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Representations:
16 letters of objection were received in relation to this application the contents of which can be summarised as follows:
- Loss of amenities (privacy, light, overbearing impact, loss of view);
- Cramped form of development & overdevelopment (scale, bulk and massing, height; inadequate separation distance to boundary; limited amenity retained)
- Impact on trees (removal & further damage);
- Right to light;
- Highway implications (traffic, parking, loss of existing parking, unsuitable access);
- Proximity to railway line;
- Garden grabbing;
- Combined impact of development;
- Previous application on site refused & difference from initial plans by developer;
- Changes to existing building under separate application;
- Disruption from building works (parking).

The application has been promoted by Cllr Harman if the officer recommendation is to permit.

***This application qualifies for public speaking***

Report

Description

1. The application site of approximately 0.23ha is located on the north of St Georges Avenue in Weybridge. The southern section of the site is occupied by ‘Leverton’, a large detached building comprising flats. The site is adjoined to the north boundary by the railway line, flats to the west and dwellings to the east. St Georges Avenue is characterised by a mix of residential properties, ranging from blocks of flats to detached dwellings. The buildings are of a varied age and there are numerous design styles and forms. The site falls within the Lower St Georges Hill and East of Brooklands Road character area as identified in Weybridge Companion Guide to the Design and Character SPD 2012.

Constraints

2. The relevant planning constraints are:
• Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5km buffer zone
• Adjoining railway line (25m National Rail buffer zone)

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
CS1 – Spatial Strategy
CS4 – Weybridge
CS13 – Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area
CS17 – Local Character, Density and Design
CS19 – Housing type and size
CS21 – Affordable Housing
CS25 – Travel and Accessibility

Development Management Plan 2015
DM1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM2 – Design and amenity
DM6 – Landscape and trees
DM7 – Access and parking
DM8 – Refuse, recycling and external plant
DM10 – Housing

Design & Character SPD 2012
& Companion Guide: Weybridge

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>2017/4072</td>
<td>First floor side extension incorporating balcony above, conversion of existing flat roofs to provide balconies, side dormer window, enlargement of existing side dormer windows, front porch and alterations to fenestration.</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2207</td>
<td>Subdivision of second floor flat to create new residential unit, single storey rear extension, first floor balcony, first floor side extension incorporating a balcony above, two-storey side extension, creation of second floor balcony, side dormer windows, front porch, entrance gates and piers (a maximum of 1.8m high), 1.8m high walls/fences to amenity space, bin store and new hardstanding</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal

5. Permission is sought for a two-storey detached building consisting of 7 flats, with accommodation over four floors including rooms in the roof space, dormer windows, basement parking, refuse store and ancillary parking and landscaping.

6. The proposed building would be 24.5m wide, 16.7m deep with a maximum ridge height of 11.6m (10.6m when measured from the existing ground level). The building would maintain minimum separation distances of 1.1m, 5.1m and 2.2m to the north, east and west boundaries respectively. Parking provision would be made in the form of a basement car park to be accessed via a ramp and some additional surface parking spaces.

7. An amended site plan was accepted during the consideration of the application that omits the entrance gate originally shown on this plan. The entrance gate was not part of the description of development and no elevations were provided to show the size and design of the gates.
The omission of the gates was a procedural request, to ensure that the site plan showed only the elements of the scheme considered under this application.

**Consultations**

8. Surrey County Council Highways – The County Highway Authority having assessed the application on safety, capacity and policy grounds raised no objection subject to conditions.

9. Trees – Raised no objection subject to conditions.

10. Environmental Health (Pollution) – No requirements.

11. Natural England – Raised no objection subject to compliance with the Local Authority’s avoidance and mitigation strategy for the SPA.


13. Environmental Services (Care) – No comments to make on the application.

14. Trees – No objection to the proposal on arboricultural grounds subject to the imposition of conditions in relation to tree protection and a pre-commencement inspection.

15. Surrey Wildlife Trust – Raised no objections to the proposal. Made recommendations in terms of the biodiversity mitigation and enhancements to be secured by condition.

16. Network Rail – No comments have been received.

**Positive and Proactive Engagement**

17. 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.

