<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Application No:</strong></th>
<th>2017/2872</th>
<th><strong>Application Type:</strong></th>
<th>FULL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Officer:</strong></td>
<td>Natalie Lynch</td>
<td><strong>Ward:</strong></td>
<td>Hersham Village Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>67 Vaux Crescent Hersham Walton-On-Thames Surrey KT12 4HF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>First-floor rear extension incorporating rear dormer window, front roof lights and alterations to fenestration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Aplin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agent:</strong></td>
<td>Mr N J Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A T Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 Alexandra Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knaphill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GU21 2DG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Level:</strong></td>
<td>If Permit – Sub-Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If Refuse – Sub-Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representations:** None.

This application has been promoted to North Area Sub-Committee by Cllr Green if the officer recommendation is to refuse.

**Report**

**Description**

1. The application site contains a two storey semi-detached dwelling, located on the southern side of Vaux Crescent. To the rear of the site is Green Belt land. The dwelling has been extended to the rear by a single storey rear extension and there is a detached outbuilding located in the rear garden. The site is located in character area HE02 Queensway, Robinsway and Green Lane Environs as designated in the Design and Character SPD 2012.

**Constraints**

2. The relevant planning constraints are:
   - Flood Zone 2
   - Adjoining Green Belt

**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**
   - CS5 – Hersham
   - CS17 – Local Character, Density and Design
   - CS26 – Flooding

   **Development Management Plan 2015**
   - DM1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
   - DM2 – Design and Amenity

   **Design & Character SPD 2012**
   - Companion Guide: Home Extensions
   - Companion Guide: Hersham
Flood Risk SPD 2016

4. Relevant Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51/0971</td>
<td>Council housing 148 houses</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50/0716</td>
<td>Council Housing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal

5. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first floor rear extension and a rear roof dormer.

6. The first floor rear extension would project above the existing ground floor extension to a depth of 3.1m and would be 3.5m wide. The first floor extension would have a pitched roof and would be finished in render to match the host dwelling. Two windows would be inserted into the elevation facing the rear garden and a window on both side elevations.

7. The rear roof dormer would be ‘L’ shaped, extending across the main roof and above the proposed first floor extension. The roof dormer above the main roof would measure 5.3m wide, 3.5m deep and 3.4m high. The dormer would be set in from the sides by 0.2 and 0.3m and 0.3m from the eaves and ridge. The dormer would extend above the proposed first floor rear extension and would measure 3.2m wide, 2.2m deep and 3.4m high. The roof dormer would be finished in hanging roof tiles to match those used on the roof of the dwellinghouse. Two windows would be inserted facing the rear garden, one window would be inserted into the eastern side elevation and two windows in the western side elevation.

8. On the main dwellinghouse, two front roof lights and two side windows at first and second floor levels would be inserted.

Consultations

9. None.

Positive and Proactive Engagement

10. 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.

11. Pre-application advice (ref PreApp1423077) was sought prior to the submission of the planning application for the erection of a first floor rear extension and rear roof dormer. It was recommended that the roof extension above the first floor rear extension was removed and the set in from the sides, ridges and eaves of the roof dormer increased to ensure the addition would be proportionate to the host dwelling and would comply with the Home Extensions Companion Guide. No objection was raised to the first floor rear extension. However, the current proposal is identical to that submitted with the pre application inquiry, albeit, a site visit was not carried out previously.

Planning Considerations

12. 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
   - The impact on flood risk
The design of the proposal and its impact on the host dwelling, the character of the area and the street scene

13. Policy DM2 states that proposals should preserve or enhance the character of the area taking account of design guidance detailed in the Design and Character SPD. The Council’s Design and Character SPD Companion Guide on Home Extensions states that ‘the roof of an extension should be similar to that of the existing house, in scale, design and the angle of the pitch’ and that with regards to roof extensions and dormers, these ‘are often the most difficult to add successfully to a house. In particular they should not dominate the roof by being over large.’

