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1. A two-storey detached dwelling on the southern corner of the junction with common road and Ruxley Ridge.

History

2. 1998/0480 - Part two storey part first floor side first floor rear and two storey front extensions – Approved but not implemented.

Proposal

3. The current application seeks planning permission for a two-storey extension to the side and rear of the property, in place of the existing single-storey flat roof elements. As a wrap-around extension the proposal would project approximately 5.8m from the side of the property and 3.8m to the rear. It would match the existing eaves and ridge heights with a double pitched roof and gable ends. First floor accommodation would be contained partially within the roofspace. An additional single storey infill would be added measuring 1.5m by 1.7m. At first floor level, a window and Juliet balcony would be added.

Consultations

4. Claygate Parish Council – Object to the proposal because it will cause overdevelopment of the site and a lack of amenity space.

Positive and Proactive Engagement

5. In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of 186-187 of the NPPF. Officers have:

Provided or made available pre-application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.

Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered.
Planning Considerations

6. The National Planning Policy Framework seeks a presumption in favour of sustainable development and seeks to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, as well as taking account of the character of different areas.

7. Saved Policy HSG16 of the Local Plan highlights the relevant criteria for the design and layout of residential development proposals. Saved Policy HSG20 offer guidance on development and protection of neighbouring amenity. Saved Policy ENV2 emphasises the need for a high quality of design in development proposals.

8. Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy relates to the Oxshott area and emphasises the need for all development proposals to be well designed and integrate with and enhance local character. Policy CS17 emphasises that new development will be required to deliver high quality and inclusive sustainable design which maximises the efficient use of urban land whilst responding to the positive features of individual locations.

9. The site falls within sub-area Clay 04 of the ‘Design and Character SPD’ companion guide for Claygate. The sub-area comprises the private estate of Ruxley Heights and to the south Ruxley Ridge which includes the Grade II listed Ruxley Towers. There is an individuality to the architectural style of houses although there is a higher density of development to Ruxley Ridge and more reliance of on standard house types and repeated plan layout which bring homogeneity to this part of the sub-area.

10. The property in this instance lies directly at the corner of Ruxley Ridge and Stevens Lane, whilst Common Road projects away to the west with a bridleway passing the site to the south. The scale and design of this existing building reflect its original use as a Lodge within the grounds of the original mansion house. The property is located very close to the highway with minimal screening and as such is prominent within the streetscene. Given its origins, the design differs significantly from the more uniform properties within Ruxley Ridge.

11. Planning permission was previously approved under application ref 1998/0480 for lesser works that would nonetheless begin to alter the character of the existing building. The proposed side extension in this case would be noticeably larger than the previous approval, adding over 6m in length to a property that measures approximately 7.3m in length when excluding the existing bay. Similarly the proposed rear extension would be visible from outside the site, particularly from the adjacent bridleway. However, the works would replace an existing flat roof single storey element which has no particular merit. The double pitched roof would reduce the scale and mass whilst the design and materials would match the existing structure. Within the context of larger detached dwellings along Ruxley Ridge and Steven Lane, the proposal is not considered harmful to the scale and character of the existing property, the streetscene or the character of the area.

12. A separation distance of approximately 6m would be retained from the proposed flank elevation to the side boundary. The neighbouring property at 31 Ruxley Ridge is situated on a higher ground level at an angle to the road with an integral garage projecting towards the shared boundary. Given this arrangement, the proposal is not considered harmful in terms of loss of light. This flank elevation would include a window and a Juliet balcony at first floor level both serving bedrooms. It is noted that the existing property includes a side facing window at first floor level. However, given the position of neighbouring habitable windows, the proposal is not considered unduly harmful in terms of overlooking.

13. The property is located on an irregularly shaped plot. Concern has been raised regarding an overdevelopment of the site and a lack of amenity space. The proposal would see a parking area retained at the side of the house for two cars. From the edge of this area to the rear boundary, the retained amenity space would measure a distance of approximately 10m to 13m. An additional triangle of land would also be retained to the rear of the property of
approximately 10m in width and 6m in length at the longest point tapering to a corner. The ‘Design and Character SPD’ gives guidance on amenity space and suggests that;

‘The surroundings of houses are as much a part of the character of the residential neighbourhoods as the buildings themselves. Gardens should not be reduced to such an extent that they are out of scale with the house and the character of the area. Adequate amenity space must be retained for current and future occupants of the house. Normally the Council will expect the minimum length of a private garden for a house to be 11 metres’.

14. The level of amenity space retained in this instance would be minimal, but with space retained to both the side and rear, the useable amenity space in this instance would be wrap around the side and rear of the property and on balance is considered acceptable.

Matters raised in Representations

15. None.

Conclusion

16. This application is for a satisfactorily designed extension that is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the scale and character of the existing property, the existing streetscene and the character of the area or the amenity of neighbouring properties. The application has been considered against saved policies ENV2, HSG16 and HSG20 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000, Policy CS11 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy, National Planning Policy Framework 2012, the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide and other material considerations. It has been concluded that the development would not result in harm that would justify refusal in the public interest.
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Recommendation: Grant Permission

Conditions/Reasons

1 TIME LIMIT (FULL APPLICATION)
The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 51 of Part 4 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 LIST OF APPROVED PLANS
The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following list of approved plans: DRM92/PL002 and DRM92/PL003 received on 3rd September.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in a satisfactory manner.

3 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.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory external appearance is achieved of the development in accordance with saved Policy ENV2 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.
Informatives

1 REASONS FOR PERMISSION
Summary of reasons for grant of permission: This application is for a satisfactorily designed extension that is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the scale and character of the existing property, the existing streetscene and the character of the area or the amenity of neighbouring properties. The application has been considered against saved policies ENV2, HSG16 and HSG20 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000, Policy CS11 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy, National Planning Policy Framework 2012, the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide and other material considerations. It has been concluded that the development would not result in harm that would justify refusal in the public interest.