18. A couple of pre-application enquiries (ref. PreApp1414501 and PreApp1449171) were made prior to the submission of this application. Initially, although the principle of a more intensive residential use was considered acceptable, there were concerns regarding the initial scale of the building and the impact upon the character of the area. The scheme was subsequently amended for PreApp1449171 and reduced in scale, but the parking area was increased in size. It was considered that the changes made had addressed some of the issues associated with scale, however further changes were still necessary in order to fully resolve the concerns about the impact upon the character of the area. It was also considered that the enlarged parking area would be a negative feature.

19. The proposal has been amended since the latter pre-application enquiry. The overall scale of the building has been reduced and the size of the parking area made smaller.

**Planning Considerations**

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

- The principle of development;
- The design of the proposal and its impact on the character of the area;
- The impact on the residential amenities;
- Highway implications;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Financial considerations.
The principle of development

21. The Core Strategy indicates that there is scope for residential development through the redevelopment of existing sites with well-designed schemes that integrate with and enhance the local character. The new development is required to deliver high quality design, which maximises the efficient use of land and which responds to the positive features of individual locations; integrating sensitively with locally distinct townscape while protecting the amenities of those living in the area.

22. The development is located on existing garden land on the site. Whilst garden land does not fall within the definition of previously developed land, the NPPF does not necessarily preclude development on such land and it is subject to considerations of the character and appearance of the development within the context of the area.

23. Policy CS17 requires a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare to be achieved to ensure the efficient and effective use of land within the urban area. The proposal, including the existing flats on the site, would result in an overall density of approximately 30dph, which would comply with the recommended minimum of 30dph. Therefore, the proposal is considered to represent efficient use of land within the urban area.

Housing development

24. Policy DM10 states that housing development on sites of 0.3ha or more should promote house types and sizes that make most efficient use of land and meet the most up to date measure of local housing need, whilst reflecting the character of the area. Policy CS19 seeks to secure a range of housing types and sizes on developments reflecting the most up to date SHMA in terms of the size and type of the dwellings.

25. The 2016 SHMA identifies the need for a higher proportion of 1, 2 and 3 bed homes in the Borough. Data from the latest monitoring report 2016/17 (published February 2018) state that 1, 2 and 3-bedroom homes should make up 90% of the delivery of gross new market homes. This is supplemented by the SHMA 2016, which identifies the housing mix required as a proportion of our housing need. As the proposal would provide six 3-bedroom and one 2-bedroom units, the development would assist in the delivery of the identified housing need in the Borough.

The design of the proposal and its impact on the character of the area

26. The proposed building would be located to the rear of the site, close to the boundary with the railway line. It would be a two storey building with a substantial roof, encompassing additional two floors of accommodation. The proposal also includes a basement level and a large expanse of hardstanding associated with parking provision.

27. The surrounding area of the application site is characterised by a mix of residential properties, ranging from blocks of flats, through terraced to detached dwellings. The buildings are of a varied age and appearance. In the context of the varied type, scale and design of dwellings, the introduction of a block of flats with a relatively traditional hipped roof design would not appear out of place. Whilst the building would be sited in an area that is currently open, the rear of buildings on the north side of St Georges Avenue is typically subject to various residential infill developments. Therefore, the introduction of a built form into this area would not appear out of keeping with the character of the wider surrounds. Due to its siting beyond the existing built form, the views of the proposed development would be restricted within the St Georges Avenue street scene, and therefore its impact on the street scene would be limited.

28. The proposed building would include two large front gable features, as well as dormers across two levels in the front and rear elevations and dormers in the side elevations at the lower roof level. This design results in a building of substantial scale with considerable roof bulk. However, in the context of the area with other large buildings in the vicinity, it is not considered the proposal would result in any significant adverse impact upon the character of the area.
29. The development introduces a large area of hardstanding on site with enclosed bin store to be provided to the west boundary of the site, to the rear of the existing building. Although the bin storage would be obscured from the views in the street scene by the existing building, they will be visible from the neighbouring buildings of Ikona Court, Leverton itself and Outram Place. However, given the various backland developments in the area that include parking and garages to the rear of buildings on this side of St Georges Avenue, it is considered that this would not result in any adverse visual impact within the surrounding area.

