



Caring for Claygate Village

MINUTES

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING held at 7.30pm on Thursday 23rd February 2023 at Claygate Cricket Pavilion

Present: -

Chair of the Committee:	Michelle Woodward
Committee Member Councillors:	Brian Rawson, Geoff Herbert, Gil Bray, Sue Grose, Janet Swift, Mark Sugden
Co-opted Committee Members:	Michael Collon
Elmbridge Borough Councillor:	Mike Rollings
In attendance:	Sally Harman (Parish Clerk & RFO), 1 x members of the public

The Clerk noted at the start of the meeting that she would be recording the meeting to assist with her minutes and that the recording would be destroyed upon approval of the meeting's minutes at the next Council meeting.

1. Apologies for absence

Cllr Wang and John Bamford had sent their apologies in advance of the meeting. John Bamford had provided some commentary on various items on the agenda to the Clerk which the Clerk would read out at the appropriate places on the agenda.

2. Declarations of Interest in items on the agenda.

1. To receive Declarations of Interest from Councillors in items on the agenda.
None
2. To note written requests for dispensations received 7 days prior to the meeting:
None.
3. To note decisions made on any dispensation requests noted in agenda item.
None.

3. Minutes of the last meeting (26th January 2023)

It was agreed in a majority decision that the 26th January 2023 Planning Committee Minutes be approved with 1 amend to the Title of Item 3 which should state 'Minutes of the last meeting (5th January 2023)'. 1 Cllr abstained.

Cllr Woodward signed the 26th January 2023 Planning Committee Minutes, witnessed by the Clerk.

AP50 Clerk to upload final minutes for 26th January 2023 on to website.

4. Actioning of Items from Previous minutes

AP15 Cllr Bray to organise meeting with the agent of CK Hutchinson as well as the representative for Vodafone/O2s contractors with Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) in attendance. **ONGOING**

AP42 Clerk to upload final minutes for 5th January 2023 on to website. **DONE**

AP43 John Bamford to circulate his thoughts on the SCI document to Committee members. **DONE**

AP44 Clerk to recirculate EBC/CPC Biannual Meeting minutes from October 2022 where publication of representation letters was discussed. **DONE**

AP45 Cllrs to feedback SCI consultation comments to Cllr Woodward and the Clerk who would prepare draft response to submit to 23rd February Planning Committee. **DONE**

AP46 Clerk to add SCI Consultation Draft Response review to 23rd Feb Planning Committee agenda. **DONE**

AP47 Cllrs to review 13-15 Derwent Close, 1 Common Road and 16 Elm road for Planning compliance breaches and come back to discuss at the next Planning Committee meeting. Cover under Item 11 **DONE**

AP48 Clerk to circulate maps of 5G coverage provided by a 5G Mast provider. **DONE**

AP49 Clerk to circulate EBC's Design Code Workshop link out on Facebook and Website to residents. **DONE**

5. Planning correspondence, notification of applications and outstanding results.

The Clerk had received the following pieces of correspondence outside those shared within Action Points (APs) and further down the Agenda which the Committee noted.

She had secured extensions from EBC Planning Department for the following applications: -

- Variation of Condition 2023/0001 - 60 Hare Lane Claygate Esher
- Variation of Condition application 2022/3855 - 16 Stevens Lane
- 2023/0047 – Pennsway, Fee Farm Road
- 2023/0114 - 6 Oakhill

The Clerk had received a number of emails from residents objecting to Planning Application 2022/3728 9 Judge Walk. They were unhappy with the Parish Council's response and noted that they had received late notice of the consultation from EBC. The Clerk had directed them to EBC on the late notice of the consultation and that they should raise their objections to EBC Planning and also contact their EBC Borough Cllrs should they wish. In addition she had responded stating that the Parish Council Planning Committee where the application was discussed was advertised one week in advance and that residents could have come along and spoken about their concerns.

19h35 EBC Cllr Mike Rollings entered the room.

The Clerk had been copied into an objection letter to EBC on 2022/3801 18 Trysting's Close which arrived on the 30th January 2023 after the Planning Application had been discussed at the 26th January 2023 Planning Committee.

