

## ITEM 6 - APPLICATIONS DECIDED, APPEALS LODGED & DECIDED – 6<sup>th</sup> Oct 2022

### 6.1. APPLICATIONS DECIDED

#### 6.1.1. w/e 9<sup>th</sup> Sept

Application Number	Address	Proposal	CPC	EBC	
2022/0873	16 Dalmore Avenue	Single-storey rear extension and widening of existing vehicular access.	NO, WC [Flat roof restriction]	<b>Grant Planning Permission</b> 3 x std conditions Flat roof restriction 3 x tree Conditions 3 x Other Conditions	<a href="#">View Details</a>
2022/1834	Brantwood Mountview Road	Confirmation of Compliance with Conditions: 5 (Tree Pre-commencement Meeting), 6 (Tree Protection Measures), 7 (Additional Arboricultural Information), 8 (Site Supervision), 9 (Tree Retention) and 10 (Biodiversity Mitigation) of planning permission 2021/4261.	NC	<b>Condition(s) - Confirm in Part- Refuse in Part</b> [Please refer to web site. Decision is 2 pps A4]	<a href="#">View Details</a>

#### 6.1.2. w/e 16<sup>th</sup> Sept

Application Number	Address	Proposal	CPC	EBC	
2022/2007	Squirrels Wood 3 Common Lane	Front porch.	NO, NC	<b>Grant Planning Permission</b> 3 x Std C's	<a href="#">View Details</a>
2022/2159	2 Kilinside	Single-storey rear extension, single-storey rear extension for ancillary use to main house, rear dormer window, enlarge existing rear dormer window following demolition of existing shed. [NB: this extension was VERY long and thin, along a single side of the garden on No 2. It did, indeed, look very odd. In retrospect, I can understand the EBC view]	NO, NC	<b>Refuse Planning Permission</b> 1. 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	<a href="#">View Details</a>

			<p>character and appearance of the host dwelling, surrounding area and street scene contrary to 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.</p> <p>2 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 contrary to 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.</p> <p>3 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</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				Elmbridge Core Strategy and Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document.	
2022/1989	22 Crediton Way	Part two/part single-storey side/rear storey extensions and alterations to fenestrations and rooflight following demolition of garage.	NO, NC	<b>Grant Planning Permission</b> 3 x Std C's	<a href="#">View Details</a>
2022/1377	5 Beaconsfield Gardens	Removal of Conditions: 4 (Tree Pre-commencement meeting) 5 (Tree protection measures) 6 (Additional arboricultural information) 7 (Tree retention) and 8 (Tree planting and maintenance) of planning permission 2022/0265 (Householder extension).	TW's: NO, NC	<b>Refuse Planning Permission</b> 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.	<a href="#">View Details</a>
2022/2120	10 Glenavon Close	Ground-floor side and rear extension, new roof incorporating front and rear dormer windows and side dormer windows and rooflights following demolition of garage and removal of existing roof.	NO, NC [x 2] [Clearly the PC did not feel the proposals would jeopardise the streetscene, where EBC did].	<b>Refuse Planning Permission</b> 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 which conflicts with policies CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015 and the Home Extension Companion Guide 2012.	<a href="#">View Details</a>

### 6.1.3. w/e 23<sup>rd</sup> Sept

Application Number	Address	Proposal	CPC	EBC	
2022/2481	9 Langbourne Way	Rear dormer windows and front rooflights following removal of chimney.	NO, WC [would be only house in close with front-facing roof lights]	<b>Grant Planning Permission</b> 3 x Std C's	<a href="#">View Details</a>
2022/1988	12 Oakhill	Alterations to fenestration, changes to external finish from brick to render and installation of heat pump.	NO, NC	<b>Grant Planning Permission</b> 3 x Std C;s 1 x Noise Assessment to be carried out.	<a href="#">View Details</a>
2022/2641	65 Foley Road	Non-Material Amendments to planning permission 2021/3088 to include new oriel box window to rear extension and roof lantern changed to flat rooflight.	NC	<b>Accept Amendment</b>	<a href="#">View Details</a>
2022/2051	21 Langbourne Way	Single-storey rear extension and alteration and extension to an existing chimney stack.	NO, WC [PC hopes CO will give full weight to O's Comments]	<b>Grant Planning Permission</b> 3 x Std C's	<a href="#">View Details</a>

