

Report on Planning Applications Decided since the Last Planning Meeting

Applications Refused by Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) excluding LDCs

No.	Address	Details	CPC
2021/2987	11 Stevens Lane KT10 0TD	Part two/part single-storey side extension and front porch following demolition of existing porch, garage and utility room.	No Obj <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Side extension is built up to the side boundary • Front porch forward of building line.
<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 Policies CS17, DM2 and the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF. <p>EBC further noted in response to CPC's note about the front porch that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "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 grounds alone." 			
2021/2962	Arenella Mountview Road KT10 0UD	Detached single-storey house with basement and attached garage.	No Obj <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . subject to the provision of a condition for the retention for the trees for the lifetime of the development. . noted that the proposed dwelling is forward of the building line.
<p>EBC refused on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development by reason of its siting and design will appear overly prominent and uncharacteristically cramped within the plot and undermine the perception of openness which is a distinctive characteristic of this side of Mountview Road, resulting in detrimental views from within the street scene and upon the general character of the area contrary to Policies DM2, CS11 and CS17, Elmbridge Design and Character SPD and NPPF. <p>Amongst the points noted in the Officers Report were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Plan policies to protect local distinctiveness would be contravened; • Whilst the built form would be broken up by this layout, there would still be a greater extent of development along the frontage and the proposed new driveway and vehicular access would increase intervisibility into the site and erode the open appearance of the site, which the Inspector recognised as a feature of this section of the road; • As on the 2017 application the retention of trees and landscaping would be secured as far as reasonably possible, however, given the proximity of the retained trees particularly the Silver Birch (T24), the Sweet Chestnut (T11), and the trees along the frontage to bedroom 1 and the kitchen which are single aspect, there would be a pressure to unduly prune and crown lift these trees and potentially have them felled due to leaf litter, shading, perceived/actual property damage etc; • "The landscaping may also fail or die in the future. Moreover, the plot would be comparatively small and the house would be located close to trees and shrubs. It is not inconceivable that future occupants may wish to thin the landscaping so as to encourage more light, guard against falling debris from the trees or to create more usable amenity space. For these reasons, the longevity of the landscaping cannot be relied upon and therefore the landscaping may not suitably mitigate the incongruous presence of the proposed dwelling into the future." • "Furthermore, the angle of the road is such that when approaching the proposed new access from the north, much of the front elevation of the house would be visible despite the additional planting. Also, as noted by the Inspector in the most recent appeal decision, whilst landscaping can be protected in the short term by planning condition it would be hard to enforce its protection in perpetuity." • due to its position the scheme still feels cramped. Nor has the proposal addressed the previous concerns that it "would be sited in a discordant position in front of Arenella and would diminish the sense of openness the undeveloped front garden currently offers the street scene. It would also be positioned much closer to the edge of the street than the other properties on the eastern side of the Mountview Road and this would result in it appearing as a strident departure from the existing pattern of development." 			

2021/2931	34 Holroyd Road KT10 0LG	Conversion of ground and first floor flats into single dwelling house.	No Obj No Comment
	<p>EBC refused on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development would result in the net loss of a residential unit that would be harmful to the Borough's housing supply and it has not been demonstrated that the benefits would outweigh the harm contrary to Policy DM10 guidance in the NPPF. 		
2021/3361	29 Ruxley Ridge KT10 0HZ	Single-storey rear outbuilding.	No Obj No Comment
	<p>EBC refused on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The outbuilding would be situated approximately 0.75m from the boundary shared with Woodlands, Common Lane and would have a maximum height of 3.3m from the ground level of the application site. It is noted that the application site is situated upon significantly higher ground level than Woodlands. As such, the overbearing effect would be exacerbated by this difference in ground level, resulting in a negative impact upon this property sufficient to warrant a refusal of the application contrary to Policy DM2, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF <p>EBC also noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of two ancillary living spaces within the site are considered to be acceptable however a condition would be necessary to ensure the outbuilding isn't let out or sold as an independent unit. 		

Other Applications Decided:-

No.	Address	Details	CPC
2021/3196	22 Tower Gardens KT10 0HB	Tree Preservation Order EL:89/25 - Crown reduce 1 x Oak by 1.5m on the east side and crown raise up to 6m from ground level on east side.	Obj Raising the crown to provide 6m clearance is excessive and will be detrimental to the visual amenity of the tree
	<p>EBC granted permission prior to receipt of CPC's objections stating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The proposed works are considered to have a limited impact on the short and long term amenity the tree provides and are in line with good arboricultural practice resulting in a low impact on the remaining tree's health" <p>Informatives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion by two years Deadwood removal exemption <p>You may remove deadwood under Section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as an exemption to normal controls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bats All species of bat found in the UK are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and under the Conservation of Species & Habitats Regulations 2010. Together this legislation makes it an offence to kill, capture or disturb the animal, or to damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of such an animal. Birds Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), wild bird nests and eggs are protected from damage or destruction whilst in use or under construction. It is recommended that extra caution is taken when undertaking tree works during the main bird nesting season (March to August inclusive), to avoid adverse effects on nesting wild birds. 		
2021/2932	5 Fairlawn Close KT10 0EN	Single-storey side extension, first-floor front extension, conversion of garage to living space and alterations to fenestration following removal of side bay window and existing front dormer.	No Obj No Comment
	<p>Non-standard Condition for permission was</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obscure glazing <p>Prior to the first occupation of the development the new first floor windows shall be glazed with obscure glass and only openable above a height of 1.7m above the internal floor level of the room to which it serves. The window shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.</p>		

