Application No: 2018/3808  
Application Type: FULL  
Case Officer: Natalie Lynch  
Ward: Hersham Village Ward  
Location: Land to Rear of 37 Molesey Road Hersham Walton-On-Thames Surrey KT12 4RN  
Proposal: Detached single-storey house with associated parking, refuse storage and 2.1m high rear boundary fence, following demolition of existing outbuilding.  
Applicant: Mr David Jackson  
Agent: Mr Brian Gatjenby 
Get Planning and Architecture Ltd  
7 Tudor Court 
Brighton Road 
Sutton 
Surrey 
SM2 5AE  
Decision Level: Permit – Sub-Committee  
Refuse – Sub-Committee  
Recommendation: Permit

Representations: A total of 4 objections have been received, raising the following concerns:
- Loss of garden
- Site has been left to fall into a state of disrepair
- Impact on character and appearance of local area
- Development is out of keeping in terms of design, appearance, location and materials
- Insufficient space to accommodate a dwelling
- Basement accommodation would provide poor living conditions
- Overshadowing/loss of light
- Overlooking/loss of privacy
- Access road is insufficient to provide access and allow vehicles to turn
- Impact on pedestrians using the access road
- Impact on parking and congestion in surrounding area
- Loss of trees
- Building fronting Claremont Road is not a dwelling
- Previous application refused and dismissed at appeal – new scheme does not address the previous issues
- The proposal would set a precedent
- Applicant does not own the land or have access rights over Nos. 37 and 39
- Concern regarding access for emergency vehicles and construction vehicles
- Concern over the impact on utilities

Two observations have also been received, raising the following concerns:
- Access road is private land
- Damage to the access road from construction vehicles
- Access road should be re-surfaced upon completion
- Location Plan incorrect
- Beginning of access road does not fall within ownership of the applicant
- Concern over vehicles turning
- Impact on pedestrians using the access road
- Access road should be kept tidy and Construction vehicles should be cleaned when leaving the site
- Vehicles should not drive over land not within the applicant’s ownership

***This application has been promoted by Councillor Green if the recommendation is to permit the scheme***
Report

Description

1. The application site relates to garden land to the rear of 37 Molesey Road. Access is from Claremont Close.

Constraints

2. There are no relevant planning constraints for the site.

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
CS2 – Housing provision, location and distribution
CS5 – Hersham
CS17 – Local Character, Density and Design
CS19 – Housing type and size
CS21 – Affordable housing

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 – Hersham

Developers Contributions SPD 2012

Flood Risk SPD 2016

Relevant Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/2058</td>
<td>Additional single storey detached house with rooms in roof space following demolition of existing garage</td>
<td>Refused for the following reasons: The proposal would not be frontage development or have a front garden and would not be sympathetic to, or be in character with the area or accord with the pattern of development established locally, as such it fails to take account of advice in the saved policies HSG16, HSG18 and ENV2 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000, Policies CS5 &amp; CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy, the Design and Character Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Refusal Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2010/1386 | Sub division of existing residential curtilages to provide a pair of semi-detached houses | 1. The proposal, by virtue of the subdivision of the plot would result in small plot sizes, substandard rear amenity spaces and inadequate separation distances between the resultant houses that would be incongruous in the locality, and would detrimentally affect the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the overall depth and height of the proposal in relation to this plot size would create an overly dominant and cramped form of development in this sensitive backland location. As such, the proposal fails to take account of advice in Government Planning Policy Statement 1 (Delivering Sustainable Development), Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing) and the saved policies HSG16, HSG18, ENV1 and ENV2 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.  
2. The location of the front/rear facing first floor windows and the front/rear facing dormers, by virtue of their proximity to the amenity areas of Nos. 35 & 37 Molesey Road and No. 2 Claremont Close, their height above ground level and the lack of boundary screening would result in an unreasonable amount of overlooking and a loss of... |
privacy that would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring properties. In addition due to the overall height and close proximity of the proposed building to the rear elevation of No. 2 Claremont Close, it would be unreasonably overbearing on this neighbouring property. As such, the proposal fails to take into account of advice in Government Planning Policy Statements 1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) and the saved policies HSG16, HSG18 ENV1 and ENV2 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.

2007/0225  Part single storey/part two storey side/rear extension and conversion of existing dwelling to 2no one bedroom flats with off street parking for two cars  Granted

ESH/1948/5748  Erection of styes  Refused

Proposal

5. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached single-storey house with basement level accommodation. The proposal includes associated parking, refuse storage and 2.1m high rear boundary fence, following demolition of existing outbuilding.

Consultations

6. Surrey County Council (Transportation) - Based upon the information supplied without site inspection the Highway Authority has assessed the impact of the proposal on highway safety and capacity and raised no objections subject to conditions and informatives. The development is considered to be in accordance with policy CS25 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and policy DM7 of the Development Management Plan 2015.