The Clerk had received and circulated to Councillors the EBC's Community Vision 2023 Launch event invitation to be held on the 7th March 2023.

Finally, the Clerk had received some correspondence from residents on the possible Torrington Lodge development. She had directed them to the EBC Planning Application Alert email system and the agenda page on the Parish Council website so they could stay up to date with when the application would be brought to the Parish Council Planning Committee for discussion.

6. Applications and Appeals decided since last meeting.

The Clerk had circulated two reports from Cllr Bray in advance of the meeting (Appendix A and Appendix B). The Committee noted the reports.

7. Applications from Elmbridge Borough Council Weekly Lists

(<https://www.elmbridge.gov.uk/planning>) including confirmation of comments sent to EBC: - w/e w/e 27th January, 3rd February, 10th February and the 17th February

<u>Application Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Claygate Parish Council Response</u>
2023/0206	167 Coverts Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0LE	Prior Approval Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A: Single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear projection.	No Comment. Unanimously agreed.
<i>19h38 Cllr Grose entered the meeting.</i>			
2022/3855	16 Stevens Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0TE	Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) and 3 (Materials) of planning permission 2021/0160 (Detached house and pair of semi-detached houses) for changes to fenestration, external materials and roof form of Plot 2.	No Objection with Comment. We note that a resident over the road was not consulted. Majority agreed. 1 Cllr abstained.
2023/0001	60 Hare Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0QU	Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 2021/1039 (Extensions) to add french doors to North side elevation and change windows and rooflight to the rear.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2023/0047	Pennsway Fee Farm Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0JX	Single-storey rear extension following demolition of garage.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2023/0155	2 Kilnside Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HS	Single-storey rear extension, rear dormer window, enlarge existing rear dormer window, single-storey detached outbuilding and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing shed.	Cllr Sugden noted he knew the neighbour so would not participate in the discussion nor vote. No Objection with Comments: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consideration is given to applying a condition that the outbuilding shall only be occupied in connection with and ancillary to the occupation of the existing dwelling on the site and in particular shall not be separately let, sold or otherwise occupied as a separate independent dwelling. - Consideration is given to applying a condition to the window of the first floor study that it is to be permanently obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m from the floor to protect the privacy of

			the current and future owners of the adjacent property. Majority agreed. 3 Cllrs abstained.
2023/0169	143 Coverts Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0LE	Single-storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2023/0114	6 Oakhill Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0TG	Single-storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2023/0074	15 Derwent Close Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RF	Single-storey side and rear extensions, front porch, alteration to garage roof and partial conversion of garage into living space.	LDC. No Comment. Unanimously agreed.
2023/0153	1 Rythe Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 9DG	Single-storey rear extension, rear and side rooflights, rear pergola, side balcony, side/rear canopy and alterations to fenestration following partial demolition of existing house and removal of chimney stacks.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2023/0209	The Lodge 33 Raleigh Drive Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 9DE	Roof replacement from flat roof to pitched roof, conversion of garage into living space and alterations to fenestration.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2023/0279	37 Beaconsfield Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0PN	Tree Preservation Order EL:19/48 - Crown lift 1 x Oak to a height of 7m and crown reduce by 1.5-2m.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.

8. East Area Sub Committee Meeting report.

Nothing for Claygate. Next East Area Sub Committee meeting on the 27th March 2023.

9. EBC Planning Committee Meeting Report.

The Committee noted at the 7th February 2023 EBC Planning Committee meeting there was an update on 1 Caerleon Close. A site visit took place in October and EBC are in the process of getting a warrant to gain access however no timescales were mentioned. The Local Plan Regulation 19 Representations were also discussed. EBC are still aiming for adoption in 2023 however delays could be possible due to examination process. The SCI consultation was also discussed. 14th March 2023 is the next EBC Planning Committee meeting.

10. Licensing Applications in Claygate.

No licensing application alerts for Claygate have been received by the Clerk.

11. Compliance issues in Claygate.

1 Caerleon Close – Update given in Item 9.

The Committee discussed 3 possible compliance issues which had been raised at the 26th January 2023 Planning Committee meeting.

