single-storey rear extension, conversion of garage to living space with single-storey front extension and first-floor side extension and front dormer windows following removal of existing front dormer window.	No Obj	Not in keeping with the street scene.
<p>EBC Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although five properties within this cul-de-sac have similar front roof design incorporating a flat roofed dormer, its replacement with a gable-end dormer and two hipped dormers integrate with the existing property and other surrounding properties along Torrington Road. Although prominent from the street, the extension should not unduly affect the street scene or the visual amenities of the area. 				

Appeals Decided:-

None