Application No: 2014/4162
Application Type: FULL
Case Officer: Jane Harrison
Ward: Oxshott and Stoke D’Abernon
Expiry Date: 19/12/2014
Location: 27 D’Abernon Drive Stoke D’Abernon Cobham Surrey KT11 3JE
Proposal: Single storey rear extension
Applicant: Mr James Vickers
Mr Michael Harris
Michael Harris Architect Ltd
14 Flints Court
Agent: Berkeley Hill
Falmouth
Cornwall
TR11 3ED

Decision Level: If Permit – Sub-Committee
If Refuse – Sub-Committee
Recommendation: Permit

Site Notice: No.

Representations: None

***This application is required to be determined by Sub-Committee as the applicant is a Member of the Council***

Report

Description
1. The application relates to a two storey detached dwelling to the west of D’Abernon Drive, an unclassified residential road in Stoke D’Abernon.

Constraints
2. The relevant planning constraints are:
   - Flood Zone 2
   - Land adjoining the 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
CS10 – Cobham, Oxshott, Stoke D’Abernon and Downside
CS17 – Local Character, Density and Design
CS26 – Flooding

Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000
HSG16 – Design and Layout of Residential Development
HSG20 – Extension and Alteration to Existing Dwelling
ENV2 – Standard of Design
GRB27 – Development of Land Adjoining the Green Belt
4. Relevant Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973/1076</td>
<td>Erection of single storey lounge extension</td>
<td>Grant Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/1887</td>
<td>Single storey side/rear extension and pitched roof to single storey extension</td>
<td>Grant Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/0091</td>
<td>Single storey side/rear extension and pitched roof to single storey extension (Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2005/1887 to extend the time limit for a further 3 years)</td>
<td>Grant Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/3878</td>
<td>Lawful Development Certificate: Whether planning permission is required for a proposed single storey rear extension</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal

5. This application seeks permission for a single storey rear extension. The proposed extension would project 3m from the existing rear elevation with a width of 3.6m. The proposed roof would be in a barn end style with a side eaves height of 2.7m and a maximum height of 3.8m.

Consultations

6. None.

Positive and Proactive Engagement

7. 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.

8. No pre-application advice was sought.

Planning Considerations

9. 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 streetscene.
   - The impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties.
   - The impact on garden space.
   - The impact on the adjoining Green Belt.
   - Flood risk.

   The design of the proposal and its impact on the host dwelling, the character of the area and the streetscene.

10. The proposal would be located towards the rear of the dwelling and, as such, would not be readily visible from within the street scene. The proposal has been designed to appear subservient in size and scale to the original dwelling. Therefore, it is not considered that
the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the character of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area.

**The impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties.**

11. The proposal would be approx. 1.3m from the shared flank boundary with No.29 and would not project more than 3m past the rear of No.29. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in an adverse loss of light or an overbearing impact on this neighbour. With respect to the other flank neighbour, No.25, the proposed extension would not be readily visible behind the existing conservatory. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

**The impact on garden space.**

12. The garden would retain a rear garden length of some 20m. As such, 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’.

**The impact on the Green Belt**

13. The proposed extensions would not significantly increase the scale of the dwellinghouse and the design would be sympathetic to the original dwelling. As such, the proposal would not be considered detrimental to the Green Belt. In any case, GRB27 should be given very limited weight following the Examination In Public of the draft Development Management Plan that will replace the remaining saved policies in the Local Plan 2000. The Inspector suggested a main modification to the plan that removed reference in the DMP policy on Green Belt to land adjoining it. Instead it would become a design issue to be addressed under DM2 – Design and Amenity.

**Flood risk**

14. The Flood Risk Assessment details that the floor levels of the proposals would be set no lower than the existing property and flood proofing would be incorporated where appropriate. This is considered acceptable and accords with the flood risk compatibility table in the NPPG which concludes that development is appropriate for ‘more vulnerable’ proposals, including extensions to dwelling houses, in Flood Zone 2. As such it is not considered that the proposal would have a material increase in flood risk.

**Matters raised in Representations**

15. None.

**Conclusion**

16. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Officer Checklist</th>
<th>27/11/2014 JH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour Notifications</td>
<td>27/11/2014 JH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td>27/11/2014 JH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings</td>
<td>27/11/2014 JH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: 2014/14-003, 2014/14-152, 2014/14-153, 2014/14-162 and 2014/14-166 received on 24/10/2014.

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

3 MATERIALS TO MATCH
The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall match as nearly as is practically possible those of the existing building to which it is attached, in colour, type, finish and profile.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory external appearance is achieved of the development in accordance with saved Policy ENV2 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.

4 FLOOD RISK
All flood mitigation measures shall be carried out in accordance with approved details set out in the Flood Risk Assessment received on 24/10/2014.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to satisfy Core Policy CS26 Flood Risk of the Elmbridge Borough Core Strategy (adopted 2011).
NOTES

REAR GARDEN ELEVATION

PATIO ELEVATION

ELEVATION TO NO. 29 D'ABERDON DRIVE

ARCHITECT LTD.
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