Report To North Area Planning Sub-Committee – List A – Applications For Decision

Application No: 2016/3829  
Application Type: FULL

Case Officer: Karim Badawi  
Ward: Molesey East Ward

Location: 1 Walton Road East Molesey Surrey KT8 0DE  
Proposal: Two-storey side and rear extensions with rooms in the roofspace to provide 9 flats with associated car parking and access following partial demolition of existing building and garages (amendments to include bin storage cover, additional bin storage to the west, reduction of the extension to the north and changes to proposed fenestration)

Applicant: Jane Sawyer  
Agent: Mr David Cranmer  
OSP Architecture (On behalf of Langham Homes)  
Broadmede House  
Farnham Business Park  
Weydon Lane  
Farnham  
GU9 8QT

Decision Level: If Permit – Sub Committee  
If Refused – Sub Committee

Recommendation: Permit subject to the receipt of an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 by the date of the meeting to secure affordable housing contributions

Representations: 11 letters of objections from 9 addresses raised the following concerns:
- Over-development of the site, the number of flats is not supported by communal space and public facilities.
- Loss of light, overshadowing to No.125; the sunlight study was carried out without any site visit and not true to the actual floor plans at No.125.
- Location of bin store is too close to neighbouring properties with issues of noise and potential vermin.
- The extra bin store is very small to relief pressure from the main bin store, the enclosure of the bin store is not clear.
- Comments in relation to identifying the site being noisy are not a true reflection of reality.
- Impact on the conservation area
- Impact on historic building
- Demolition of the existing site is not environmentally friendly and diminution of a historic asset
- Traffic disruptions during construction
- Insufficient parking provision, highway safety from the proposed access

This application has been promoted by Cllr Popham if the recommendation is to permit.

Report

Description

1. The application relates to a 0.11 hectare triangular shaped site which is located on the northwest side of the junction joining Bridge Road, Walton Road and Esher Road. The site is currently occupied by the former police station building, an Edwardian locally-listed building over two storeys which mainly fronts the curve connecting Walton Road and Bridge Road. The site also has a single storey detached structure along its northern boundary and a big car...
parking space accessed from Walton Road. The site is bordered with No.3 Walton Road to the east and No.125 Bridge Road to the north.

Constraints

2. The relevant planning constraints for this application are:

- Area of High Archaeological Potential
- Air Quality Management Area
- SSSI Impact Risk Zone
- Conservation Area – East Molesey Bridge Road
- Listed Building
- Potential Contaminated Land
- Flood Zone 2
- Classified Road

Policy

3. In addition to the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance, the following local policies and guidance are relevant to this pre-application enquiry:

Core Strategy 2011
CS7 – East and West Molesey
CS17 – Local Character, Density and Design
CS2 – Housing provision, location and distribution
CS19 – Housing type and size
CS21 – Affordable housing
CS25 – Travel and accessibility
CS27 – Sustainable buildings

Development Management Plan 2015
DM1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM2 – Design and amenity
DM4 – Comprehensive development
DM6 – Landscape and trees
DM7 – Access and parking
DM8 – Refuse, recycling and external plant
DM10 – Housing
DM12 – Heritage
DM21 – Nature conservation and biodiversity

Design & Character SPD 2012
Companion Guide – East and West Molesey

Developer Contributions SPD 2012

4. Relevant Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/2152</td>
<td>Two storey side and rear extensions with rooms in the roof space to provide 10 flats with associated car parking and access following partial demolition of existing building</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal

5. The proposal is for a part two/part single storey side and rear extensions with rooms in the roof space to provide 9 flats with associated car parking and access following partial demolition of existing buildings.
6. Final amendments had been submitted to the proposal reducing the extant of the two storeys the north (right side) wing whilst maintaining the parameters of the ground floor. As the amendments were only concerned with reducing the bulk of the original proposal, a re-consultation period was not deemed necessary. The description below is for the final proposal which would be the scheme under consideration.