It was **unanimously agreed** that a suspected compliance breach be reported to the EBC Compliance team on excessively high fencing for which planning permission had not been sought at 13-15 Derwent Close.

It was **unanimously agreed** that there was no need to raise a compliance breach with EBC on the Velux windows at 1 Common Road.

It was **agreed** in a majority decision that there was no need to raise a compliance breach with EBC on 16 Elm Road's driveway. 1 Cllr abstained.

AP51 Clerk to notify EBC of suspected compliance breach at 13-15 Derwent Close.

12. Consider a response to EBC's Consultation on the Dough Shack Street Trading Application.

The Committee discussed the Street Trading application from the Dough Shack for 2 locations within Claygate: -

1. The Parade, Claygate, Esher, Surrey, KT10 0NU -> Tuesdays
 2. Outside The Griffin, 58 Common Road, Claygate, Esher, Surrey, KT10 0HW-> Sundays
- The Application request was to be able to trade 7 days a week and from 8:00 to 23:00 however it had further commentary and cover notes which suggested that the Dough Shack would only be looking for Tuesday and Sundays between 16:00 – 21:00 although this could be subject to change.

It was **unanimously agreed** to object to the application in its current form with the following comment. If the applicant's intention is to keep to the current trading hours, days and specific locations as detailed in the covering email then CPC request the Dough Shack withdraw their current application and submit a fresh application with these terms. This would help CPC's consideration in due course.

AP52 Clerk to notify EBC of decision.

13. EBC's Local Plan including the consideration of a response to EBC's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) Consultation.

The Committee had received a proposed response prepared by Cllr Woodward ahead of the meeting. EBC Cllr Mike Rollings spoke on the EBC Cabinet meeting which had been held the prior evening and where the SCI Consultation had been discussed. He noted that an amended motion had been approved by the EBC Council. EBC had established principles to guide any changes that arise from the consultation and agreed that:

1. the council must continue to take all reasonable steps to comply with all relevant data protection legislation and statutory guidance;
2. maximum transparency, probity, and an auditable process is fundamental to public confidence in the planning system;
3. residents value the ability to express their views, positive or negative, on planning applications as part of the democratic oversight of planning; and
4. if submissions/comments to planning applications are not published transparently, confidence in the planning system will be significantly reduced

As a result of these principles, and subject to the outcome of the consultation, EBC ruled out any changes that would remove on-line visibility to the public representations about planning

applications (unless specifically requested by authors of those comments) in a transparent manner prior to the final decision being made. This does not preclude the removal or redaction of sensitive or personal information, in accordance with GDPR or other relevant legislation, or consideration by this Council of any appropriate changes, consistent with GDPR legislation, to the current system as might be suggested by the consultation to improve and encourage opportunities for comment on planning applications and other planning matters.

The Committee noted that this was a reversal on what EBC had proposed but it was agreed it was worthwhile for CPC to still submit their response to the SCI consultation. Cllrs noted a few amends were needed to the response which were captured (Appendix C)

It was agreed in a majority decision for Cllr Woodward to finalise the response as per Appendix C on behalf of CPC and for the Clerk to submit.

AP53 Cllr Woodward to finalise the draft response with Councillor comments and send to Clerk for submission.

14. To receive an update on 5G Masts.

Cllr Bray updated the Committee on the latest email he had received back from Virgin. They had noted that there were no concrete plans for any additional 5G to be rolled out in Claygate at this point in time. A consultation would take place if that changed and CPC has been added to pre-planning consultation list.

15. Communication of key decisions to Residents.

The Clerk noted that the latest Courier had landed that week.

16. Matters for information purposes only.

The Committee noted that EBC have a Consultation seeking views on whether they should introduce (Public Space Protection Orders on Council owned land. The Consultation closes on 20th March.

Sites in Claygate include:-

- The Corner of Church Road
- Claygate Common
- Claygate Community Centre
- Claygate Recreation Ground
- Telegraph Hill

AP54 Clerk to add to full Council agenda on 9th March.

EBC's presentation of "Elmbridge's Vision 2030" at the Civic Centre on 7th March from 6pm includes an update on the review of Community Support Services.