Positive and Proactive Engagement

7. The revised National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities 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.

8. No formal pre-application advice was sought prior to submission of the application.

Planning Considerations

9. The main planning considerations in the determination of this application are:
The principle of the proposed development

10. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

11. Core Strategy policies CS1 and CS2 indicate 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.

12. The NPPF has a presumption in favour of sustainable development with emphasis on the need to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, as well as taking account of the character of different areas. Whilst garden land does not fall within the definition of previously developed land, the NPPF does not necessarily preclude development on such land. It is subject to considerations of the character and appearance of the development within the context of the area.

13. The existing garden area relating to No. 37 has been sub-divided to create this separate plot. Development Management Policy DM10 states that:

Housing development on garden land will be appropriate provided that:

i. The scheme as a whole has been well designed to respect the character of the area,
ii. The relationship between buildings within and outside the site ensures that privacy and amenity of existing and future residents are preserved,
iii. The means of access is appropriate in size and design to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians safely and to prevent harm to the amenities of adjoining residents, and
iv. A high standard of landscape is incorporated into the design

14. The surrounding area is characterised as residential. Therefore, the principle of the redevelopment and intensification in the use of the site would be considered acceptable subject to compliance with policy DM10 and other matters as discussed below.

Housing

Housing mix and need

15. Policy CS19 and para. 122a of the NPPF state that development should meet the identified need for housing, which is identified with the 2016 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Kingston and North Surrey. The SHMA identifies the need within Elmbridge is for smaller 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. The proposal under consideration here would provide a 2 bedroom unit of which the AMR acknowledges that there is an identified need for this type of housing.

Affordable housing

16. Policy CS21: Affordable Housing of the Council’s Core Strategy (2011) requires that development resulting in the net gain of 1 - 4 residential units should provide 20% of the gross number of dwellings on-site as a financial contribution. It is acknowledged that a revised
National Planning Policy Framework has been published and is a material consideration in the determination of all relevant planning applications. However, as set out in Section 38(6) of Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the starting point for any decision is the Development Plan unless material consideration(s) indicate otherwise. As set out in paragraph 2 of the NPPF, this approach is required by planning law. It is therefore for the decision-maker to determine the weight to be applied.

17. Paragraph 63 of the NPPF states that ‘provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer)’. Elmbridge Borough is not a designated rural area and major development sites are defined in the NPPF as development of 10 or more homes, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares of more. Nevertheless, as set out in paragraph 3 of the NPPF, the Framework should be read as a whole (including its footnotes and annexes). In this context the following NPPF policies are also relevant in regard to the Council’s continuation to apply policy CS21.

18. Paragraph 59 of the NPPF state that within the context of significantly boosting the supply of homes “… that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed”. Paragraph 61 states “… the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing…” Finally, paragraph 62 states:

‘Where a need for affordable housing is identified, planning policies should specify the type of affordable housing required, and expect it to be on-site unless:

a) off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu can be robustly justified…”

19. Paragraph 63 of the NPPF is a clear continuation of the approach to developer contributions on small sites as set out in Government’s Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) (28 November 2014) and subsequent changes to Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) dated 19 May 2016. In response to this policy change, the Council set out in its Statement on the WMS (Update – February 2017), that its position was to continue to consider on a case by case basis whether local circumstances with regard to affordable housing and the nature of the development sites in the Borough were sufficient to warrant the application of policy CS21, or whether greater weight should be attached to the WMS and changes to PPG.

20. The Council’s approach has been repeatedly upheld by Appeal Inspectors recognising that policy CS21 was consistent with other policies of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 and 50 (NPPF, 2012)) which required 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. Furthermore, several Appeal Inspectors noted that whilst the WMS was a material consideration of considerable importance and weight, 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. Appeal Inspectors have continuously addressed the Council’s Statement on the WMS (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.

21. Appeal Inspectors have also stated that there has been no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the requirements of policy CS21 are placing an unreasonable or disproportionate burden on developers. As a consequence, it has been found that whilst the WMS carried considerable weight, Inspectors do not consider it to outweigh the development plan given the acute and substantial need for affordable housing in the Borough (as evidenced by the Kingston & North-East Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)) (2016) and the importance of delivery through small sites towards this.
22. On the basis of the above and the evidence in relation to local housing need, affordability and housing land supply (as summarised in the Council’s Statement (Update – February 2017)), the Council will continue with its approach to apply Policy CS21 in the decision-making process where relevant. The Council has provided clear evidence of the acute need for affordable housing whereas, little evidence has been submitted by applicants suggesting that policy CS21 is having a disproportionate effect on small schemes. Where evidence is submitted to the contrary, the Council will, in accordance with policy CS21 and the Development Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2012), allow flexibility.

