EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

To determine or make recommendations to the Planning Committee on the list of planning applications set out in Appendix ‘A’.

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT THE LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS SET OUT AT APPENDIX ‘A’ TO THE SUB-COMMITTEE’S AGENDA BE CONSIDERED.

REPORT:

1. To consider the attached list of planning applications and where appropriate make recommendations thereon to the Planning Committee (Appendix ‘A’).

Financial implications: None
Environmental / Sustainability implications: Planning application matter - exempt
Legal implications: As set out in the planning applications reports
Equality Implications: None
Risk Implications: None
Community Safety Implications: None
Principal Consultees: As set out in the planning applications reports
Background papers: None
Enclosures/Appendices: Appendix ‘A’ – Planning Applications
Contact details:
Mrs. K. Fossett, Head of Planning Services, 01372 474702
tplan@elmbridge.gov.uk
KEY TO LIST OF APPLICATIONS

1. ELECTORAL WARDS AND SUB-COMMITTEE AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electoral Ward</th>
<th>Sub-Committee Area</th>
<th>Sub-Committee Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Weston Green</td>
<td>Molesey(S)</td>
<td>Cobham Fairmile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esher</td>
<td>Thames Ditton</td>
<td>Walton Ambleside</td>
<td>Oatlands Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claygate</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Walton(C)</td>
<td>St George’s Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinchley Wood</td>
<td>Hersham (N)</td>
<td>Walton (N)</td>
<td>Weybridge (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Ditton</td>
<td>Hersham (S)</td>
<td>Walton (S)</td>
<td>Weybridge (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxshott</td>
<td>Molesey (E)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke D’Abernon</td>
<td>Molesey (N)</td>
<td>Cobham Downside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. LIST C - APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION – DECISION LEVEL

DEL - This identifies the application as being capable of determination by the Strategic Director under the Delegation Scheme, provided that the number of representations received does not exceed the level at which the application must be referred to an Area Planning Sub-Committee for determination, and it is not 'promoted' to a Sub-Committee by a Councillor.

SUB - This identifies the application as being of a type that would normally be referred to an Area Planning Sub-Committee for consideration. In most circumstances the Sub-Committee will determine the application but, in some instances, it may have to refer the application to the Planning Committee for decision with its recommendation.

Further details of these procedures are available from Planning Services.

3. STRUCTURE OF REPORTS

Header Panel gives the following information:

- Application No. – Unique application reference number.
- Type – Application type – e.g. Full, Outline, Listed Building Consent, Advert, etc.
- Ward – Electoral Ward in which site is located.
- Date Registered – Date of formal registration of application (not necessarily initial date of receipt).
- Location – Application site postal address.
- Proposal – Description of proposed development.
- Applicant – Name of Applicant.
- Agent – Name and address of any person or organisation acting on Applicant’s Behalf.
- Site Notice – Date of display of any Site Notice giving application details.
- Neighbour Notification – Date of any notification letters sent to specific addresses.

Following the Header Panel, there follows a summary of Representatives Received and the Report of the Strategic Director identifying the relevant considerations.

SUB-COMMITTEE DELEGATION - Whether or not the Sub-Committee have authority delegated to them to determine the application under the Council’s current Orders of Delegation.

RECOMMENDATION – ‘Strategic Director’ recommended decision (may contain coded standard conditions).
## Report To East Area Planning Sub-Committee – List A – Applications For Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No:</th>
<th>2014/0883</th>
<th>Application Type:</th>
<th>FULL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Officer:</td>
<td>Steve Elliott</td>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>Oxshott and Stoke D'Abernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiry Date:</td>
<td>20/05/2014</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 32a and 34 Station Road Stoke D'Abermon Cobham Surrey KT11 3BN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>Detached two storey house with rooms in the roof space, attached garage and new access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Lochailort Investments Ltd</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
<td>Mr Ray Freeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BBF Fielding Ltd</td>
<td>41 Chobham Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>GU21 6JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Level:</td>
<td>If Permit – Sub Committee</td>
<td>If Refuse – Sub Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representations:
23 letters of representation have been received in relation to this proposal, from 21 separate addresses, 3 of which are in support of the proposal, the remainder all raised objection, the issues raised were as follows:

