Representations: Five letters of objection have been received from the same address in relation to this application, content from the latest letter (post amendments) are summarised below:

- Description of proposal is inaccurate
- The plans submitted are inaccurate
- Loss of daylight and sunlight
- The proposal would breach the 45 degree sightline test
- Overbearing impact and cast shadow over the neighbouring patio
- Encroachment and creation of long narrow gap between the application dwelling and No.16 Summer Road
- The proposed development is out of character with the street scene
- The application has been accepted without Design and Access Statement
- The plans do not include shadowing
- Concerns over the advice given within the PreApp response
- Will the previous permission be revoked?

This application has been promoted to East Area Sub-committee by Cllr Randolph if the officer recommendation is to permit.

Report

Description

1. The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse with an existing dormer window to the front and a two-storey rear outrigger. The property is located on the south side of Summer Road which is a residential cul-de-sac consisting of similar semi-detached dwellinghouses.

2. The application site is situated in the settlement area of East Molesey.

Constraints

3. The relevant planning constraint is:

- Flood Zone 2
Policy

4. 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
CS7 – East and West Molesey
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

Flood Risk SPD 2016

5. Relevant Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/3329</td>
<td>Single storey side/rear infill extension</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/0213</td>
<td>Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 2015/3329</td>
<td>Refused permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Single storey side/rear infill) to increase the footprint of the proposed extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/1638</td>
<td>Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 2015/3329</td>
<td>Withdrawn decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Single storey side/rear infill) to increase the footprint of the proposed extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Planning application 2017/0213 was refused as per the following reason:


Proposal

7. This application seeks planning permission for single storey side/rear extension following demolition of existing outbuilding.

8. The proposal is for a single storey wraparound extension to the main dwellinghouse which would be set 2.6m from the front elevation and would leave at the front of the extension a 0.8m gap to the side boundary and approximately 1.35m at the point where the extension chamfers, this is due to the splayed angle of the boundary. The proposed extension would measure 1.7m in width from the nearest flank wall to the side boundary and 6m in width at its widest point (across the rear of the extension), it would have a maximum length of 13.6m and would have a mon-pitched roof measuring 2.5m in height to the eaves and 3.6m in height to the ridge.

9. The proposed extension would be finished in render in colour to match that of the existing house and slate roof tiles with glazed area and windows in white frames to match the existing building.
10. Amended plans were accepted during the determining of this application, this was due to the applicant submitting location and site plan which did not reflect the proposed development. The neighbours were re-consulted for a period of 14 days to advise them of the amended plans. The Case Officer has subsequently visited the site to measure the accuracy of the revised plans. The amended plans represent a true reflection of the site.

11. The description of the proposal was also amended in order to accurately describe the proposed works.

Consultations

12. None.

Positive and Proactive Engagement

13. 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.

14. Formal pre-application advice was sought prior to the submission of this application with the reference PreApp1405116. The pre-application enquiry was submitted following on from a refusal of planning application ref. 2017/0213. To overcome the reason for refusal the design of the proposed extension was changed to have a chamfered corner to overcome the concerns raised in terms of loss of light and overbearing impact. This approach was welcomed by the officer and it was recommended that an application is submitted for full consideration.

15. Since the pre-application the size, mass and design of the extension has not changed.

Planning Considerations

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

- The design of the proposal and its impact on the host dwelling and the wider surrounding area
- The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties
- Impact on garden amenity
- Flooding

The design of the proposal and its impact on the host dwelling and the wider surrounding area

17. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains, at paragraph 14, a ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ that is to say that permission should always be granted unless there are compelling planning reasons to refuse.

18. Paragraph 56 of the NPPF, details that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Paragraph 59 continues to advise that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.

19. Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan – Development Management Plan 2015 requires all development to achieve a high standard of design, having regard to the local character of the area and to harmonise with its environment. Specific guidance for residential development proposals is contained within the Elmbridge Local Plan - Design and Character Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPD) 2012: Home Extensions.
20. The proposal is for a single storey wraparound extension with mono-pitched roof and chamfered corner on the north-west side.