30. The Council's Tree Officer raised no objection to the proposed development subject to the imposition of suitable conditions in relation to tree protection and a pre-commencement inspection. To ensure that the proposal includes appropriate landscaping it is considered that a condition should also be imposed in relation to a landscaping scheme.

The impact on the residential amenities
Amenities of the existing neighbouring occupiers

31. Due to the proximity to the application site, the neighbours potentially affected by the proposal would be the occupiers of flats at Ikona Court to the southwest, the dwellings on Outram Place to the north east and flats at Leverton.

32. In relation to Ikona Court, the proposal would be sited approximately 12.5m from the nearest corner of this neighbouring building. The proposal would not breach the 45-degree lines from the relevant habitable windows within a distance of 15m. The rear-facing windows in Ikona Court are small secondary windows and therefore any effect on these windows would have a limited impact upon amenity. As such, given the retained separation distance between the buildings and the orientation of the development to the northeast, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any detrimental loss of light or overbearing impact upon this building. Whilst the new building would be located relatively close to the side boundary shared with this neighbour, the area beyond the application site’s boundary has a dense tree cover and is therefore of limited use as a private amenity space. As a result, no adverse impact upon this outdoor space associated with Ikona Court is considered to result.

33. In terms of privacy, the proposal would introduce windows in the front elevation across four storeys and in the side elevation up to third storey level. The forward facing windows would provide some angled views towards Ikona Court. However, given the separation distance involved and the angle of the views it is not considered that these would result in any significant loss of privacy. Front balconies are proposed at first, second and third floors. The views from these would be similar to the front facing windows and given the separation distance and the angle of any views, it is considered that they would not result in any adverse loss of privacy. The primary views from the side facing windows would be over the vegetated amenity area and garages of Ikona Court. Whilst this would not result in any adverse loss of privacy, it could potentially prejudice the future development of this neighbouring site. As such, and as these windows serve non-habitable rooms or as secondary openings to habitable rooms, it is considered appropriate to impose an obscure glazing condition on these windows above the ground floor level.

34. The proposed bin store would be situated adjacent to the boundary with Ikona Court. As the storage would be low, with a maximum height of 1.6m, its view would be obscured by an average height fence that could be secured through a landscaping condition. The use of the stores would be in association with the residential use of the site, which is unlikely to result in any significant level of disturbance to the neighbours. The proposed surface parking area is beyond the bin stores and would result in vehicular movements to the rear of the site. However, given the likely limited number of movements, as well as the proximity to other areas of parking to the rear of St Georges Avenue, it is not considered that this would result in any detrimental level of disturbance to the occupiers of this neighbouring property.

35. With regards to the neighbours in Outram Place, the proposal would be approximate minimum of 24m from the nearest property, No.6 Outram Place. Given the separation distances
involved, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any detrimental loss of light or overbearing impact to these neighbours. With regards to privacy, the views from the proposed front windows and balconies would be oblique and at a considerable distance and are therefore not considered to result in any adverse loss of privacy. The proposed flank windows would afford views across the garages to the east towards the garden of No.6 Outram Place. However, given the separation distance involved, no adverse loss of privacy is considered to result. Again, as there is a potential that the garages at Outram Place could represent a development site in the future, it is considered appropriate to impose an obscure glazing condition on the flank windows above the ground floor level serving non-habitable rooms or as secondary openings to habitable rooms.

36. The proposed building would maintain approximate minimum of 23.9m from the rear elevation of Leverton. At such a distance it is not considered that any significant loss of light or overbearing impact would result. In terms of privacy, the maintained separation distance would exceed the recommended minimum of 22m, as set out in the Council’s Design & Character SPD, in order to retain suitable levels of privacy. Although the proposal would result in additional vehicular movements to the rear of the site, given that the proposal is for a residential development of a relatively small number of units with a reasonable separation distance between the parking area and primary habitable room windows, it is considered that this would not result in any unacceptable level of disturbance to the occupiers of the existing building.

37. The size of the outdoor amenity space for Leverton would be reduced as a result of the proposed development. Whilst Elmbridge has no minimum garden space standards for flatted developments, the proposal would allow for the retention of private amenity space of the ground floor units. It is noted that permission for balconies was recently granted under the ref. 2017/4072, which would provide additional small areas of private amenity space for the majority of the flats at first and second floor level, should this be implemented. However, even if this permission was not implemented, the location of the site being near the local services with links to the public amenity spaces is considered to be sufficient to ensure a suitable level of amenity for occupiers of the existing building.