- The development in out of character
- Loss of privacy
- The development will appear cramped
- The ridge heights will appear excessive
- Station Road is a busy road, this development will add to the congestion
- The proposed materials are out of character
- In an area that is liable to flood
- No room for refuse lorries to turn around
- The site is capable of extending further northwards
- Noise during the construction phase will adversely impact upon local residents
- No site notice put up
- Harmful to the Thames Basin Heath SPA
- Japanese knotweed exists on the site

*****This application qualifies for Public Speaking*****

### Report

#### Description

1. The application site is a parcel of land located between 32a and 34 Station Road and at the rear of 8-14 (evens) Bray Road. The site is located within the Thames Basin Heath (Zone C) and Flood Zone 3. The application site is as identified within settlement area COS07 (South of Stoke Road) of the Elmbridge Design and Character SPD.

#### History

2. 2013/4020 – 2 detached two storey houses with rooms in the roof space, rear dormer windows and new access from Station Road – Refused
The proposed development by reason of its size, scale, mass, bulk and lack of amenity space results in a highly visible, incongruous cramped and contrived form of development that would be out of character with and detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and street scene in general. As such, the proposal is contrary to saved Policies HSG16 and ENV2 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan (2000), CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011), The Design & Character Supplementary Planning Document (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

The proposed development by reason of insufficient separation distance being proposed between Plot 1 and No. 34 Station Road would provide an inadequate living environment for occupiers of these properties by reason of the poor levels of privacy to the front facing habitable rooms. There would also be a loss of privacy to the occupiers of no. 34 whose rear facing windows and rear garden would be overlooked from the proposed first floor front bedroom and study windows. As such, the proposal fails to take adequate account of saved Policies HSG16 and ENV2 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan (2000), CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011), the Design & Character Supplementary Planning Document (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

The proposed development by reason of the height and proximity of the car port (plot 1) to the rear garden of No. 34 Station Road it is considered that it will result in an overly dominant feature that will adversely impact upon the outdoor amenities of the occupiers of No. 34. As such, the proposal fails to take adequate account of saved Policies HSG16 and ENV2 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan (2000), CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011), the Design & Character Supplementary Planning Document (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Proposal
3. Planning permission is being sought for a detached two storey house with rooms in the roof space, attached garage and new access.

Consultations
4. Tree Officer – Raised no objection
5. Surrey County Council Transportation – Based upon the information supplied the Highway Authority has assessed the impact of the proposal on highway safety and capacity and raised no objections subject to suitably worded conditions and informatives being imposed. The development is considered to be in accordance with saved policies MOV4 and MOV6 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.
6. Environment Agency – Raised no objection subject to a condition being imposed relating to the implementation of mitigation measures in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.

Positive and Proactive Engagement
7. 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. This has included: 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
8. National Planning Policy Framework 2012, the Elmbridge Design & Character SPD, CS10, CS17, CS21 and CS28 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy and saved policies HSG16, HSG18,
HSG19, MOV4, MOV6, ENV2 and ENV12 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000 are material considerations in this case.

9. 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.

10. Given the eclectic mix of property styles within the locality it is considered that this proposal is of an acceptable design.

11. The proposed siting of the proposed new house is one where the larger two storey element of the proposal continues the perceived building line when read, given the existing nature of the line of properties (28-32a) with the garage area being the only element of the proposal that overlaps with the chalet bungalow (No. 34) which sits forward of the application site within what is considered to be a separate building line. In addition the new house will be set in 1.7m from the side boundary adjacent to No. 32a, which is in excess of the requirements of the Council’s adopted guidance.

12. In light of the proposed design the eaves height replicates those of the adjoining two storey houses. The ridge height is marginally higher than that if the direct neighbours however given the distance that the proposal is set back from the highway it is not considered to represent such an increase that will result in any adverse impact being created upon the views from within the street scene or upon the general character of the area.