7. To the north, the part single/part two side extension would start 4.7 metres behind the front building line; the two storey element would project 2.6 metres for the depth of 3.8 metres, this element would have a hipped roof with eaves similar to existing and ridge at a height of 8.3 metres subservient to main ridge. The single storey element would be a perpendicular L-shaped with a staggered projection of 5 metres maximum (from existing) and a total depth of 8.5 metres, this element would have a flat roof with maximum height of 3.8 metres. A further infill single storey extension, for the bins area, would extend to the boundary, shared with No.125 Bridge Road, with the depth of 6.3 metres along the boundary at a maximum height of 2.4 metres sloping down to 2.2 metres by the boundary.

8. To the west, the main two storey bulk would start at some 3 metres from the front boundary and 6.4 metres from the west boundary. This element would have a depth of 14 metres with a frontage width of 11 metres. Towards the rear this element would have a maximum projection of 7.8 metres from the main bulk of the existing building. The new building would extend the existing hipped roof with a flat roof section in the middle; the west side extension would have similar roof eaves with a subservient ridge. The rear roof slopes would contain 6 dormers windows of different sizes, however all with subservient sizes.

9. The proposal would retain the existing vehicular access by the west boundary, would include 9 parking spaces towards the northwest corner and 10 bikes spaces towards the rear in addition to 2 bike racks to the front.

10. The proposal would offer 9 two bedrooms flats of different sizes at 71 square metres minimum. Flats 1 & 2 on ground floor would have direct access from the street, whilst the rest of the flats would be accessed through an entrance lobby behind the existing main entrance of the building. A secondary bin store is proposed next to the entrance of flat 1.

Consultations

11. SCC Transport Planning – 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 conditions and informatives. The development is considered to be in accordance with Elmbridge Core Strategy Policy CS28, Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

12. SCC Archaeology – Raised no objections and added a condition for securing the implementation of a program of archaeological work.

13. Environmental Health (Contaminated Land) – the consultation agreed with the submitted Environmental Assessment and its recommendations in relation to the need for an intrusive site investigation to evaluate the upper layer of soil, and accordingly recommended adding appropriate conditions.

14. Environmental Health (Noise & Pollution) – Following the addition of a roof over the proposed refuse bin storage area, the consultation was satisfied that noise was not likely to be noticeable and would have no observed effect as defined in the National Planning Practice Guidance and therefore no noise control conditions were recommended.

15. Environmental Services – the consultation agreed that the option for communal bins was preferred for flats development.

16. Surrey Bat Group – the consultation stated that the submitted report confirmed the building to have a medium potential and requested further emergence surveys, this is discussed in more details below.
17. Surrey Wildlife Trust – The consultation did not raise any objection to the proposal with recommendations on wild-habitat friendly construction methods and opportunities to restore or enhance biodiversity on site. Further consultation raised no objection in relation to impact on Bats; this is discussed in more details below.

18. East Molesey Conservation Area Advisory Committee – the consultation recommended the refusal of the scheme as issues raised within the previous scheme were not addressed. These concerns were in relation to the visually continuous frontage and the massing of the proposal which both detracted from the original building and undermined its impact, additionally the reduction of the units by one was still considered an overdevelopment of the site.

19. Listed Building Consultant – the consultation did not raise any objections and concluded that the current scheme addressed the shortcomings of the previous application, this is discussed in more details below. Further consultation to the amended scheme recommended that the additional small bin store to be formed by a matching brick wall and that a reduction of the proposed bulk would have an even lesser impact to the original one.

Positive and Proactive Engagement

20. Paragraphs 186-187 of the NPPF require officers to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner to resolve problems before the application is submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development. This requirement is met within Elmbridge through the availability of pre-application advice.

21. Pre-application enquiry was not sought prior to the submission of this application.

Planning Considerations

22. The main planning considerations in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of the development
- The design of the proposal and its impact on the listed building and the conservation area
- The impact on the neighbouring properties
- Provision of a suitable residential environment
- Highway and Parking Issues
- The impact on biodiversity
- Financial considerations

The principle of the development

23. Policy DM1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development specifies that the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

24. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal for East Molesey Bridge Road specifies that the general principles for new development, within a conservation area, are that it should not overlook or dominate neighbouring properties; lead to an unacceptable loss of garden space (particularly that between neighbouring properties); result in the loss of historic plot boundaries; or overwhelm the original building. Additionally All development, but particularly in conservation areas, must respond to its immediate environment, its “context”, in terms of scale, form, materials and detailing.