Amenities of the future occupiers

38. The proposal would provide spacious accommodation throughout with all proposed units exceeding the relevant minimum internal size requirements as nationally set out in the Technical housing standards. There would be suitable light and ventilation to all habitable rooms. The outdoor amenity space is limited to a small area of shared space at ground floor level with small terraces at first, second and third floor level. Whilst the amount of private amenity space is limited this is not unusual in flatted developments. The development is also located within reasonable distance from local services and public amenity space along Queens Road. On these basis, it is considered that the proposed units would afford suitable amenity for the future occupiers.

39. The proposal would provide dedicated bin storage, which is considered suitable for a development of this scale. There would be a surface and underground car park within the development. Given the residential use of the site and the relatively small number of units, it is unlikely that there would be any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of future occupiers arising from the use of these areas.

40. The development is located in the vicinity of a railway line to the rear of the site. The internal layout has been arranged so that the primary living areas are mostly situated to the front of the site, away from the railway. The proposed layout would minimise the disturbance from passing trains and it is considered that the building would offer an acceptable living environment for its future occupiers.

Highway implications

41. Surrey County Council raised no objection to the proposal on highway safety or capacity grounds. It was originally noted that the proposed parking provision would exceed the
Council’s maximum standards. However, it was subsequently clarified that the existing building does not benefit from an on-site parking and therefore part of this provision could go towards the host building. On this basis, the Highway Authority withdrew their concerns relating to the parking provision and confirmed that the parking overprovision would not represent a highway capacity or safety issue. The level of cycle storage complies with the relevant standards and the electric vehicle charging points can be secured by condition. The Highway Authority raised no concerns in association with the access arrangements.

42. The proposal would provide a total of 19 parking spaces. This would exceed the relevant maximum standards when assessed against the building in isolation. However, in relation to the site, when taken as a whole, the proposal would comply with the relevant standards. In addition, St Georges Avenue suffers from a level of parking stress and therefore the proposed development would assist in reducing this. Notwithstanding the above, it should also be noted that Policy DM7 does allow for the consideration of visitor parking in suburban locations, which would also justify a parking provision above the maximum standards in such a location. On this basis it is considered that the level of parking provision is appropriate for this development.

Impact on biodiversity

43. The ecology report submitted with the proposal identified that no works to the existing building are proposed. Surrey Bat Group are satisfied that the information provided is sufficient to demonstrate that there would not be any negative effects posed to the local bat population. Surrey Wildlife Trust advised that should the Council be minded to grant permission the applicant should ensure that there is no net increase in external artificial lighting. They also advised that any development should be carried out in a precautionary manner to avoid killing or injuring of reptiles that may be identified during development. If any common reptiles are discovered during construction, which are likely to be affected by the development, works have to cease immediately and the developer should seek the advice of a suitably qualified ecologist. They have also suggested that the development should seek to include biodiversity enhancements. It is recommended that a condition be imposed in relation to the requirement to carry out the development in a precautionary manner and in accordance with the recommendations and enhancements recommended in the ecology report. Subject to imposition of the relevant condition it is considered that the proposal would not have any adverse impact upon biodiversity.

Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

44. The application site lies within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. To mitigate the impact of the additional residential occupancy within this buffer zone the applicant is required to enter into a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) as part of the Thames Basin Heaths avoidance and mitigation strategy. A signed unilateral undertaking is expected to be provided prior to the sub-committee meeting.

Financial considerations

45. Section 70 subsection 2 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) states that any local financial considerations are a matter to which local planning authorities must have regard to in determining planning applications; as far as they are material for the application. The weight to be attached to these considerations is a matter for the Council.

46. 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 New Homes Bonus Scheme Grant Determination for 2018/19 is £1.1 million.
47. 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.

Affordable housing

48. 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.

49. 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 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.

50. A recent appeal decision (APP/K3605/W/16/3146699) in Elmbridge found in favour of the Council's approach. The Inspector considered the approach in Policy CS21 to be consistent with Paragraphs 47 and 50 of the NPPF, which require local planning authorities to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing and where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified.