23. As the applicant did not submit a viability assessment, the viability of the scheme is not considered affected by the provision of the requisite financial contribution towards the affordable housing and therefore this contribution is not considered disproportionate. As such, a financial contribution towards the affordable housing from this development is due. The applicant has submitted Unilateral Undertaking which has been signed and agreed and subject to the Committee resolving to grant permission, the proposal would comply with the requirements of policy CS21.

Quality of the living accommodation for future occupiers

24. Development Management Plan policy DM10 and the Technical housing standards - nationally described space standards, sets out the minimum internal floor areas that should be provided for all new residential units. The dwelling would provide 80.2sqm of internal living space which would exceed the minimum space standards for a 2 bed/4 person dwelling. The internal room sizes and floor to ceiling heights would also comply with the technical requirements.

25. Policy DM10 states that all new residential development should provide an appropriate level of lighting and outlook. Objections have been received regarding the basement level providing poor living conditions. The two bedrooms and bathroom would be provided at subterranean level. Glazed doors would serve the bedrooms and light would be provided by the subterranean patio. Due to the size of the patio area and glazed doors, it is considered that the bedrooms would receive an acceptable level of light and outlook.

26. In terms of amenity space, the Design and Character SPD recommends a minimum garden depth of 11m. There would be a patio at basement level and then a grassed area at ground floor level. Across the two levels, there would be a total garden depth of 6.9m. There would also be some additional garden space to the west adjacent to the car parking area. This would be less than the recommended 11m depth but would be commensurate to the size of the dwelling.

Density

27. Policy CS17 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. Innovative contemporary design that embraces sustainability and improves local character will be supported. The Council promotes development that contributes to an overall housing target of 40 dwellings per hectare and achieves a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph).

28. The revised NPPF in regard to the making effective use of land, states at para. 117:

‘Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, whilst safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions’
29. In regard to achieving appropriate densities, Para. 12 states

‘Where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site’,

30. This is supported by point C) of Para. 123 which states:

‘local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in this Framework. In this context, when considering applications for housing, authorities should take a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site (as long as the resulting scheme would provide acceptable living standards).’

31. Para 122 in regard to achieving appropriate densities further states that:

‘Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:

a) The identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it.’

32. The proposal would represent a development density of approx. 100dph on this site (0.01Ha). The proposal would therefore make the most efficient use of land in accordance with policies CS17 and the NPPF.

Layout, scale and massing

33. Policy DM2 states that all development proposals should preserve or enhance the character of the area, taking account of design guidance detailed in the Design and Character SPD, paying particular regard to the appearance, scale, mass, height and pattern of built development.

34. Application ref 2010/1386 was for a pair of semi-detached dwellings which were two storeys in height with habitable accommodation in the roof space. These dwellings were refused due to their size and scale in relation to the plot sizes would appear cramped. This was upheld at appeal. This application is for a single dwelling set across basement and ground floor level. The proposal is of a much smaller size and scale and this previous reason for refusal would be addressed.

35. In the previous application ref 2013/2058, the proposal was refused owing to the development not having a frontage and not being sympathetic to the character and pattern of development in the area. The Inspector commented that ‘...the isolated dwelling would be located on a backland site unrelated to and at odds with the established pattern of surrounding development...[and] for this reason...would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.’

36. Since this application, there has been a change in policy with the adoption of the Development Management Plan in 2015, the Core Strategy in 2011 and the NPPF in 2019 which seeks to ensure that proposals make the most efficient use of land. Policy DM10 states that development on garden land to the rear or side of existing residential property will be appropriate provided that:

i. The scheme as a whole has been well designed to respect the character of the area,

ii. The relationship between buildings within and outside the site ensures that privacy and amenity of existing and future residents are preserved,

iii. The means of access is appropriate in size and design to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians safely and to prevent harm to the amenities of adjoining residents, and
iv. A high standard of landscape is incorporated into the design

37. The dwelling would be partly subterranean and would have a maximum height of 3.5m above natural ground level which would reduce its prominence in views from the surrounding area and those properties directly adjoining the site. Whilst it would not have a direct street frontage, the rear of the properties are served by an access road with large detached outbuildings/garages fronting this. It is also noted that a two storey dwelling was approved at appeal at land to the rear of 29 Molesey Road (ref 2012/3546). An objection has been received stating that this two storey building is not a dwelling. However, planning permission was granted for a dwelling and this permission has been implemented. Given the existence of this dwelling, the proposal would not appear out of keeping within this context and would have a frontage onto the access road. It is considered that due to the change in policy since the last application and the existence of a new dwelling to the rear of 29 Molesey Road, the proposal would now address the previous reason for refusal. The dwelling would be set in from the side boundaries and the dwelling would appear proportionate to the size of the site. There would be no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area as a result of the proposal.