21. The proposal is a significant structure, however it is not considered to represent overdevelopment of the site. The resultant dwelling would have adequate amenity space available and would not appear at odds with other properties and their built ratio. In the representation letter concerns have been raised with the design of the extension, especially the chamfered corner on the north-west side of the extension. It is considered that overall the proposed extension has been designed to integrate well with the host building in terms of its height, mass and fenestration detailing. Whilst a chamfered corner is not a design solution which is encouraged, it is considered given that as this part of the development would not be visible from the street scene, there would not be a significant impact on the overall appearance of the dwelling especially given the varied character and design of the rear elevations of dwellings on Summer Road.

22. In terms of the concerns raised in relation to the impact upon the views from within the street scene created by the separation distance between the flank wall of the proposed extension and the flank wall of the neighbouring property (No.16) being only 0.8m. It should be noted that the applicants could extend closer to the flank wall of No.16 under permitted development. Therefore, the fail-back position is one that does carry significant weight in assessing the impact that this single storey element. In addition, the proposed front porch is located approximately 2.6m back from the front corner of the host dwelling and therefore further reduces the visual impact that would be created upon the views from within the street scene.

23. Further concerns have been raised with regards to the encroachment of the proposed extension on neighbouring properties. The Design and Character SPD: Home Extensions at paragraph 1.23. details that

1.23 Single storey extensions can result in problems caused by the encroachment of foundations or guttering if the extension is too close to the boundary. A minimum 300mm (0.3m) between the side wall of a single storey extension and the property boundary should therefore be aimed for whenever possible.

24. In this instance the proposed extension would be set in a minimum of 800mm (0.8m) increasing to approx. 1350mm (1.35m) from the property boundary with No.16 and would be built right on the property boundary with No.20. Given that the extension would be built entirely on the land that is in the ownership of the applicant, it is not considered that the proposal would result in encroachment issues with the neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, given the close proximity of the extension to the neighbouring property at No.20, the applicant would be advised by an informative of no right of encroachment to neighbouring property.

25. In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal accords with the expectations of the NPPF, Policy DM2 and the Design and Character SPD: Home Extensions and will not detract from the appearance or setting of the host property.

The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties

26. The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the proposed development area Nos. 16 and 20 Summer Road located to the west and east of the application side respectively.

27. The Design and Character SPD at paragraph 1.15 states that

1.15 Each application is treated on its own merits but experience has showed that if single storey extension does not project more than 3 metres rearwards, the effect on natural light is minimal. Beyond that distance the extension should be less than an angle of 45 degree from the edge of the nearest adjoining neighbour's window.

28. It is noted that the sightline was in-correctly drawn on submitted proposed floor plans drawing. The plans originally included a 60 degree sightline rather than at 45 degree sightline. The
amended plans have addressed this issue. The plans indicate that there is a breach of the 45 degree sightline. This breach occurs just before the chamfered corner. The chamfered corner starts 2.7m beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring property (No.16). The Council’s adopted approach which is set out in the Design and Character SPD for Home Extensions indicates the following:

Each application is treated on its own merits, but experience has shown that if a single storey extension does not project more than 3 metres rearwards; the effect on natural light is minimal. Beyond that distance the extension should be less than an angle of 45° from the edge of the nearest adjoining neighbour’s window.

29. In this regard it is accepted that the rearmost element of the proposed extension is located approximately 4.7m beyond the rear window of the neighbouring property, however due to the angle of the chamfered corner the impact created by this extension in terms of loss of sunlight is not considered significant to warrant the refusal of this proposal. Moreover, it was noted that the affected room at No.16 is an open plan living/dining room which is fitted with large bi-folded doors and a large three panel window.