51. The Inspector added that the application should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations which indicate otherwise, noting the WMS as a material consideration of considerable importance and weight. The Inspector notes that the intention of the WMS is to ensure that financial contributions do not become a disproportionate burden for small scale developers and thus frustrate housing supply, and that there is a conflict between the national threshold relating to the provision of affordable housing in the WMS and the PPG and the local thresholds set out in Policy CS21 of the CS, which he found to be consistent with the Framework. He states:

52. The effect of the national policy in the WMS is that it would normally be inappropriate to require any affordable housing below the thresholds stated. Nevertheless, whilst there is a presumption that a policy such as a WMS should be followed, especially as it postdates the CS, it is also important to acknowledge that a policy that is relevant to the matter in hand should not be applied rigidly or exclusively when material considerations may indicate an exception may be necessary. I therefore share the view of the Council that it is for the decision taker to weigh any conflict between relevant policies in light of material considerations, including local circumstances.

53. The Inspector also addressed the Council's Statement on the Written Ministerial Statement (referenced above) and the significant difficulty in the delivery of affordable housing in the least affordable authority in England outside of London, noting that small sites make a significant contribution towards the delivery of affordable housing in the Borough. He also noted that there was no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the requirements of Policy CS21 are placing an unreasonable or disproportionate burden on developers. As a consequence, whilst the WMS carries considerable weight, the Inspector did not consider it to outweigh the development plan given the acute and substantial need for affordable housing in the Borough and the importance of delivery through small sites towards this. He concluded:
Consequently, on the basis of the evidence before me, it appears that the need for the contribution sought by the Council arises from the development and satisfies the 3 tests in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010. Accordingly, the proposal should be determined in line with the development plan.

54. There have been further appeal decisions which have supported the Council’s position on this matter with the following appeal reference numbers; APP/K3605/W/16/ 3154395, 3156943 and 3156265.

55. Based on the above, the appropriate level of the contribution towards the affordable housing provision was calculated. The applicant however provided a financial viability assessment indicating that such a provision would render the development proposal unviable. The Council sought advice from its own viability consultants to establish the viability of the proposal. Based on this review, a reduced contribution was agreed. A signed unilateral undertaking is expected to be provided prior to the sub-committee meeting.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

56. The proposed development is liable for CIL. The applicant has provided the relevant liability forms required to pay the chargeable amount in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Matters raised in Representations

57. The material planning issues have been fully assessed in the planning considerations above.

- The impact upon neighbouring amenity was fully considered as part of this application, however right to light is a civil matter.

- While the concerns of the local residents in terms of the disruption including noise and traffic implications that may be caused by the construction works are noted, it is not the planning system's role to obstruct development on this basis. Inevitably, any construction works may lead to some temporary disruption. Ordinarily, the requirements of Environmental Health legislation will seek to limit any harm so far as reasonably practicable. A standard informative would be added to permissions to draw this matter to the attention of the applicant. Furthermore, a condition is suggested requesting method of construction statement to be approved prior to commencement of works to minimise any such disruption.

- Previous removal of trees on site is not a material consideration. These trees were not protected.

- The loss of a view is not a material planning consideration. The planning assessment has fully considered the impact upon neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light and overbearing impact.

- Comments were received suggesting that the development differed from the initial plans discussed with neighbours. Whilst this may be the case the development must be assessed on the basis of the information submitted.

- Comments regarding the proximity to the railway line are noted. Network Rail were consulted on the application, however no comments were received in relation to the application.

- It is noted that a number of changes to existing building have been considered under a separate application. Whilst these changes were in part as a result of the proposed development the two schemes could feasibly be carried out separately and are not reliant upon one another. As such it is considered that the two applications could be considered separately. The combined impact of the works is not considered to have any significant impact.
Whilst there is a previous refusal on the site this was for a materially different scheme. There have also been material changes in planning policy since this refusal. The development should be assessed on the basis of current planning policy and any other relevant material considerations.

