

| Application No | Address | Reason for Refusal | Policies Contravened |
|----------------|------------------------|---|---|
| 2022/2128 | 12 Langbourne Way | The proposed two-storey side extension would provide distances from first floor level to the side boundary shared with No. 14 Langbourne Way of less than 1m, creating a terracing effect that would result in unacceptable harm to the character of the area and street scene. | Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF. |
| 2022/2229 | 35 Foley Road | The proposed rear dormer being overly large and dominating of the roof space would result in an adverse and harmful impact on the host dwelling and the character of the area. | CS17 of the Core Strategy (2011), DM2 of the Development Management Plan (2015), the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: Home Extensions (2012) and the NPPF. |
| 2022/2120 | 10 Glenavon Close | The proposed crown roof would not accord with the overall roof pattern of the street scene and would result in a harmful impact on the character of the area and the visual amenities of the street scene. | Policies CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015 and the Home Extension Companion Guide 2012. |
| 2022/1377 | 5 Beaconsfield Gardens | Conditions 7 (Tree Retention) and 8 (Tree planting and maintenance) of application 2022/0265 were imposed to replace a previously felled protected tree that provided amenity, wildlife habitat, contributed to reducing the effects of climate change and contributed to the overall tree canopy cover of the borough helping to reduce the carbon footprint of Elmbridge. Removal of these conditions would result in an adverse impact on the landscape amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DM6 of the Development Management Plan 2015. | Policy DM6 of the Development Management Plan 2015. |
| 2022/2159 | 2 Kilinside | The proposed development, by virtue of its design, scale, bulk, mass, and proximity to the boundary, would result in a dominant and incongruous form of development that would appear as an overdevelopment of the site. This would cause an unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, surrounding area and street scene. | Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, guidance within the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (Home Extensions Companion Guide) 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. |
| | | The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, bulk and proximity to the boundary, would result in an overbearing impact for the adjoining occupiers of No. 4 Kilinside. This would cause an unacceptable harm to the amenities of adjoining occupiers | Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and guidance within the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (Home Extensions Companion Guide) 2012. |

| | | | |
|-----------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | | The proposal is located within an area of medium risk of surface water flooding and the submitted flood risk assessment fails to demonstrate that the proposal is safe and does not increase flood risk elsewhere and contains no measures to mitigate such risk. | The proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy and Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document. |
| 2022/1277 | 7 Stevens Lane | 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. The | 1. Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, 2. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015 3. Design and Character 4. The revised NPPF |
| 2022/1186 | 28 Lower Wood Road | 1. The proposed two storey extension, as a result of its scale, height, design and siting, would result in unacceptable harmful impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling to the south, 1 Melbury Close, by virtue of loss of outlook and an overbearing impact. | 1. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015 2. the Design and Character SPD 3. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021. |
| 2022/1186 | 28 Lower Wood Road | The application has failed to provide sufficient supporting arboricultural information , to British Standard 5837:2012 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations, and produced by a suitably qualified and experienced professional, to demonstrate that that reasonable protection will be fully afforded to retained trees and significant trees adjacent to the site which are subject to a TPO, as a result of the proposed development. | 1. Policy DM6 of the Development Management Plan 2015. |
| 2022/1519 | Tiara 29 Ruxley Ridge | No arboricultural information has been provided to support this application and to ensure that the surrounding trees are not adversely affected. The proposal therefore fails to assess the arboricultural implications of the proposal, | 1. The recommendations of BS5837:2012 2. EBC's own requirements 3. Policy DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and the NPPF 2021 |
| 2022/0996 | Fig Tree House 131 Coverts Road | The height and depth of the proposed first floor extension, would result in an overbearing impact when viewed from the rear windows and private amenity space of No. 133 Coverts Road. | 1. Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011 2. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015 3. the Design and Character SPD Companion Guide: Home Extensions 2012 and the NPPF 2021. |
| | | The proposed front gates, piers and boundary wall would be an incongruous form of development resulting in material harm to the character of the area and the visual amenity of the street scene. | 1. Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 3. the Design and Character SPD 4. the revised NPPF. |
| | | The proposed dwelling, by reason of its excessive ridge and eaves heights and resultant second storey would appear as an incongruous form of development resulting in material harm to local character and the visual amenity of the street scene. | 1. Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 3. The Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF. |

| | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|
| 2022/0716 | 83 Oaken Lane | <p>The proposed dwelling would result in material harm to the amenity of the occupants of No. 85 Oaken Lane in terms of light and overbearing effect due to its height, depth and breach of 45o sightlines within 15m of front facing windows of this property.</p> | <p>1. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015 Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF. 2. the</p> |
| | | <p>The proposed outbuilding and gates, piers and boundary wall would be located within the root protection areas of trees and are likely to result in a substantial and unacceptable impact upon the future health and survival of those trees.</p> | <p>1. Policy DM6 of the Development Management Plan 2015 2</p> |
| | | <p>The application has failed to submit up to date and sufficient information required to adequately address the impact of the proposal development upon all legally protected species, habitats and biodiversity.</p> | <p>1. Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy 2011 2. Policy DM21 of the Development Management Plan 2015 3. The Revised NPPF.</p> |