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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No:</th>
<th>2017/1036</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Type:</td>
<td>FULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Officer:</td>
<td>Nathan Fell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>Thames Ditton Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>10 Basing Close Thames Ditton KT7 0NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>Part two/part single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, roof extension incorporating side dormer window, partial conversion of garage into living space, front and rear rooflights and rooms in the roofspace and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing conservatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs C Appleyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent:</td>
<td>Mr Matthew Parkes-Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hausi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78 York Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1H 1DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Level:</td>
<td>If Permit – Sub Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If Refuse – Sub Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representations:** Two letters of objection received from the same address, commenting on the following:
- Loss of daylight
- Loss of privacy and overlooking
- Loss of private amenity
- Overbearing impact
- Loss of mature trees
- Accuracy of the plans including no inclusion of topography level changes
- Increased localised flooding
- Destruction of property
- Inappropriate conversion of garage to living space
- Out of keeping design/materials impacting on host dwelling/character of the area

The application has been promoted by Cllr Bland and Cllr Randolph, if the officer recommendation is to refuse or permit, respectively.

**Report**

**Description**

1. The site is occupied by a two storey detached house, located on Basing Close, an unclassified road in the settlement area of Thames Ditton and within the Design and Character Sub-area DHW02 Thames Ditton, Giggs Hill Green & part of Long Ditton.

**Constraints**

2. No relevant planning constraints.

**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 the determination of this application:
Core Strategy 2011
CS8 – Thames Ditton, Hinchley Wood, Weston Green
CS17 – Local Character, Density and Design

Development Management Plan 2015
DM1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM2 – Design and amenity

Design & Character SPD 2012
Home Extensions Companion Guide

Relevant Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/3921</td>
<td>Single storey side/rear extension, partial conversion of garage into living space, first floor rear extension, side dormer window, front and rear rooflights and rooms in the roofspace and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing conservatory</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982/0514</td>
<td>Single storey extension to enlarge lounge and kitchen and provide WC</td>
<td>Granted and Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978/0082</td>
<td>Erection of a two storey extension to form study with bedroom over</td>
<td>Granted and Implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. This application seeks to resolve the reasons for refusal from the previous application (2016/3921) which was refused on the following grounds:

“The design and appearance of the 1st floor extension represents an overlarge and disjointed addition that fails to integrate acceptably with the existing house and adds considerable bulk and glazing and as such would be detrimental to the appearance of the building and harmful to the character of the area contrary to Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 Policies CS8 and CS17 and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.”

“The proposed 1st floor extension, by reason of its siting, scale, design and mass, would be visually intrusive and overbearing when viewed from No.11 Basing Close. The proposal therefore represents an un-neighbourly form of development that would be significantly harmful to the amenity of the occupiers of No.11 Basing Close contrary to Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 Policies CS8 and CS17 and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.”

Proposal

5. Planning permission is sought for a part two/part single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, roof extension incorporating side dormer window, partial conversion of garage into living space, front and rear rooflights and rooms in the roofspace and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing conservatory.

6. The single storey rear/side extension would protrude a minimum 5.71m and maximum 7.03m following the boundary lines, and have a width of 13.09m and project 1.29m beyond the northwest side elevation wall of the host dwelling. The proposed single storey side/rear extension roof is to be anthracite zinc with a shallow combined pitched design, sliding aluminium doors, and brickwork to match the existing house, with a section of walnut cladding to the rear. The first floor extension, roof extension and side dormer would be tile hung to match the existing house.
7. The proposed plans are similar to the previous application apart from a large 1st floor rear extension feature has been removed, and replaced with a pitched roof extension over a smaller 1st floor extension. These follow the design of the existing house protruding by 2m across the total width of the existing house. This would create an area of flat roof however a roof plan has not been provided with this application. The roof extension would include two frameless rooflights, as opposed to one in the previous application, and would include steel-framed Crittall windows at the first floor level.

8. A large side window is proposed in the northwest elevation vertically stretching from the roof and down the 1st floor.

9. The submitted plans were missing part of the agent's annotations and following the agent's request, it was allowed for the plans to be updated to show all the information. Following the site visit it was realised the existing plans incorrectly showed the southeast elevation and the agent was allowed to amend the Elevation Plans. This assessment has been made on the updated plans.

Consultations

10. Planning Tree Officer – No objection.

Positive and Proactive Engagement

11. 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 by making available pre-application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.

12. No formal pre-application advice was sought prior to the submission of this application.

Planning Considerations

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

   - The design of the proposal and its impact on the host dwelling, the character of the area and the street-scene
   - The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties

14. The alteration to the proposed application is to the rear and includes a pitched roof extension and first floor extension. This would not be visible within the street scene and follow the pitched roof design of the existing house with tiling to match the existing house, and this can be seen as good design as identified in the Home Extensions Companion Guide.