Conclusion

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

The proposed development does require a CIL payment

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:
- 1630.LEV.N100 Rev A (Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan),
- 1630.LEV.N101 Rev E (Proposed Ground Floor Plan),
- 1630.LEV.N102 Rev E (Proposed First Floor Plan),
- 1630.LEV.N103 Rev E (Proposed Second Floor Plan),
- 1630.LEV.N104 Rev D (Proposed Third Floor Plan),
- 1630.LEV.N105 Rev B (Proposed Roof Plan),
- 1630.LEV.N110 Rev B (Proposed Front Elevation),
- 1630.LEV.N111 Rev B (Proposed Rear Elevation),
- 1630.LEV.N112 Rev B (Proposed (East) Side Elevation),
- 1630.LEV.N113 Rev B (Proposed (West) Side Elevation),
- 1630.LEV.N117 (Proposed Site Section), and
- 1630.LEV.N118 (Proposed Refuse Store), all received on 19/12/2017;
- 1630.LEV.N119 (Refuse Store - Rear Elevation) received on 12/01/2018;
- 1630.LEV.LP01 B (Location & Site Plans) and
- 1630.LEV.LP03 F (Proposed Site Plan - Colour), both received on 03/05/2018.
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. **OBSCURE GLAZING**
The windows above the ground floor level on the west/side and east/side elevations of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscure glass; and non-openable unless above 1.7m over the finished floor level of the room they serve to. Such glass shall be sufficiently obscure to prevent loss of privacy. The affixing of an obscure film will not be sufficient.
5  **METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION STATEMENT**

No development shall commence until a construction transport management plan, to include details of:

(a) Parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
(b) Loading and unloading of plant and materials
(c) Storage of plant and materials
(k) On-site turning for construction vehicles

Have 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.

6  **PARKING AND TURNING**

The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for vehicles and cycles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose.

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.

7  **LANDSCAPING - SCHEME**

No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the borough council and these works shall be carried out as approved. This scheme shall include indications of all hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out, and details of the measures to be taken to protect existing features during the construction of the development.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

8  **LANDSCAPING - IMPLEMENTATION**

All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Arboricultural work to existing trees shall be carried out prior to the commencement of any other development, otherwise all remaining landscaping work and new planting shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance to the timetable agreed with the borough council. Any trees or plants, which within a period of five years of the commencement of any works in pursuance of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of similar size and species, following consultation with the borough council, unless the borough council gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.
TREE PROTECTION AND PRE-COMMENCEMENT INSPECTION
BEFORE DEVELOPMENT TAKES PLACE TREE PROTECTION MEASURES SHALL BE INSTALLED AND ANY FURTHER INFORMATION PROVIDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SUBMITTED ARBORICULTURAL INFORMATION. THE APPLICANT SHALL ARRANGE A PRE-COMMENCEMENT MEETING AFTER THE INSTALLATION OF THE TREE PROTECTION BETWEEN THE BOROUGH COUNCIL AND THE APPLICANT’S PROJECT ARBORICULTURIST TO ALLOW INSPECTION AND VERIFICATION OF THE PROTECTION MEASURES.

Reason: This permission is granted on the basis that the trees would remain on site to mitigate the impact of the development and to preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM6 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 for the future health and amenity of retained trees within the site.

TREE PROTECTION
In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree, which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the first occupation of the development.

a) no retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be pruned other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Borough Council. Any pruning shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (tree work) and in accordance with any supplied arboricultural method statement.

b) if any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the Borough Council.

c) tree protection shall be maintained in-situ and not moved or removed until all construction has finished and equipment, materials, or machinery are removed from site.

d) any arboricultural protection information and plans submitted as part of the application, and listed in the approved plans condition, or submitted to meet a condition of consent shall be implemented and adhered to at all times during the construction process unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Borough Council. This shall include any requirement for arboricultural supervision and site monitoring. This condition may only fully be discharged on completion of the development subject to satisfactory written evidence of contemporaneous supervision and monitoring of tree protection throughout construction by the appointed arboriculturist.

Reason: This permission is only granted on the basis that the trees would remain on site to mitigate the impact of the development and to preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

ELECTRIC CHARGING POINTS
The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until four parking spaces have been provided with a fast charge socket, and an additional four have been provided with a power supply to provide additional fast charge sockets to enable the charging of electric vehicles, in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to encourage and facilitate current and future use of electric vehicles in line with Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and national objectives for pollutants in accordance with paragraphs 120 & 124 of the NPPF 2012.