25. Policy CS2 seeks to ensure effective use of urban land for housing by delivering high-density housing development in the most sustainable locations. Considering the previous points and that the building had been decommissioned since 2012 with no current use on site, the
principle of the development to the former police station listed building will be acceptable subject to considerations set below.

The design of the proposal and its impact on the listed building and the conservation area

26. The proposal would retain the frontage of the listed building. Following the final amendments, the part single/part-two storey extension to the north (right wing) would be subservient in scale and would be set back from the front boundary line. Whilst to the west, the two-storey extension would show subservience through its set back and relatively lower ridge and its design and scale would integrate it with the main building. Adding to the curve of the plot, the extension's step back from the original frontage would maintain the stature and the prominent architectural features of the listed building which would still dominate the site.

27. The above assessment is echoed through the Listed Building Consultant comments who considered that the right hand extension wing was set well back from the frontage exposing the prominent external side chimney structure, while the left hand extension wing was at an angle reflecting the site footprint and exposed the external left hand chimney structure. The symmetry and dominance of the original corner building is thus preserved.

28. The current site is fronted by the main building and a combination of wooden fence and picket fence on both sides, whilst the north boundary (the rear) is dominated by a string of single storey abandoned structures. The proposal would be leaving some 6-7-metre separation gaps with the neighbouring properties on both sides, which would reduce the gap between the existing building and the neighbouring property to the west diminishing the appearance of the unkempt area. This is in combination with the integrated design of the proposal, which would subsequently impact on the conservation area in a positive fashion. This is echoed by the Listed Building Consultant comments which stated that the proposal would have the character of this part of the conservation area respected.

29. The comments from East Molesey CAAC consultation are noted. However, as discussed above and following the final amendments, the prominence of the Listed Building frontage would be maintained and apparent within the proposal. The west extension is set back on two different lines and the north extension, particularly following the final amendments, would be subservient in scale and height. Other concerns were raised in relation to overdevelopment of the site, however, following the demolition of the single storey buildings by the north boundary, the partial demolition of the building and the added extensions, the proposal would add some 82 square metres of footprint to the site. It may be argued that such a bulk is notably different to the immediate vicinity; however the area consists of semi-detached and detached dwellings, and even larger buildings as The Orchard Infant School or Wolsey Court.

30. Considering all the points above, the proposal would be bringing back a derelict building into a use that is commensurate to the vicinity, would result in a better visual to the existing site than the existing car park and abandoned single storey structures and would provide an effective use of the land for housing. As such, the proposal would not be considered to have an adverse impact on the Listed Building or the Conservation Area.

The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties

31. Neighbouring property No.3 Walton Road to the east does not have any side windows overlooking the site, whilst the first floor rear window would not have its 45\(^\circ\) line breached by the proposal. Historical planning documents for the mirrored attached house No.5 show that the two first-floor side windows to be serving a bathroom and secondary to a room served by a rear window; as such, the proposed two storey extension at a distance of more than 8 metres would not be considered to have such an adverse impact on the amenity of No.3 to warrant a refusal.

32. Neighbouring property No.125 Bridge Road to the north has side windows on both ground and first floor overlooking the site. The ground floor windows would face a wall with a height of 2.2 metres behind the existing 1.8 metre high boundary wall. After some 8 metres from the front boundary, the ground floor side windows would face a corner with a height of 3.8 metres at 2.2
metres away; this would not be considered to have such a detrimental impact on the ground floor side windows considering the existing boundary wall’s significant height starting from a similar if not the same spot.

33. The final amended plans reduced the bulk of the two storey extension to the north and pulled it back to be in line with the existing building, apart from 2.6 metres projection. These recent modifications diminished concerns in relation to overbearing impact onto the first floor side window at No.125, additionally, the 45° line of the same window is not breached and its outlook would retain its current openness and visibility angle despite the proposed two storey extension.