### 6.1.4. w/e 30th Sept

Application Number	Address	Proposal	CPC	EBC	
2022/1594	15 Forge Drive	Two-storey front extension incorporating front dormer window, part two/part single-storey rear extension, conversion of garage into living space and alterations to fenestration.	NO, NC	<b>Grant Planning Permission</b> 3 x std C's 1 x Flood Risk mitigation 1 x Potential for Unforeseen Ground Contamination 1 x Obscure Glazing	<a href="#">View Details</a>
2022/2172	40 Stevens Lane	Tree Preservation Order EL:19/10 - Crown reduce 3 x Poplar.	NO, WC [3 trees important to street scene, but close to houses]	<b>Grant Consent</b> Pls refer to Decision	<a href="#">View Details</a>
2022/2229	35 Foley Road	Single-storey rear extension, increase in ridge and eaves height. Rear dormer with juliet balcony to create rooms in the roof space, rooflights and alterations to fenestration.	NO, NC	<b>Refuse Permission</b> The proposed rear dormer being overly large and dominating of the roof space would result	<a href="#">View Details</a>

				in an adverse and harmful impact on the host dwelling and the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to 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.	
2022/2128	12 Langbourne Way	Two-storey side/rear extension, single-storey outbuilding, alterations to fenestration and removal of chimney stack following demolition of existing garage.	O, WC [concerns re terracing and the rear annexe]	<p><b>Refuse Planning Permission</b></p> <p>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. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF.</p>	<a href="#">View Details</a>

## 6.2. APPEALS LODGED

### 6.2.1. w/e 9<sup>th</sup> Sept

Application Number	Address	Proposal	CPC	EBC	
--------------------	---------	----------	-----	-----	--

2022/0384	Land adjacent to 14 Elm Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0EH	Detached two-storey building containing two flats with associated parking and bin and cycle store.	NO, c. 5 x Comments [pls view website]	<b>Refuse Planning Permission</b> The proposed scheme, due to its siting and proportions would provide a jarring visual appearance detrimental to the character and appearance of the area appearing discordant and incongruous. As a result, the proposal would result in adverse harm to the character of the street scene contrary to Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD 2012 and the NPPF 2021.	<a href="#">View Details</a>
-----------	---	--	--	---	------------------------------

### 6.2.2. w/e 16<sup>th</sup> September

[2022/0384 was noted again]

### 6.2.3. w/e 23<sup>rd</sup> September

[2022/0384 was noted again]

### 6.2.4. w/e 30<sup>th</sup> September

[2022/0384 was noted again]

## 6.3. APPEALS DECIDED

### 6.3.1. w/e 9<sup>th</sup> Sept

None

### 6.3.2. w/e 16<sup>th</sup> Sept

Application Number	Address		CPC	EBC	Planning Inspectorate	
--------------------	---------	--	-----	-----	-----------------------	--

2022/0770	16 Gordon Road	Single-storey rear extension part two-storey side extension and first-floor side extension following partial demolition of existing house.	NO, NC	<p>1. 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. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF.</p> <p>2 The proposed rear/side extensions, by reason of their height, proximity to the side boundary and infringement of 45o and 25o sightlines, would adversely impact the residential amenity of No. 18 Gordon Road in terms of light and outlook. The proposal would fail to comply with Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF.</p> <p>3 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 No. 18 Gordon Road in terms of overlooking and privacy. The proposal would fail to comply with Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF.</p> <p>4. The proposed first floor side extension, by reason of the disjointed relationship with the</p>	<p><b>APPEAL DISMISSED</b></p> <p>The main issues in this appeal are:</p> <p>a) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and of the local area, and...</p> <p>b) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbours at No 18 Gordon Road.</p> <p>[pls see website for remainder of Decision. 3 x A4 page decision]</p>	<p><a href="#">View Details</a></p>
-----------	----------------	--	--------	--	--	-------------------------------------

				host dwelling due to the low eaves height, would result in harm to the host dwelling, character of the area and street scene contrary to Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF		
2021/2707	Land adjacent to 14 Elm Road	Detached two-storey building containing two flats with associated parking and bin and cycle store.	NO, with 4 x Comments.	The proposed scheme, due to its design, siting and proportions would provide a jarring visual appearance detrimental to the character and appearance of the area appearing discordant and incongruous. As a result, the proposal would result in adverse harm to the character of the street scene contrary to Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD 2012 and the NPPF 2021.	Main Issue 3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.	<a href="#">View Details</a>

None

### 6.3.3. w/e 23<sup>rd</sup> Sept

Application Number	Address	Proposal	CPC	EBC	Planning Inspector	
2022/0447	19 Ruxley Ridge	Single-storey side infill extension, extend existing garage with	NO, NC	By reason of its scale, siting and design, the proposed first	Decision 1. The appeal is allowed and	<a href="#">View Details</a>



		room above, front dormer window and alter garage door.		<p>floor side extension would result in a prominent form of development which would result in significant harm to the visual amenity of the character and appearance of the site, surrounding area and street scene.</p> <p>The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF.</p>	<p>planning permission is granted</p> <p>4 x Conditions</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

**6.3.4. w/e 30<sup>th</sup> Sept**

[2022/0447, 0770, 2707 all reported again]