17. Date of the next meeting 23rd March 2023.

Meeting closed: 20h40

Signed:

ned

Dated:

23-3-23

ITEM 6 - APPLICATIONS DECIDED, APPEALS LODGED & DECIDED – for CPC PC, 23rd February 2023**6.1. APPLICATIONS DECIDED****6.1.1. w/e 27th Jan**

Application Number	Address	Proposal	CPC	EBC	
2022/3384	9 Lower Wood Road	Front boundary wall and entrance gates.	NO, NC	Refuse Planning Permission The proposed front wall, piers, railing and gates by virtue of their design, height and appearance would result in a dominant and incongruous form of development which would cause unacceptable harm to the overall appearance of the locality and the street scene. This would be contrary to policies CS11 and CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.	View Details
2022/3040	40 Simmil Road	Single-storey rear extension.	NO, NC	Grant Planning Permission 3 x standard conditions 1 x Flood Risk Mitigation	View Details
2022/3449	15 Forge Drive	Two-storey front extension, single-storey rear extension, conversion of garage into living space, front porch and alterations to fenestration.	NO, NC	Grant Planning Permission 3 x standard conditions 1 x Obscure glazing 1 x Potential for Unforeseen Ground Contamination 1 x Flood risk mitigation	View Details
2022/2893	40 Simmil Road	Single-storey rear outbuilding.	NC	Grant Lawful Development Cert – Proposed Reasons for Grant of Certificate The proposed development constitutes permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 as amended. The proposed development is considered lawful and as such planning permission from the Local Planning Authority is not required.	View Details

6.1.2. w/e 3rd Feb

Application Number	Address	Proposal	CPC	EBC	
2022/3216	7 Stevens Lane	Part two/part single-storey side/rear extension, front porch, roof extension incorporating increase in ridge height, rear dormer window, alterations to fenestrations and rooflights following partial demolition of existing house.	NO, NC	Grant Planning Permission 3 x Standard Conditions 1 x Obscure Glazing	View Details
2022/3371	The Willows Albany Crescent	Tree Preservation Order ELM:40 - Crown reduce 1 x Horse Chestnut by up to 1.5-2m.	NA[?]	Grant Consent 1. British Standard 3998:2010 2. Crown reduction - applicant	View Details
2022/3470	17 The Avenue	Two-storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration.	NO, NC	Grant Planning Permission 3 x standard conditions 1 x flood Risk mitigation 1 x Obscure Glazing	View Details
2022/3377	46 Oaken Lane	Car port Canopy.	NO, NC	Refuse Planning Permission The proposed car port by reason of its height, width, enclosed nature and positioning would appear out of keeping and would be harmful to the overall character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 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	View Details
2022/3006	19 Ruxley Ridge	Confirmation of Compliance with Condition 4 of planning permission 2022/0447 allowed at appeal.	Problem retrieving data 5/2/23	Condition(s) - Confirm Compliance	View Details
2022/3708	30 The Avenue	Single-storey infill extension between existing garage and house, conversion of garage into living space	NC	Refuse Lawful Development Certificate The proposed development does not constitute permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, 1(ja) of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 as amended because the extension would be attached to an existing enlargement so the total	View Details

2022/3603	23 Torrington Road	and alterations to fenestration.	NO, NC	height would exceed 4m and total width would exceed 50% the width of the original dwellinghouse. The proposed development is not considered lawful and as such planning permission from the Local Planning Authority is required.	View Details
		Hip to gable roof extension incorporating rear dormer rooflights, Juliet balcony and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing dormer.		Grant Planning Permission 3 x Standard Conditions 1 x Obscure Glazing	View Details

6.1.3. w/e 10th Feb

Application Number	Address	Proposal	CPC	EBC	
2022/2712	24 The Avenue	Retrospective application for a single-storey rear extension.	NA[?]		View Details
2022/3764	108 Foley Road	Tree Preservation Order EL:09/40 - Crown reduce 1 x Yew by 1m and lift to a height of 2.5m.	NC	Grant Consent	View Details