13. It is noted that the proposed depth of the rear garden only measures 11m which would be contrary to the Elmbridge guidance which indicates that larger family homes should achieve a distance of 15m. The width of rear garden is 21.5m and therefore it is considered that a more than sufficient amount of private residential amenity space is being provided and is largely commensurate in size to that of a number of other gardens within the locality.

14. It is acknowledged that the proposed plans indicate that there is a breach of the 45 degree angle from the first floor rear facing windows within No. 34, however this breach occurs at a distance (15m minimum) that meets the requirements as identified within the Elmbridge Design and Character SPD. It is therefore considered that this proposal will not result in any adverse loss of light being created.

15. The proposed plans indicate that there will be an additional side facing window (stairwell) located between the ground and first floor, in order to prevent any adverse loss of privacy being created upon the neighbouring property (No. 32a). It is considered reasonable to impose an obscure glazing condition.

16. Moreover, it is not considered that the views into the rear garden of No. 34 from the first floor front facing windows within the new house will create any adverse loss of privacy given that the views are largely of the front garden of the application site and the front garden of No. 32a, the only view of No. 34 will be the flank wall and roof (which pitches away). It is therefore considered that this proposal, subject to the suggested condition above will not result in any adverse loss of privacy.

17. Whilst it is acknowledged that the first floor side facing bedroom window would be capable of looking directly into the rear garden of the neighbouring property (No. 34), it is considered that the amended plan that indicates that this window will be obscurely glazed up to 1.85m above the finished floor level and therefore will prevent any direct views into the private areas within this rear garden.

18. The Highway Authority in assessing this proposal have concluded that subject to suitably worded conditions being imposed, relating to parking and turning within the site and suitable vision splays being provided, this proposal will not impact upon highway safety or capacity.
19. Given that the proposal provides a sufficient of off-street car parking, that does not dominate the frontage or impact upon the views from within the street scene this element of the proposal complies with saved policy HSG19 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.

20. The Council’s Tree Officer has assessed this proposal and raised no objection.

21. A suitably worded Flood Risk Assessment has accompanied this proposal in line with the requirements of the NPPF. Despite this and in line with the comments received from the Environment Agency it is considered reasonable to impose the suggested condition to ensure that the works are carried out in strict accordance with this submitted survey.

22. The application results in an increase in new residential units and therefore requires a contribution towards affordable housing and the Community Infrastructure Levy. The applicant in this instance has provided a completed Unilateral Undertaking to secure the necessary financial contribution in line with policies CS21: Affordable Housing of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document on 'Developer Contributions' 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Matters raised in Representations

23. Issues that have not been addressed above include the choice of materials, collection of refuse, construction noise and the fact that Japanese knotweed exists.

24. In terms of the choice of materials the Council could reasonably impose a condition requiring that external materials be approved in writing prior to any approved development commencing on site.

25. There would not be a requirement for the refuse lorries to enter into the application site, it would be for the future occupants to place wheelie bins in an accessible place for collection. Finally the noise during the construction stage is not a material planning consideration however relevant noise informatives could be imposed on any approved scheme.

Conclusion

26. This proposal after careful consideration is not considered to have a significant adverse effect on the neighbouring properties or the visual amenities of the area. This proposal was considered against saved policies HSG16, HSG18, HSG19, MOV4, MOV6, ENV2 and ENV12 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000, CS10, CS17, CS21 and CS28 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy, the Elmbridge Design & Character SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework. It has been concluded that the development would not result in any significant harm that would justify refusal in the public interest.

Sub-Committee Delegation: Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE OFFICER CHECKLIST</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour Notifications</td>
<td>SEL 13/06/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td>SEL 13/06/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings</td>
<td>SEL 13/06/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: 13904 [PL] 03 rev K, 04 rev C, 05 rev C, 07 rev C, 08 rev C, 09 rev D, 11 rev D received on 10 March 2014 and 13 June 2014.