2021/2551	24 The Avenue KT10 ORY	Front vehicular gate and vehicular access.	No Obj No Comment
<p>Non-standard Condition for permission was</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways <p>The proposed access shall be constructed in general accordance with the approved plan subject to possible alterations required as part of a Road Safety Audit to be submitted to and approved in writing by EBC in consultation with SCC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway Safety <p>The proposed gates to be installed at the access onto The Avenue shall be automatic, to open inwards onto the property, and shall not obstruct the public highway in accordance with the approved plan</p> <p>Informatives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway <p>The applicant is advised that prior approval must be obtained from SCC before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, or verge to form a vehicle crossover to install dropped kerbs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Licence: works on highway <p>The applicant is advised that a permit and, potentially, a Section 278 agreement must be obtained from SCC before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway.</p>			
2021/3021	19 Dalmore Avenue KT10 OHQ	Hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer window and front rooflights.	No Obj Noted concerns about the design and appearance
EBC had no concerns and had no non-standard conditions or Informatives			
2021/1148	18 Trystings Close KT10 OTF	Part two/part single-storey rear extension, part two/part single-storey front extension, single-storey side extension and alterations to fenestration.	<p>No Obj</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • commented on the impact on privacy and overlooking. • commented on whether it would be possible to introduce a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) for the tree identified as T1 on the arboricultural information.
<p>EBC noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footprint of the existing house will increase by approximately 87%. However, the footprint of the dwelling following the development would occupy approximately 19% of the site. This is comparable to other properties along Trystings Close and as such, no harm to the host dwelling, the character of the area of the street scene is envisaged. Furthermore, a minimum rear garden of at least 11m is maintained. • the separation distances from rear elevations of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties to the rear would be approximately 34m following the development which is considered to be an acceptable distance that is compliant with policy. Furthermore, a number of trees are also present at the end of the rear gardens of the application site and adjoining properties and whilst it is accepted that many of these are deciduous and do not provide screening all year, some level of screening would still occur during the winter months to assist the separation distances between rear elevations of the properties in maintaining privacy. • The Council's Tree Officer has visited the site and does not consider introducing a TPO as requested by CPC to be necessary <p>Non-Standard Conditions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obscure glazing (see 2021/2932) • Balcony screen <p>Prior to the first use of the terrace the balcony screen as shown on the drawings shall be erected and maintained permanently in strict accordance with the approved plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree Pre-commencement Meeting (Additional Arboricultural Information) • Tree Protection Measures (With Pre-Commencement Meeting) • Additional Arboricultural Information <p>No development including groundworks and demolition shall take place until all supporting arboricultural information has been submitted to and approved in writing by EBC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree Retention <p>All existing trees, hedges or hedgerows inside the identified site boundary shall be retained, unless shown on the approved drawings as being removed and shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the first occupation of the proposed development.</p>			
2021/2176	Apple Tree House Fee Farm Road KT10 OJX	Single-storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration.	No Obj No Comment
<p>Non-Standard Condition was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flat Roof - no other use <p>The flat roof to the extension hereby permitted shall not at any time be altered or adapted to form a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of a further Grant of Planning Permission from EBC.</p>			

Appeals Decided:-

No.	Address	Details	CPC
2021/0846	6A High Street KT10 OJG	Retrospective application to alter roof finish.	No Obj No Comment
<p>Planning Inspector Dismissed Appeal. Amongst the points he made were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · “the roof plane on the appeal building has an extensive area and its covering by felt is a finish that falls far short of what might be reasonably be expected for the appeal building and its location in the conservation area. Nor is there any evidence of a credible reason why a slate roof covering could not be installed that prevents water penetration into the building, provided the materials and construction of the eaves are of an appropriate standard.” · In my view therefore, the felt covering is harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The fact that there are few if any views of the roof from the public realm lessens the harm caused, but the preservation of the conservation area from harmful development requires an holistic approach that necessarily includes the impact on private views. And in this case I consider that a felt roof covering on this scale is noticeably detrimental to the aspect from the gardens and rear windows of Nos. 1-4 Sims Cottages. 			