6.1.4 w/e 17th Feb

Application Number	Address	Proposal	CPC	EBC	
2022/3730	Vale View 28 Beaconsfield Road	Single-storey rear extension, rear balcony and raised patio incorporating external stairs and glass balustrade, and	NO, NC		View Details
				Grant Planning Permission 3 x standard conditions 1 x Balcony Screen	

		alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing raised rear balcony.			
2022/3575	Horrington Farm Vale Road	Detached single-storey outbuilding following demolition of existing outbuildings.	NO, NC	Refuse Planning Permission 1. Inappropriate etc in Green Belt 2. Scale, siting and design etc 3. Over-supply of parking on the site etc 4. Failure to supply arboricultural information etc 5. Lack of ecological survey information etc [NB: for more information, refer to the Register of Refusals etc]	View Details
2022/2016	21 Tower Gardens	Roof extension incorporating rear dormer window, raised roof height and alterations to fenestration.	NO, NC	Grant Planning Permission 3 x standard conditions 1 x TR103 - Tree Protection Measures (No Pre-Commencement Meeting) 1 x TR108 - Tree Retention [NB: for more information, refer to the Register of Refusals etc]	View Details
2022/3846	Arbrook Hall Church Road	Tree Preservation Order EL:210 - reduce height and width of 1 x Oak.	Not visible[?]	Grant Consent 1 x British Standard 3998:2010 1x Crown reduction - applicant	View Details
2022/3763	10 Rosehill	New front porch.	NO, NC	Grant Planning Permission 3 x standard conditions	View Details

6.2. APPEALS LODGED

6.2.1. w/e 27th Jan

None

6.2.2. w/e 3rd Feb

None

6.2.3. w/e 10th Feb

6.2.4 w/e 17th Feb

None

6.3. APPEALS DECIDED


6.3.1. w/e 27th Jan

None

6.3.2. w/e 3rd Feb

None

6.3.3. w/e 10th Feb

Application Number	Address	Proposal	CPC	EBC	PI	
2022/0384	Land adjacent to 14 Elm Road	Detached two-storey building containing two flats with associated parking and bin and cycle store.	Objection with 5 Comments	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.	Refuse Planning Permission "Main Issue 3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area." [For more information, Ctrl/Click"View Details"]	

6.3.4 w/e 17th Feb

Only as above, Land adjacent to 14 Elm Road.

Application No	Address	Reason for Refusal/Condition	Policies Contravened
2022/2016	21 Tower Gardens	<p>4. TR103 - Tree Protection Measures (No Pre-Commencement Meeting) No development including groundworks and demolition and no equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site for the purposes of the development until all tree protection measures have been installed in the positions identified on the approved tree protection plan(s) Grant of Planning Permission Approval Application No: 2022/2016 Type: Householder Application DNFULL CONSULTANT: TREECYCLE/SITE: 21 Tower Gardens Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HB/TPP: 2022/2016 21 Tower Gardens Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HB/DATE: 2022 and maintained for the course of the development. The development thereafter shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details and method statements contained in: CONSULTANT: TREECYCLE/SITE: 21 Tower Gardens Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HB/TPP: 2022/2016 21 Tower Gardens Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HB/DATE: 2022</p> <p>5 TR108 - Tree Retention All existing trees, hedges or hedgerows inside the identified site boundary shall be retained, unless shown on the approved drawings as being removed and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the first occupation of the proposed development. No retained tree, hedge or hedgerow providing a screen shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars. If any retained tree, hedge or hedgerow is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree, hedge or hedgerow of similar size and species shall be planted at the same place, in the next available planting season or sooner.</p>	<p>4. TR103 - Reason: To protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality, reduce the risk to protected and retained trees in accordance with the approved details pursuant to section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and in accordance with policies CS14, DM6 of the Councils Core Strategy 2011 and Development Management Plan 2015.</p> <p>5 TR108 - Reason: To protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality, reduce the risk to protected and retained trees in accordance with the approved details pursuant to section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and in accordance with policies CS14, CS15, of the Councils Core Strategy 2011 and DM6 of the Councils Development Management Plan 2015</p>