34. Representation letters were concerned about the location of the bins by the shared boundary with No.125. The location of the bins store is discussed below; however, the amended version of the application added a roof covering to an enclosed bins store which should eradicate smell and vermin concern. Additionally, as a communal bin area, residents would be carrying rubbish bags and not dragging wheeled bins to the store room, as such any noise would not be that adverse to No.125 on its merits. This assessment would be in accordance with the consultation response by Environmental Health in relation to noise or pollution which agreed that the roof covering would be preferable.

Provision of a suitable residential environment

35. The proposal includes provision of 9 two-bedroom flats; all habitable bedrooms would have adequate ventilation and outlook with no concerns on their amenities. The smallest flat would have a surface area of 71 square metres which would be in accordance with the Nationally Described Space Standard for a 2 bedroom/4 person’s apartment on a single storey.

36. The proposal would include on-site cycle storage provision for 14 spaces: 10 spaces in a dedicated store and 4 spaces to the front of the development. That would be more that the requirement set by the Development Management Plan 2015 which specifies that flats should have 1 space each.

37. Environmental Services stated that the size and number of bins provided was sufficient to meet their guidance and that an option for communal bins was preferred for flat developments as it would reduce the number of containers to be emptied and would help in minimising the stopping time of the collection vehicle. Discussions in relation to the location of the bin store explained that the northwest corner of the site would not be suitable as the site would not have sufficient space for the collection vehicle turning and the prospect distance from access to stopping point would exceed the maximum reversing distance. Amended plans suggested a secondary provision for a bins area to the west of the site in an effort to reduce the number of users to the main bin store, the re-consultation from Environmental Health did not raise an issue with that prospect, particularly due to the limited number of bins in that secondary location which would in turn reduce the stopping time for the collection vehicle.

Highway and Parking Issues

38. DM7 - Access and Parking states that in areas of parking stress the Council would expect a minimum of 1 space per residential unit, and accordingly the proposal would include a car park for 9 vehicles through the existing entrance on Walton Road and would be considered acceptable in terms of impact on parking and highway. Additionally, SCC Highways stated that in order to prevent dangerous parking in the vicinity double and single yellow line parking restrictions were set out on Walton Road, Bridge Road and Esher Road with the single yellow line parking restriction in place Monday to Saturday between 8:30am and 6:30pm. SCC added that six frequent bus routes (411 - 514 - 641 - 661 - 814 - 881) ran along Bridge Road and Walton Road and the closest bus stop located approximately 60 metres walking distance from the development and that Hampton Court Railway Station was located approximately 700 metres walking distance from the development. Users of the site have therefore the opportunity to travel by alternative mode of transports to the car towards London and other locations in Surrey which would mean that the shortfall of car parking spaces within the proposal would therefore not create any highway safety issues in the vicinity of the site.
39. Representation letters raised concern in relation to highway safety from the additional traffic generated by the proposal. Regardless of the current site being used as a car park for some 16 vehicles, the proposal would accommodate 9 vehicles at an existing entrance, in the case of recommending permission, SCC Highways recommended that the existing access should be modified to a bellmouth arrangement and to be provided with dropped kerb and tactile paving at a pedestrian crossing point across the access. This new arrangement which would be imposed via a condition would be considered to eradicate any concern in relation to highway safety on pedestrians.

40. A representation letter raised a concern in relation to traffic disruptions during construction. SCC Highways requested a pre-commencement condition to be added, in the case of granting permission, in relation to construction transport management plan to ensure minimum disruption impact on the vicinity.