14. The roof dormer would extend above the proposed first floor rear extension and would be ‘L’ shaped. The size and scale of the roof extension results in a bulky and unsympathetic addition that dominates the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The roof dormer would appear bulky and overly dominant in views from the neighbouring properties and would also be partly visible from the street scene due to the gap between the application site and No. 69 Vaux Crescent. The size and scale of the roof dormer would be detrimental to the overall character and appearance of the surrounding area. There are no other roof extensions within the immediate vicinity, however, there are some examples of other roof extensions in the wider area which have been carried out under permitted development and the applicant has provided examples of these. However, these are smaller in size and are limited to the original roof slope.

15. Whilst the applicant refers to the fall-back position of permitted development, no application for a Certificate of Lawfulness to prove that the proposal would be permitted development has been received. Therefore, a full assessment as to the impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area must be made. Overall, it is considered that the size and scale of the roof dormer would appear bulky and this would be detrimental to the overall character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

16. The proposed first floor rear extension would extend above the existing ground floor extension. The extension would be of a size and scale that would be proportionate to the host dwelling. The extension would have a pitched roof and would be finished in render and roof tiles to match the external appearance of the host dwelling. The extension would reflect the overall character and appearance of the host dwelling and would have no adverse impact on the surrounding area.

17. There are other examples of roof lights along the street scene and there would be no objection to the addition of two roof lights to the front roof slope.

The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties

18. Policy DM2 seeks to protect the amenity of adjoining occupiers. The roof dormer would be positioned at roof level, given its positioning at roof level and the separation distance from neighbouring windows, the roof dormer would not result in any issues of loss of light or outlook for neighbouring residents.

19. The first floor rear extension would be positioned on the western side of the property. The nearest neighbouring window at No. 65 serves a bedroom. There would be no breach of the 45 degree line from this neighbouring window. The nearest neighbouring window at No. 69 is obscurely glazed and serves a bathroom. The next window along serves a bedroom. There would be no breach of the 45 degree line from this window. As there would be no breach of the 45 degree line and the rear of these properties are south facing, there would be no adverse impact on neighbouring amenity through loss of light or outlook.

20. A number of side facing windows are proposed. These could be conditioned to be obscurely glazed and non-opening below 1.7m to ensure there would be no impact on neighbouring residents’ through overlooking or loss of privacy.
21. Core Policy CS26 seeks to reduce the overall and local risk of flooding in the Borough. It requires that new development is located, designed and laid out to ensure that its safe; the risk from flooding is minimised whilst not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere; and that residual risks are safely managed. National guidance advises that minor developments are unlikely to raise significant flood risk unless specific issues arise as defined in paragraph 47 of the PPG. Elmbridge Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) published May 2015 advises that in parts of the Borough there is potential for minor development to be considered to be having an cumulative impact on flood risk in the local area as a result of impact on flood storage capacity and flood flows (paragraph 7.2.13). Therefore, it is appropriate to take a precautionary approach to all development within an areas identified as being at risk of flooding.

22. The site is located within flood zone 2. As the proposals would relate to extensions at first floor and roof level, there would be no increase in non-permeable surfaces at the site and no adverse impact on flooding in the surrounding area in accordance with the Flood Risk SPD 2016 and policy CS26.

Matters raised in Representations

23. None.

Conclusion

24. The size and scale of the rear roof dormer results in a bulky, unsympathetic addition that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene and the surrounding area. The proposal is contrary to polices CS5 & CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, the Elmbridge Design and Character SPD 2012 and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission

Reasons For Refusal

1. The size and scale of the rear roof dormer results in a bulky, unsympathetic addition that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene and the surrounding area. The proposal is contrary to polices CS5 & CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, the Elmbridge Design and Character SPD 2012 and the NPPF.
Proposed materials, facing brickwork, render, vertical tile hanging and roof tiles, all to match existing.

proposed front elevation
proposed side elevation (view from side)
proposed side elevation
proposed rear elevation

proposed ground floor plan
proposed first floor plan
proposed second floor plan
proposed roof plan