38. Objections have been received regarding the loss of garden space, however, policy DM10 supports development on garden land. Objections have also been received regarding there being insufficient space to accommodate a dwelling, however, as discussed above, there is sufficient space within the site to ensure the proposal would not appear cramped or overdeveloped.

Design and appearance

39. The dwelling would have a modern design and appearance being partly subterranean and being finished in a mixture of zinc and brick. A number of objections have been received regarding the design and appearance of the dwelling. There would be no objection to this modern design and appearance. It would have a relatively low visibility from the surrounding area given its location to the rear of the site. The dwelling to the rear of No. 29 also has a modern design and appearance and the proposal would therefore have no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

40. The addition of a 2.1m high boundary fence would be a similar boundary treatment to the existing situation and would not appear out of keeping with the surrounding area.

The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties

41. Policy DM2 states that to protect the amenity of adjoining and potential occupiers and users, development proposals should be designed to offer an appropriate level of outlook and provide adequate daylight, sunlight and privacy.

42. Due to the overall height of the proposed new dwelling and the separation distances with the neighbouring properties, there would be no significant impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light or overshadowing. The existing boundary treatment would be retained and this would prevent any issues of direct overlooking or loss of privacy for the neighbouring properties.

43. The addition of a 2.1m high boundary fence would have no adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.

The impact on the highway and parking

44. The existing vehicular access to the site would be utilised. A number of objections have been received regarding the applicant not having access rights across this land. This is not a material planning consideration and would be a civil matter between the land owners.

45. Objections have been received regarding the impact on parking, congestion and insufficient access to allow vehicles to turn. Policy DM7 requires a maximum of 1.5 car parking spaces
per 2 bed unit. 1 car parking space would be provided on site and there would be sufficient space for the vehicle to manoeuvre on site to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. This would ensure that there would be no increase in parking in the surrounding area. The addition of one additional dwelling is unlikely to have a significant impact on congestion and the number of additional trips as a result of the proposal is likely to be low. Concern has also been raised regarding the impact on pedestrians using the access road. Surrey County Council as the Highway Authority have raised no objection to the proposal regarding highway capacity or safety.

46. There would be a designated refuse and recycling store which would be moved towards Claremont Close on collection day.

Financial considerations

47. 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.

48. 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 4 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 2019/20 is £957,930 (approx.).

49. 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.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

50. The proposed development is liable for CIL. The applicant has provided the relevant forms in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Matters raised in Representations

51. Concern has been raised regarding the site falling into a state of disrepair. This is noted.

52. An objection has been raised regarding the loss of trees. However, one tree would be removed as part of the proposal and due to its low amenity value, there would be no objection to the removal of the tree.

53. Objections have been received regarding the new scheme not addressing the previous reasons for refusal. However, as demonstrated above, the proposal has overcome the previous reasons for refusal and dismissal by the Planning Inspector.

54. Concern has been raised regarding the proposal setting a precedent. However, each application must be assessed on its own merits.

55. Concern has also been raised regarding access for emergency and construction vehicles. Whilst this is not a planning consideration, the Manual for Streets provides some guidance on access for emergency vehicles. Access ways should achieve a minimum width of 3.7m or be within 45m of the road. In this case, the proposal would comply with this. Regarding construction vehicles and the impact on the access road, Surrey County Council have requested a Construction Transport Management Plan to be submitted prior to commencement of development.
56. An observation has been received regarding the Location Plan being incorrect. However, Land Registry Certificates have been provided to confirm that the Location Plan is correct.

57. A concern has been raised regarding the impact on utilities. However, this is not a material planning consideration.

58. All the other matters raised have been addressed in the report above.

Conclusion

59. It is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to the signed Unilateral Undertaking. 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.

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: 01, 05, 07 Rev. A received on 20 December 2018 and 06 Rev. B, 08 Rev. B received on 04 February 2019 and 11 received on 08 February 2019.

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

3 MATERIALS SAMPLES
No above ground works 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 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
(d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
(e) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
(f) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused
on-site turning for construction vehicles has 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.

5 ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING PROVISION

The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until the proposed dwelling is provided with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirements - 7 kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply) and thereafter retained and maintained.

Reason: To encourage more sustainable modes of transport in accordance with policy DM7.

Informatives

1 OTHER WORKS TO THE 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.

2 MATERIALS DEPOSITED ON THE HIGHWAY

The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).

3 ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the electricity supply is sufficient to meet future demands and that any power balancing technology is in place if required. Please refer to: http://www.beama.org.uk/resourceLibrary/beame-guide-to-electric-vehicle-infrastructure.html for guidance and further information on charging modes and connector types.
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