The impact on biodiversity

41. It is noted the Surrey Bat Group (SBG) recommended a further bat survey to be carried out during the bat active season following the submitted report by RSK which identified the building as having 'medium' potential for bat roosting. In response to SBG consultation, RSK explained that the building identification as having a medium potential was merely due to the fact that the internal roof void could be accessed through the gable crevices, however, during the surveys that had been carried out, no evidence of bats having used the roof as a roost. This includes droppings, urine splashes, scratch marks, feeding remains or sebaceous oil staining. Additionally, the interior of the roof on both occasions was heavily cobwebbed with webs extending across the roof void. If bats had been using the roof void many of these webs particularly those extending across the void would not be present as bats would have to fly through them. Final consultation from Surrey Wildlife Trust agreed with the recent letter from RSK and raised no objection to the method of their work or concerns that the building would have any Bat potential.

Financial considerations

42. Following a Court of Appeal decision which found in favour of the Government, paragraphs 012-023 of the National Planning Policy Guidance on planning obligations have been reintroduced. These paragraphs and the Ministerial Statement are now a material consideration, alongside local planning policy, against which the Council must consider all planning applications. However, given that the local plan remains the primary consideration against which decisions must be made, the Council is continuing to apply policy CS21 Affordable Housing as set out in the Core Strategy. Following receipt of legal advice, the Council has produced a statement to set out our local evidence in support of continuing to apply policy CS21 to this application in light of the revised PPG. This is available to view on the Planning Services webpages.

43. The New Homes Bonus is a grant paid by central government to local councils for increasing the number of homes and their use. The New Homes Bonus is paid each year for 6 years. It is based on the amount of extra Council Tax revenue raised for new-build homes, conversions and long-term empty homes brought back into use. There is also an extra payment for providing affordable homes. The Council’s New Homes Bonus Scheme Grant Determination for 2017/18 is £1.89m (approx.).

44. Local financial considerations are defined as grants from Government or sums payable to the authority under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This means that the New Homes Bonus is capable of being a material consideration where relevant. In the current case, the approval of the application would mean that the New Homes Bonus would be payable for the net increase in dwellings from this development.

45. Policy CS21: Affordable Housing of the Council’s Core Strategy (2011) requires that development resulting in the net gain of 6-14 residential units should provide 30% of the gross number of dwellings on site as Affordable Housing, where viable to do so, which as per the
Developer Contributions SPD would equate to 2 affordable homes on-site and a financial contribution equivalent to 0.7 of a unit.

46. In this case, the applicant has contended that it would not be viable for the scheme to proceed and deliver the full affordable housing requirement and a viability appraisal and supporting evidence was provided on its behalf to support this position. This economic viability appraisal has been subject to a review by Dixon Searle Partnership on behalf of the Council and lengthy communications have ensued, with a particular focus on reaching common ground on the actual value of the site, which is a key element in any economic appraisal. Both parties have reached agreement on this and the various other assumptions used and taken together, the review have indicated that whilst it does not appear that the site could viably deliver the Council’s full policy target, it would appear possible for the scheme to provide one affordable home (in the form of a shared-ownership tenure) plus a financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing of £61,752.

47. The above can be secured through a Unilateral Undertaking agreement, which would cover such matters as the transfer of the leasehold of the unit to a Registered Provider and the initial equity share to be sold, which is recommended by Housing services to be 35-40% of the open market value. As such, the recommendation would be to permit to the scheme subject to this document being finalised in an agreed timescale.

48. In addition to the above, the proposal would add 726.3 square metres of floor space to that existing; as such it would fall within the CIL threshold for the amount of £108,215.46.

Matters raised in Representations

49. The comments in relation to demolition of the existing site not being environmentally friendly are not a material planning consideration. Other matters are discussed within planning considerations.

Conclusion

50. On the basis of the above, and in light of any other material considerations, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, the recommendation is to grant permission.

Recommendation: Permit subject to S106 Agreement

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: Location Plan received on 21 November 2016; P105A and P106 received on 01 March 2017; P101D; P102E; P104D; P106A; P110E; P111D; P112E received on 20 April 2017.

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 Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the use of satisfactory external materials goes to the heart of the planning permission.

4 ARCHAEOLOGY - SCHEME OF WORKING (SITE OF HIGH ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL)
NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL TAKE PLACE UNTIL THE APPLICANT HAS SECURED THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROGRAMME OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK ON THE SITE IN ACCORDANCE WITH A WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION WHICH HAS BEEN SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT AND APPROVED IN WRITING BY THE BOROUGH COUNCIL.