15. A previous reason for refusal discussed the proposal representing an overlarge and disjointed addition that fails to integrate acceptably with the existing house and adds considerable bulk and glazing and as such would be detrimental to the appearance of the building and harmful to the character of the area. The current proposal would significantly reduce the scale and be of a design more in keeping with the host dwelling. However it adds an area of flat roof. The surrounding dwelling houses along Basing Close are characterised by properties of pitched roof design and extensions varying from single-storey to two-storey. The area of flat roof would not be in keeping with the character of the area, and the first floor and roof extension represents an additional bulk which detracts from the character of the area.

16. The change made to the proposal would include a large amount of glazing at the first floor and roof level however it is acknowledged this has been reduced from the previous application. The first floor glazing would not be in keeping with the existing house, and the resulting cumulative rear elevation would represent an eclectic mix of glazing in terms of size, design,
and alignment. It is recognised the glazing is to the rear, however in light of the above, on balance, the proposed changes are not considered to address the previous reason for refusal.

17. The proposal is not considered to adversely impact on parking or garden amenity due to the previous application raising no concerns.

The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties

18. There were no significant concerns raised regarding the impact upon neighbouring properties of No.9 Basing Close and No.17, 18, 19 and 20 Linden Close. The issue regarding a proposed large side window was considered to be acceptable in the previous application following the condition that this was to be fixed shut and obscurely glazed and this could be imposed by means of a condition.

19. A previous reason for refusal discussed the first floor extension having an overbearing impact and visually intrusive appearance when viewed from No.11 Basing Close due to siting, scale, design and mass. The current proposal would reduce the scale, mass and design of the refused proposal. The proposed first floor extension would protrude 2m in length as oppose to 2.5m in the previous application, and the roof extension would be pitched extending 2m and in line with the existing roof, as oppose to the refused application which protruded from the existing roof by approximately a minimum of 4m and maximum of 6.5m. Therefore this would reduce the overbearing impact and intrusive design and in light of the above it is considered the proposal has overcome the previous reason for refusal.

20. One of the objections raised concerns regarding the first floor extension’s impact in terms of loss of daylight, loss of privacy and overlooking, and loss of private residential amenity, to No.11. However these were considered in the previous application, and on balance found to not have any significant adverse concerns. It is noted the reduced bulk of the 1st floor and roof rear extension would reduce the impact on the amenities of No.11. The proposal includes side rooflights on the existing single storey side garage and it was considered in the previous refusal it would be reasonable for a condition to be imposed for obscure glazing to mitigate any loss of privacy or Outlook.

21. It is noted the proposal includes the demolition of the existing rear conservatory which currently has approximate eaves of 2m and a roof height of 3.1m. This is to be replaced with a single storey rear extension with eaves at 3m and roof height of 3.3m and this would increase the height of the side wall to No.11. This was not discussed in the previous application however due to the single storey nature of this part of the proposal and the conservatory structure existing already; it was considered the single storey rear extension would have no adverse impact on the residential amenity of No.11.

22. During the site visit it was noted No.11 were concerned due to the topography changes of its garden in relation to that of the host dwelling, which could impact on the height of the proposed single storey rear extension. It was clear the ground level sloped up towards the back of the rear garden of No.11 along the boundary with the applicant site. The proposed ground floor extension would have a maximum height of 3.3m and therefore the proposal could appear lower from No.11 when standing towards the rear of the garden.

Matters raised in Representations

23. The material planning considerations have been assessed in the planning considerations above.

24. The submitted plans have been considered to be accurate following amendments requested, and provide enough evidence to decide this planning application. It is noted the objector felt the topography was incorrectly shown on the plans however it is not a requirement for the changing ground level to be shown in regards to the surrounding area.

25. With regards to the impact of the development along the boundary walls and the potential damage to neighbour’s property this is not a material planning consideration. The applicant
will need to ensure they comply with the relevant building regulations and notify neighbours under the Party Wall Act. It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure they comply with all relevant other legislation.

26. A neighbouring property was concerned regarding the increase flooding from the proposal. National guidance advises that minor developments are unlikely to raise significant concerns in terms of flood risk however the adopted local Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document 2016 sets out situations in which flooding considerations must be demonstrated. The application site is situated in Flood Zone 1 and therefore not at a significant risk of flooding.

27. With regards to the issue raised regarding the impact of the proposal on neighbouring trees at No.11 Basing Close, the Council’s Tree Officer raised no objection to the proposal due the absence of a Tree Preservation Order, or of any trees near the proposal of a substantial size, which play any significant role in the character of the area.

Conclusion

28. The proposed first floor and roof extension by reason of its bulk, and design, adding an area of flat roof and considerable amount of glazing, would fail to integrate acceptably with the existing house and be detrimental to the appearance of the building and harmful to the character of the area contrary to Policies CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission

Reasons For Refusal

1 The proposed first floor and roof extension by reason of its bulk, and design, adding an area of flat roof and considerable amount of glazing, would fail to integrate acceptably with the existing house and be detrimental to the appearance of the building and harmful to the character of the area contrary to Policies CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character SPD 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.