2022/3573	Horrington Farm, Vale Road	<p>1. The proposed development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt that would, by definition, be harmful to the Green Belt. There are no very special circumstances put forward by the applicant and it is not considered that there are any very special circumstances which would clearly outweigh the definitional harm and any other harms.</p> <p>2. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, siting and design would result in a more urbanising form of development and material change of use of the land which would fail to respect the rural character and appearance of the site and surrounding area resulting in harm to visual amenity.</p> <p>3. The proposal would result in an oversupply of on-site parking provision to serve the residential dwelling.</p> <p>4. The application has failed to provide 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 how trees on site will be afforded adequate level of protection as a result of the proposed development.</p> <p>5. The application has failed to demonstrate, through the lack of submission of ecological survey information, that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on wildlife, habitats or protected species.</p>	<p>1. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DM17 and DM18 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. 2. 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 National Planning Policy Framework 2021. 3. contrary to Policy CS25 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM7 of the Development Management Plan 2015 and the Parking SPD 2020.</p> <p>4. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the terms of Policy DM6 of the Development Management Plan 2015. 5. contrary to Policy CS15 of the Elmbridge Core Refusal of Planning Permission Refusal Application No: 2022/3575 Type: Full Application DNREF Strategy 2011, Policy DM21 of the Development Management Plan 2015 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.</p>
2022/3730	28 Beaconsfield Road	Balcony Screen No development excluding demolition and ground work shall take place until details of a 1.7m high privacy screen has been submitted to and approved in writing by the borough council. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained permanently in strict accordance with the approved details.	To preserve the privacy of neighbouring residents in accordance with policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015
2022/3040	40 Simmill Road	All flood mitigation measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details set out in the flood risk assessment prepared by Lewis Barker received 26th October 2022 and 24th January 2023..	To reduce the overall and local risk of flooding and to comply with policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy and the Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document.
N/A	Standard Condition: Materials	Materials to match. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall match as nearly as is practically possible those of the existing building to which it is attached, in colour, type, finish and profile.	To ensure that a satisfactory external appearance is achieved of the development in accordance with policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan.

2022/3384	9 Lower Wood Road	The proposed front wall, piers, railing and gates by virtue of their design, height and appearance would result in a dominant and incongruous form of development which would cause unacceptable harm to the overall appearance of the locality and the street scene.	Contrary to policies CS11 and CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
2022/3419	34 Rythe Road	Obscure glazing Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the one window on the side elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscure glass that accords with level three obscurity as shown on the Pilkington textured glass privacy levels (other glass suppliers are available) 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.	Reason: To preserve the reasonable privacy of neighbouring residents in accordance with policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan.
2022/3041	Foley House Ruxley Crescent	Occupancy - single dwelling. The outbuilding hereby permitted shall only be occupied in connection with, and ancillary to, the occupation of the existing dwelling on the site, and in particular shall not be separately let, sold or otherwise occupied as a separate independent dwelling.	Reason: Because of its small size the accommodation would be out of keeping with other properties in the locality, which would be contrary to policy DM10 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan.
2022/2452	6 St Leonards Road	Obscure glazing. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the first floor window on the north east elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscure glass that accords with level three obscurity as shown on the Pilkington textured glass privacy levels (other glass suppliers are available) 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.	To preserve the reasonable privacy of neighbouring residents in accordance with policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan.
2022/3043	9 Foley Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed rear extension by reason of its height combined with its length and proximity to the boundary would result in be overbearing when viewed from the rear windows and private amenity space of No. 7. 2 The loss of 11 trees as result of the proposed development would result in a degradation of the local environment and have an adverse impact on the overall character of the area which the trees make a positive contribution to. 3 The application has failed to demonstrate, through inadequate surveys/assessments that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on protected species 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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. 2. The proposal would be in conflict with policies CS14 and DM6 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Development Management Plan 2015. 3. contrary to policy CS15 of the Core Strategy 2011, policy DM21 Development Management Plan 2015 and the NP

2022/2487	17 The Avenue	The two-storey element of the rear extension, by reason flat roof design would have a harmful effect on the character of the host dwelling and the wider area.	The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, policies CS11 & CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015 and the guidance contained within the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document on 'Design and Character' 2012
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.
		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.