Reason: The site is one of/within an area of high archaeological potential and it is important that the archaeological information should be preserved as a record before it is destroyed by the development in accordance with Policy DM12 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

5 EXISTING ACCESS
Notwithstanding the submitted plans the existing access shall be modified to a bellmouth arrangement and provided with dropped kerb and tactile paving at the pedestrian crossing point across the access in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, all to be permanently maintained.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety, the free flow of traffic nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

6 METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION STATEMENT
NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL COMMENCE UNTIL A CONSTRUCTION TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT PLAN, TO INCLUDE DETAILS OF [DELETE WHERE APPROPRIATE]:
(a) PARKING FOR VEHICLES OF SITE PERSONNEL, OPERATIVES AND VISITORS
(b) LOADING AND UNLOADING OF PLANT AND MATERIALS
(c) STORAGE OF PLANT AND MATERIALS
(d) PROGRAMME OF WORKS (INCLUDING MEASURES FOR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT)
(e) PROVISION OF BOUNDARY HOARDING BEHIND ANY VISIBILITY ZONES
(f) HGV DELIVERIES AND HOURS OF OPERATION
(G) VEHICLE ROUTING
(H) MEASURES TO PREVENT THE DEPOSIT OF MATERIALS ON THE HIGHWAY
(I) BEFORE AND AFTER CONSTRUCTION CONDITION SURVEYS OF THE HIGHWAY AND A COMMITMENT TO FUND THE REPAIR OF ANY DAMAGE CAUSED
(J) NO HGV MOVEMENTS TO OR FROM THE SITE SHALL TAKE PLACE BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 8.30 AND 9.15 AM AND 3.15 AND 4.00 PM (ADJUST AS NECESSARY ACCORDING TO INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL START AND FINISH TIMES) NOR SHALL THE CONTRACTOR PERMIT ANY HGVS ASSOCIATED WITH THE DEVELOPMENT AT THE SITE TO BE LAID UP, WAITING, IN (SPECIFY NAMED ROADS) DURING THESE TIMES
(K) ON-SITE TURNING FOR CONSTRUCTION VEHICLES

HAS BEEN SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED IN WRITING BY THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY. ONLY THE APPROVED DETAILS SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED DURING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT.
Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety, the free flow of traffic nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the demolition and construction works could have implications on highway safety and amenity and should be agreed before any works begin.

7 POTENTIAL LAND CONTAMINATION
TO ENSURE THE POTENTIAL FOR CONTAMINATION HAS BEEN INVESTIGATED AND THE NECESSARY ACTION TAKEN TO MAKE THE DEVELOPMENT SITE SUITABLE FOR ITS PROPOSED USE, THE FOLLOWING STEPS MUST BE COMPLETED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE COUNCIL. NO CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE COMMENCED UNTIL STEP (A) HAS BEEN COMPLETED BY A COMPETENT PERSON. FURTHERMORE THERE SHALL BE NO OCCUPATION OF ANY PART OF THE SITE BY ANY END USER PRIOR TO MEETING THE TERMS OF THIS CONDITION IN FULL.

A) SITE INVESTIGATION, METHOD STATEMENT AND REMEDIATION
(I) A SITE SPECIFIC INVESTIGATION PLAN USING THE INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM THE PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION (PHASE 1 REPORT), PROVIDING DETAILS OF THE INVESTIGATION FOR SOIL, GAS AND CONTROLLED WATERS WHERE APPROPRIATE, SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO, AND APPROVED BY, THE COUNCIL.
(III) THE SITE INVESTIGATION SHALL BE UNDERTAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SCHEME AGREED BY THE BOROUGH COUNCIL. THE RESULTS OF THE SITE INVESTIGATION, A REFINED CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND A RISK ASSESSMENT OF ANY CONTAMINATION FOUND SHALL BE SUBMITTED IN WRITING TO, AND APPROVED BY, THE COUNCIL.
(IV) A WRITTEN METHOD STATEMENT DETAILING ANY REMEDIATION REQUIREMENTS SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO, AND APPROVED BY, THE COUNCIL.

B) DEVELOPMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE METHOD STATEMENT
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE SHALL BE CARRIED OUT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPROVED METHOD STATEMENT, AND ANY ADDENDA SUBMITTED BY THE DEVELOPER, AND AGREED IN WRITING BY THE BOROUGH COUNCIL. ANY POST REMEDIATION MONITORING IDENTIFIED IN THE METHOD STATEMENT, SHALL BE INSTALLED BY THE DEVELOPER WITHIN THE TIMESCALES IDENTIFIED IN THE METHOD STATEMENT AND MAINTAINED AND OPERATED FOR AS LONG AS IDENTIFIED BY THE METHOD STATEMENT.

C) UNSUSPECTED CONTAMINATION
IF, DURING DEVELOPMENT, CONTAMINATION NOT PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED, IS FOUND TO BE PRESENT AT THE SITE THEN NO FURTHER DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE CARRIED OUT UNTIL THE DEVELOPER HAS SUBMITTED, AND HAD APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL, A WRITTEN ADDENDUM TO THE METHOD STATEMENT DETAILING HOW THE UNSUSPECTED CONTAMINATION SHALL BE DEALT WITH.

D) PILING
DEVELOPMENT APPROVED BY THIS PERMISSION SHALL NOT COMMENCE UNLESS THE METHOD FOR PILING FOUNDATIONS (IF PILING IS TO BE USED ON SITE) HAS BEEN SUBMITTED TO, AND AGREED IN WRITING, BY THE BOROUGH COUNCIL. THE PILING SHALL BE UNDERTAKEN ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPROVED METHOD.

E) IMPORTED MATERIAL
CLEAN, UNCONTAMINATED ROCK, SOIL, BRICK RUBBLE, CRUSHED CONCRETE OR CERAMIC ONLY SHALL BE PERMITTED AS INFILL MATERIAL. THE DEVELOPER SHALL NOT IMPORT ANY MATERIAL UNTIL A SAMPLING PROGRAM, INCLUDING APPROPRIATE IMPORT CRITERIA FOR THE PROPOSED END USE AND FREQUENCY OF SAMPLING, HAS BEEN SUBMITTED IN WRITING, AND APPROVED BY, THE COUNCIL. THE DEVELOPER SHALL CARRY OUT THE APPROVED SAMPLING PROGRAM TO CHECK THAT ALL IMPORTED MATERIAL CONFORMS TO THE AGREED CRITERIA. WHERE THE PERMITTED END USE IS RESIDENTIAL, THE SAMPLING
PROGRAM SHALL ALSO INCLUDE SAMPLES TAKEN FROM THE IMPORTED MATERIAL AFTER FINAL PLACEMENT. WRITTEN CONFIRMATION OF THE SUITABILITY OF ALL IMPORTED MATERIALS SHALL BE PROVIDED TO THE COUNCIL AS PART OF STEP (G). THIS SHALL INCLUDE BOTH THE RESULTS OF THE SAMPLING PROGRAM AND ALSO DETAILS OF THE ORIGIN, TRANSPORT, FINAL DEPOSITION AND ANY TEMPORARY STOCKPILING OF THE IMPORTED MATERIALS.

F) COMPLETION OF REMEDIATION AND VERIFICATION REPORT

NOTE: VERIFICATION BY AN INDEPENDENT, COMPETENT PERSON MUST BE CARRIED OUT PRIOR TO OCCUPATION OF ANY PART OF THE SITE BY ANY END USER. IT IS RECOGNISED THAT IN SOME LARGE SCALE DEVELOPMENTS, DEFINED AREAS WILL BE PHASED TO ENABLE PART SITE OCCUPATION PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF THE ENTIRE SITE. WHERE THIS APPROACH HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED SEPARATE VERIFICATION REPORTS FOR EACH PHASE MUST BE PREPARED AND SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL FOR WRITTEN APPROVAL PRIOR TO OCCUPATION OF THE DEFINED AREA BY ANY END USER.