30. Other relevant factors which need to be considered include the height of the proposed extension and its design, the number of windows and the rooms which they serve which could impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

31. In this instance, it is considered given the single storey nature of this proposal, which would benefit from a relatively low eaves level in conjunction with a roof which pitches away from the boundary, which has a maximum ridge height of 3.6m, that would be located more than 4m away from the side boundary. As a result, it is not considered that this proposal will appear overbearing upon the occupiers of the neighbouring property (No.16).

32. With regards to No.20, the proposed extension would project 3 metres on the boundary. In accordance with the adopted guidance explained above, extension of this size has a minimal effect on the loss of light. Moreover, it is not considered that the proposed extension would appear overbearing given its modest scale and mass. It should also be noted that this property benefits from an extant planning permission for a rear extension (2016/2945). This extension has not yet been built, but is a material consideration in the determination of this proposal.

33. With regards to privacy, the submitted plans show that there are no windows proposed in the side elevation of the extension. In terms of the proposed rooflight windows, these are located towards the front of the extension and will not allow for any adverse impact being created upon the privacy of the neighbouring property.

Impact on garden amenity

34. The retained amenity space is considered adequate and commensurate to the size of the dwelling and complies with the recommended standards set out in the Council’s adopted SPD on ‘Design and Character’.

Flooding

35. The proposal is located within Flood Zone 2. A flood risk assessment has been submitted detailing that the floor levels of the proposed extension would be the same as the existing internal finished floor levels. The entire structure is sealed water tight and there would be no services into the structure.

36. The Flood Risk SPD allows for a proportionate approach in the consideration of flood, and although the submitted flood risk assessment does not fully meet the criteria required by Core Policy CS26 and the Flood Risk SPD adopted in May 2016. It is considered given the nature of the proposed extension and the fact that it would be erected on an area which is covered mainly with non-permeable material, in this instance, it is considered to be appropriate as the proposed development would not significantly impede flood flows and is not considered to result in a significant impact upon flood risk.
Matters raised in Representations

37. The Local Validation Checklist reads that in some circumstances where there is a potential adverse impact upon the current levels of sunlight/daylight enjoyed by adjoining properties or building(s), including associated gardens or amenity space the applications may also need to be accompanied by a daylight/sunlight assessment. In this instance, due to the nature of the application, the submission of such documents was not considered necessary for the Council to determine the planning application.

38. The applicant has made the Council’s response to the pre-application available to the public at his/her own discretion. The advice given implies that the extension would only project 3m beyond the rear elevation of No.20 and extend 3 metres beyond the rear building line of No.16, contrary to the refused application which extended 5 metres from the same point. It is acknowledged that the advice does not include the chamfered corner which would result in the extension extending further beyond the rear elevation of No.16. The advice was however given on plans that were not correct, given that the plans did not include the splayed boundary. As a result, the impact upon the neighbouring property has lessened, given the separation distance has in fact increased.

39. In terms of whether or not the original permission is to be revoked, this would be a matter for the Council’s Planning Compliance Team to make a judgement of expediency. This would however, only become an issue should the applicants wish to carry out that permission.

Conclusion

40. 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: 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:
Location and Site Plan Drawing No.15002/Tp/01/B received on 6 October 2017, Proposed Floor Plans Drawing No.15002/Tp/05/E received on 24 October 2017, Proposed Elevations Drawing No.15002/Tp/06/C, and Proposed Sections Drawing No.15002/Tp/07/C received on 31 July 2017.

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

3   MATERIALS - APPROVED
The development shall not be erected other than in the following materials (render finish in colour to match that of the existing house and slate roof tiles with glazed area and windows in white frames to match the existing building), or such other materials as have been approved in writing by the borough council.
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.

4 FLOOD RISK MITIGATION

All flood mitigation measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details set out in the Flood Risk Assessment received on 31July 2017.

Reason: To reduce the overall and local risk of flooding and to comply with policy CS26 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (adopted 2011) and the Flood Risk SPD (adopted 2016).

Informatives

1 NO ENCROACHMENT

This permission confers no authority for any part of the development including foundations or guttering to encroach upon the adjoining property.
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