BIODIVERSITY
The development shall be carried out in accordance with the recommended mitigation and enhancement measures as proposed in Section 4.0: Recommendations of the Ecology Report by Cherryfield Ecology 08/11/2017 and received on 19/12/2017.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not result in any adverse impact upon protected species or biodiversity in accordance with Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM21 of the Development Management Plan 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
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. The notice is available at www.planningportal.co.uk/cil
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 LICENCE: WORKS ON 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 be 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 CHARGE FOR DAMAGE TO HIGHWAY
Section 59 of the Highways Act permits the Highway Authority to charge developers for damage caused by excessive weight and movements of vehicles to and from a site. The Highway Authority will pass on the cost of any excess repairs compared to normal maintenance costs to the applicant/organisation responsible for the damage.
Note: The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancy.
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= Site Boundary
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 área de proposta de desenvolvimento
Note: The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancy.

**SITE PLAN**

**INFORMATION**

**DATE**

**PROJECT**

**DRAWN BY**

**DATE**

**Description**

**Chkd**

**Date**

**Copyright of Concept Eight Architects**
Zinc standing seam to inset terraces / dormers

Painted metal railings

Reconstituted stone window heads

Reconstituted stone window sills

White render

New brickwork

Slate roof tiles

Note - The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancy.
EXISTING GRD LVL ±0.000M
GF FFL -1.000M
FF FFL +1.900M
SF FFL +4.800M
TF FFL +7.700M
RIDGE HEIGHT +10.600M
ZINC STANDING SEAM TO INSET TERRACES / DORMERS
SLATE ROOF TILES
RECONSTITUTED STONE
WINDOW HEADS
RECONSTITUTED STONE WINDOW SILLS
WHITE RENDER
NEW BRICKWORK

Note - The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancy.

Levron
St. George's Avenue,
Weybridge,
Kent KT13 0DQ

Copyright of Concept Eight Architects

Note - The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancy.
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Note - The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancies.
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mob +44(0)7779 234004
info@concept8.co.uk
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Revised for Consultant Issue
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Re-issued for Planning
OUTLINE OF OPENING TO PARKING IN BASEMENT
EXTENTS OF BASEMENT
RAMP DOWN FROM STREET LEVEL
1:12 & 1:8 GRADIENT

SLATE ROOF TILES
ZINC STANDING SEAM TO INSET TERRACES / DORMERS
NEW BRICKWORK
WHITE RENDER
RECONSTITUTED STONE WINDOW SILLS
LAND GRADED DOWN TO SITE

1:100 SCALE

EAST ELEVATION
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INFORMATION
Copyright of Concept Eight Architects 2017

Note - The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancy.
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Note - The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancy.

Note - The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancy.
Note:
The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any
construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancies.

APPROXIMATE FLOOR AREAS
BASEMENT AREA: 373 SQ.M
4015 SQ.FT
CORE / PLANT AREA: 48 SQ.M
516 SQ.FT

Note - The general contractor is responsible for the
verification of all dimensions on site prior to any
construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed
of any discrepancies.

APPROXIMATE FLOOR AREAS
BASEMENT AREA: 373 SQ.M
4015 SQ.FT
CORE / PLANT AREA: 48 SQ.M
516 SQ.FT

Note - The general contractor is responsible for the
verification of all dimensions on site prior to any
construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed
of any discrepancies.
Note: The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancies.

APPARENT FLOOR AREAS

FLAT 3
2 BED 4 PERS
TOTAL 159 SQ.M 1711 SQ.FT

FLAT 4
2 BED 4 PERS
TOTAL 158 SQ.M 1700 SQ.FT

LOBBY AND CORE:
TOTAL 31 SQ.M 333 SQ.FT

PRE APPLICATION
15.05.17
Revised following Pre-App feedback
12.07.17
Revised site layout
25.07.17
Revised Building Line from Window
27.07.17
Revised for Consultant Issue
13.10.17
Revised following Client Comment
11.12.17
Re-issued for Planning
19.12.17
Note - The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancies.
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Note - The general contractor is responsible for the verification of all dimensions on site prior to any construction or pricing. The architect is to be informed of any discrepancy.
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