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

3 MATERIALS SAMPLES
NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL TAKE PLACE UNTIL SAMPLES OF THE MATERIALS TO BE USED ON THE EXTERNAL FACES AND ROOF OF THE BUILDING HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED IN WRITING BY THE BOROUGH COUNCIL. DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE CARRIED OUT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPROVED DETAILS.

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.

4 OBSCURE GLAZING
The above ground floor and rooflight windows located within the side elevation adjacent to No. 32a and the side facing rooflight windows adjacent to No. 34 of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscure glass and fitted with non-opening principal lights, and subsequently maintained in this form. Such glass shall be sufficiently obscure to prevent loss of privacy. The affixing of an obscure film will not be sufficient. In addition the side facing first floor window adjacent to No. 34 shall be obscurely glazed up to a height of 1.85m above the finished floor level (in accordance with the approved plan), it shall be glazed with obscure glass and fitted with non-opening principal lights, and subsequently maintained in this form. Such glass shall be sufficiently obscure to prevent loss of privacy. The affixing of an obscure film will not be sufficient.

Reason: To preserve the reasonable privacy of neighbouring residents in accordance with saved Policies HSG16 and HSG20 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.

5 PD LIMITATION
Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (as amended - or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) no development falling within Part 1 Class A of Schedule 2 to the said Order shall be carried out within the curtilage of the/any dwellinghouse, unless planning permission is first granted by the Borough Council.

Reason: To safeguard the character and amenities of the premises and adjoining properties and to comply with saved Policies HSG16 and HSG20 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.

6 PARKING AND TURNING
No new development shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for cars to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. The parking/turning area shall be used and retained exclusively for its designated purpose.

Reason: The above condition is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy CS25 of Elmbridge Core Strategy and saved Policies MOV4, MOV6 & MOV7 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000 and the NPPF.
7 PEDESTRIAN INTER-VISIBILITY SPLAYS
Before any of the operations hereby approved are started on site, a pedestrian inter-visibility splay of 1m by 1m shall be provided on each side of the access, the depth measured from the back of the footway (or verge) and the widths outwards from the edges of the access. No fence, wall or other obstruction to visibility between 0.6m and 2m in height above ground level shall be erected within the area of such splays.

Reason: The above condition is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy CS25 of Elmbridge Core Strategy and saved Policies MOV4, MOV6 & MOV7 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000 and the NPPF.

8 FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT
The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) by Water Environment (Report Ref: 13098 Rev A, dated March 2014).

Reason: To reduce the impact of flooding both to and from the proposed development and third parties in accordance with the NPPF.

Informatives

1 REASONS FOR PERMISSION
This proposal after careful consideration is not considered to have a significant adverse effect on the neighbouring properties or the visual amenities of the area. This proposal was considered against saved policies HSG16, HSG18, HSG19, MOV4, MOV6, ENV2 and ENV12 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000, CS10, CS17, CS21 and CS28 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy, the Elmbridge Design & Character SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework. It has been concluded that the development would not result in any significant harm that would justify refusal in the public interest.

2 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
The development permitted is subject to a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liability for which a Liability Notice will be issued.

3 LICENCE: WORKS ON HIGHWAY
The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a licence must be obtained from the Highway Authority Local Highway Service Group before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. The applicant is also advised that Consent may be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice

4 JAPANESE KNOTWEED
The applicant is advised that the Environment Agency (in partnership with Defra and Network Rail) has published the knotweed code of practice for those involved in the development industry. While there is no statutory requirement for landowners to remove the plant from their property, because of its potential harm to native species, it is listed on Schedule 9 and subject to section 14 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which makes it an offence to plant, or cause this species to grow, in the wild. Both the Police and local authorities have enforcement functions for the 1981 Act. In addition, Japanese knotweed is regarded as controlled waste and has to be disposed of at licensed sites or by burning on site.
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Existing hedges retained/enhanced

New 2.0m close boarded fence

New 1.8m close boarded fence with 0.4m trellis above

Additional planting

Existing beech tree retained

Porous block paved courtyard

New 0.4m high garden wall
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