2022/2159	2 Kilnside	<p>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 Kilnside. This would cause an unacceptable harm to the amenities of adjoining occupiers</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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>The proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy and Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>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</p> <p>1. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015 2. the Design and Character SPD 3. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021.</p> <p>1. Policy DM6 of the Development Management Plan 2015.</p> <p>1. The recommendations of BSS5837:2012 2. EBC's own requirements 3. Policy DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and the NPPF 2021</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
2022/1277	7 Stevens Lane		
2022/1186	28 Lower Wood Road		
2022/1186	28 Lower Wood Road		
2022/1519	Tiara 29 Ruxley Ridge		
2022/0996	Fig Tree House 131 Coverts Road		

	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>2022/0716</p>	<p>83 Oaken Lane</p>	<p>1. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Plan 2015 2. the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF.</p>
	<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 DM6 of the Development Management Plan 2015 2</p>
	<p>The proposed outbuilding and gates, pliers 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 CS15 of the Core Strategy 2011 2. Policy DM21 of the Development Management Plan 2015 3. The Revised NPPF.</p>

Appendix C – EBC’s Statement of Community Involvement February 2023

The EBC website asks one question for response: "Do you agree with the proposal to stop publishing representation letters for planning applications on the Council's website?" CPC's draft response is set out below:

1. CPC appreciates that there is significant work involved in redacting comments, and that for data protection reasons, EBC should not publish material where the individuals making those representations can be identified, however regrets that, rather than publishing representations in anonymised form, EBC has chosen not to publish them at all.
2. Para 4.4.3 of the new draft Statement of Community Involvement (January 2023) states that "A tally of the number comments [sic] received in favour and against an application will be published on the website." It is not clear at what stage this will happen. CPC would like to see that a running total, updated daily, will be published since objectors may want to know whether the running total of objections is approaching 15, the number at which objectors can ask for a full application to be referred to an Area Sub-Committee. CPC requests clarification that the tally reflects whether multiple comments are from the same address so as to understand how many "valid" objections have been received in order to trigger an application decision by East Area Planning Subcommittee (or Planning Committee). "Observations" submitted to EBC can also form an important part of any comment or decision on an application, so a tally of the number of observations should also be provided.
3. CPC requests that hard copies of consultation documents for Draft Local Plans are made available to residents for an appropriate fee that covers EBC's costs contrary to proposed changes to Appendix 2: Key Stage 2. There is a small but significant part of the population, predominantly senior citizens, that do not have printers and are not comfortable or able to view documents (or comment) online.
4. The position of CPC is different to that of others making representations. EBC has a statutory duty to consult CPC, and a statutory duty to take representations from CPC into account. CPC has a duty to act in the best interests of the village as a whole. It is difficult to do so without knowing as fully as possible what views have been expressed, for or against an application. To achieve this, it is important to know what comments have been made for all planning applications especially objections and observations. In line with a previous request, in anticipation of this proposal, CPC is reiterating its previously expressed view that EBC uses whatever flexibility it has to ensure that CPC will retain sight of residents' representations because they believe them to be essential in enabling CPC to act in the most informed manner to do the best job they can for residents. CPC is keen to reiterate that it is the first tier of local government and therefore very much part of the decision-making process. CPC also seeks assurance that comments submitted on applications where it is not a Consultee will be posted to the Planning Portal.
5. EBC have agreed that full unredacted versions of correspondence will be made available to Members of the relevant EBC Planning Committee where an application is to be determined by a Planning Area Sub Committee or Planning Committee prior to the meeting. CPC requests that such documents relating to applications in Claygate should similarly be made available to CPC before the CPC meetings.
6. We are particularly concerned about the position of applicants. There is no suggestion in the paper put to the EBC Planning Committee on 6 September 2022 that they will have sight of comments on their applications; on the contrary, para 2.8 states that "interested parties including the applicant and Councillors are unable to see the full comments made on the website." There may well be cases where an applicant discovers that a Planning Officer, in refusing their application, has agreed with an objection of which the applicant had no knowledge and which they should have had an opportunity to argue against. The same might arise at the appeal stage.