UPON COMPLETION OF THE REMEDIATION DETAILED IN THE METHOD STATEMENT, AND BEFORE OCCUPATION OF ANY PART OF THE SITE BY ANY END USER (SEE NOTE ABOVE), A WRITTEN VERIFICATION REPORT SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO, AND AGREED IN WRITING BY, THE COUNCIL PROVIDING VERIFICATION THAT THE REQUIRED WORKS REGARDING DECONTAMINATION AND INSTALLATION OF POST REMEDIATION MONITORING, HAVE BEEN CARRIED OUT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE AGREED METHOD STATEMENT AND ANY ADDENDA THERETO. THE VERIFICATION SHALL BE CARRIED OUT AND REPORTED BY AN INDEPENDENT, COMPETENT PERSON, STATING THAT REMEDIATION WAS CARRIED OUT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPROVED REMEDIATION SCHEME AND THAT THE SITE IS SUITABLE FOR THE PERMITTED END USE.

Reason: To avoid adverse effects from pollution on the environment, harm to human health or general amenity, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

8 ASBESTOS

THE DEVELOPER MUST PROVIDE AN INTRUSIVE DEMOLITION ASBESTOS SURVEY IN ACCORDANCE WITH HSG264 SUPPORTED BY AN APPROPRIATE MITIGATION SCHEME TO CONTROL RISKS TO FUTURE OCCUPIERS. THE SCHEME MUST BE WRITTEN BY A SUITABLY QUALIFIED PERSON AND SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE LPA PRIOR TO DEMOLITION. THE SCHEME AS SUBMITTED SHALL DEMONSTRABLY IDENTIFY POTENTIAL SOURCES OF ASBESTOS CONTAMINATION AND DETAIL REMOVAL OR MITIGATION APPROPRIATE FOR THE PROPOSED END USE. DETAILED WORKING METHODS ARE NOT REQUIRED BUT THE SCHEME OF MITIGATION SHALL BE INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED PRIOR TO OCCUPATION. THE ENFORCING AUTHORITY WITH REGARD TO ASBESTOS ON A DEMOLITION OR CONSTRUCTION SITE IS THE HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed activities at the development will not cause pollution of the environment or harm to human health in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DM5 of the Council's Development Management Plan 2015.

Informatives

1 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

The development permitted is subject to a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liability for which a Liability Notice will be issued as soon as practical after the day on which planning permission first permits development.

To avoid breaching the CIL regulations and the potential financial penalties involved, it is essential a prior commencement notice be submitted. A blank commencement notice can be
For the avoidance of doubt commencement of demolition of existing structure(s) covering any part of the footprint of the proposed structure(s) would be considered as commencement for the purpose of the CIL regulations.

2 OTHER WORKS TO THE HIGHWAY
The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a permit and, potentially, a Section 278 agreement must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. All works on the highway will require a permit and an application will need to submitted to the County Council’s Street Works Team up to 3 months in advance of the intended start date, depending on the scale of the works proposed and the classification of the road. Please see http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/the-traffic-management-permit-scheme. 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.

3 MATERIALS DEPOSITED ON THE HIGHWAY
The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).

4 ADVICE TO DEVELOPERS REGARDING CONTAMINATION ASSESSMENTS
Before carrying out any contamination investigation or remediation of a site, the developer is strongly recommended to contact the Environmental Health & Licensing Team for guidance on the requirements for such investigations or remediation. Investigations, in particular, which do not adequately fulfil these recommendations, may result in additional work having to be carried out.
Street Scene

NOTE: Street Scene has been flattened around corners.
Refuse Enclosure:

Based on 6 Units. Prepared with reference to "Guidance for Developers on the storage and collection of household waste" by Elmbridge Borough Council.

- Refuse - 2 x 1100lt bins
- Recycling - 2 x 1100lt bins
- Food - 2 x 140lt bins
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The Former Police Station, East Molesey, Surrey.
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