

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

Elmbridge Borough Council

East Area Planning Sub-Committee

Report of a meeting held on 4 February 2019

Members of the Committee:

- * Mrs. K. Randolph (Chairman)
- * N. Haig-Brown (Vice-Chairman)

- | | |
|---------------|-----------------|
| * D.J. Archer | * C. James |
| * A. Coomes | * M. Rollings |
| * B. Fairbank | Mrs. T. Shipley |
| * N. Houston | * S.J. Waugh |

* Denotes attendance

Substitutes:

Tricia W. Bland (Substituting for Mrs. T. Shipley)

Also present:

Mrs. M. Marshall (in attendance for the consideration of planning application 2018/2749 - Land to Rear of 23 Claremont Road, Claygate only) and T.G. Oliver

33/18 Declarations of Interest

In respect of application 2018/2749 – Land to Rear of 23 Claremont Road, Claygate, whilst not a disclosable pecuniary or other interest under the Code of Conduct, A. Coomes wished that it be noted that he lived within the Claygate Conservation Area.

Matters of Report to the Planning Committee

34/18 Planning Applications

(Link to Council Priorities: P2 – Deliver appropriate sustainable planning decisions)

Resolved that the applications set out below be determined as indicated, in accordance with authority delegated to the Sub-Committee:

- (a) 2017/0401 - 61-63 More Lane, Esher

Three further letters of objection received.

The Sub-Committee, having reviewed the relevant material considerations, determined that the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the streetscene by virtue of the buildings

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

height, mass and bulk, and that the proposed number of parking spaces would cause harm to future occupiers and parking stress on the adjoining roads.

Accordingly, the Sub-Committee resolved to

Refuse permission, contrary to the officer's recommendation, for the following reasons set out below:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its height, bulk and massing, would not respect the streetscene and would have a harmful impact upon the character of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, policies CS9 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

2. The proposed development would provide insufficient car parking for the number of units which would result in a poor living environment for occupiers and parking congestion and parking stress in the surrounding roads. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, policies CS9, CS17 and CS25 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

(b) 2018/1695 - Site of Taggs Boatyard, 44 Summer Road, Thames Ditton

The Sub-Committee was addressed by Mr. Barr, an objector.

Refuse for the reason outlined in the agenda and subject to the following additional reasons for refusal:

Additional Reasons for Refusal:

2. By reason of the location of the first and second floor level windows serving flats 2 and 6 situated on the rear of the development facing towards Summer Road, they will result in significant adverse impact being created in terms of loss of privacy and amenity of the occupiers of No. 46 Summer Road. As such the proposal is contrary to policies DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, the Design & Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

3. By reason of the increased eaves and ridge heights of the building fronting the river together with the increased depth of the flank wall closest to No. 29 Riversdale Road, this proposal exacerbates the impact of what was already going to be a large

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

building, to the extent that it is harmful to the amenity of residents on Thames Ditton Island and to the wider riverside views. This is contrary to policies DM2 and DM13 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, the Design & Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

(c) 2018/1743 - Warling Dean, 33 New Road, Esher

As part of his introduction, the Assistant Development Manager reported that there was an error in the Planning Officer's report where it made reference to the basement parking being accessed via a single car lift. The Sub-Committee noted that the basement parking proposed would be accessed via a ramp access down to the basement and would be located on the site where the current access to the garage block was located. The Assistant Development Manager further reported that Surrey County Council Highways and the Council's Environmental Services Team (Noise and Pollution) had reconsidered the basement parking access arrangements and no objections had been raised in this regard.

The Sub-Committee was addressed by Ms. Hinckly, an objector and Mr. Wallis, on behalf of the agent.

Refuse for the reason outlined in the agenda and subject to the following additional reasons for refusal:

Additional Reasons for Refusal:

2. By reason of the height, bulk and mass of the proposed development, this proposal will appear cramped within the plot which would appear at odds with the prevailing spacious character of the area and be detrimental to the views from within the street scene and not enhance the visual character of the area. As such this proposal has not addressed the previous reason for refusal and remains contrary to policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

3. Due to the excessive number of windows facing towards the occupiers of No. 16 Littleworth Lane and the location of the first floor side facing windows adjacent to No. 31 New Road this proposal would harm the living conditions upon the occupiers of these neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking. As such this proposal has not addressed the previous reason for refusal and remains contrary to policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015, the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

- (d) 2018/2749 - Land to Rear of 23 Claremont Road, Claygate

Defer to the East Area Planning Sub-Committee on 4 March 2019 to allow for a site visit to be undertaken at a neighbouring property.

- (e) 2018/3354 - 15 Courtlands Avenue, Esher

Permit with conditions and informative as outlined in the agenda.

- (f) 2018/3363 - 5 Summer Gardens, East Molesey

Three further letters of objection received.

The Sub-Committee discussed the application and concern was raised with regard to the proposed 'piggy back' style roof extension which it was considered did not enhance the area. It was however acknowledged that a number of other properties had this style of roof extension in Summer Road and Members were reminded of the recent appeal decision for such a roof extension that had been allowed on appeal. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee agreed that the design of the roof extension could not be used as a reason for refusing the application.

However, the Ward Members also raised concern with regard to the light levels to no. 3 Summer Gardens and specifically the first floor window on the side elevation facing towards the application site which was a habitable room. Whilst it was noted that there was already a breach of the 25° test for this particular window, the Sub-Committee considered that this was not a reason to make a bad situation significantly worse. Members felt that the size of the proposed extensions, which increased the ridge and eaves height and flank wall, would therefore result in an unreasonable reduction in the light levels to the first floor window of no. 3 Summer Gardens. The Sub-Committee considered this would have an unacceptably adverse impact on the living conditions of the inhabitants of the neighbouring property at no. 3 Summer Gardens.

Therefore, the Sub-Committee, having reviewed the relevant material considerations, determined that the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the habitable window of no. 3 Summer Gardens due to the increase in the built form. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee resolved to

Refuse permission, contrary to the officer's recommendation, for the reason set out below:

1. By reason of the increased eaves and ridge height the flank wall would result in significant loss of daylight to the first floor side facing habitable room window of 3 Summer Gardens and is therefore in conflict with policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development

