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Location: 3 New Road Esher Surrey KT10 9PG
Proposal: Detached three-storey building comprising 3 flats with associated parking, bin and cycle storage and relocation of existing vehicular access following demolition of existing building.
Applicant: Mr Marc Gabriel
Agent: Mrs Julie Martin
J Martin Architects Ltd
The Manor Farm
124 Manor Road North
Thames Ditton
Surrey
KT7 0BH
Decision Level: Permit – Sub-Committee
Refuse – Sub-Committee
Recommendation: A - Permit, subject to the receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement securing a commuted sum of £15,000.00 within 3 months of the Committee resolution. Delegated authority is given to the Head of Planning Services to extend the period for completion of a satisfactory legal agreement.

B - If a satisfactory legal agreement is not completed within 3 months of the Committee resolution, or an extended period as agreed by the Head of Planning, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning Services to Refuse.

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

Report

Description

1. The application site is located on the eastern side of New Road close to the junction with Portsmouth Road and opposite Carrick Drive which is a small cul-de-sac. New Road is generally a private road, however there is a small section (where the application site is) where the road is public adopted road. The site is currently occupied by a large detached single family dwellinghouse set in from the front boundary of the site with a hardstanding area for off-street parking. The existing dwelling is two storeys with an extension at the ground floor and has a well-established vegetated boundary with the adjoining properties that assists in screening the site.

2. The surrounding area is residential in appearance with a number of large detached properties located in close proximity to the site. There are other flatted schemes within the local area notably at the adjoining property at number 1 New Road (six flats), and Esher Heights (six flats) to the rear of the site. The site falls within the Esher character area, New Road, Esher Park Avenue and Milbourne Lane (ESH02) sub area as identified in the relevant Companion Guide to the Design and Character SPD 2012

Constraints

3. There are no constraints associated with this site.

Policy

4. In addition to the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance, the following local policies and guidance are relevant to the determination of this application:
Core Strategy 2011
CS2 – Housing provision, location and distribution
CS9 – Esher
CS15 – Biodiversity
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 and Character SPD 2012

Developer Contributions SPD 2012

5. Relevant Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/2251</td>
<td>Detached three-storey building comprising 3 flats with associated parking, bin and cycle storage and relocation of existing vehicular access following demolition of existing building.</td>
<td>Refused planning permission (pending an appeal decision).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons:

The proposed development by virtue of its design, bulk and massing would represent a form of development too large for its plot, and its design would be out of character within the streetscene, which would be harmful to the character of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and Policies CS9 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011.

The proposed rear facing balconies would harm the living conditions of no. 5 New Road in terms of overlooking. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 201

The proposal would, by reason of the lack of a Unilateral Undertaking with a late review mechanism in relation to a financial contribution for affordable housing, be contrary to the requirements of Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/2350</td>
<td>Detached three-storey building comprising 5 flats with associated parking, bin and cycle storage following demolition of existing building.</td>
<td>Refused planning permission (pending an appeal decision).</td>
<td>By reason of the proposed development not providing sufficient pedestrian access, the occupiers of the proposed development would face obstacles in accessing the footway on Portsmouth Road and therefore the highway would not be safe or convenient for pedestrians. As a result, the proposed development has failed to comply with Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015. The proposal, by reason of the lack of a Unilateral Undertaking in relation to the required affordable housing contribution, fails to provide the necessary contribution towards affordable housing contrary to the requirements of Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/3618</td>
<td>Detached three-storey building comprising 5 flats and relocation of existing vehicular access following demolition of existing building.</td>
<td>Refused planning permission</td>
<td>By reason of the proposed development not providing sufficient pedestrian access, the occupiers of the proposed development would face obstacles in accessing the footway on Portsmouth Road and therefore the highway would not be safe or convenient for pedestrians. As a result, the proposed development has failed to comply with Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015. Due to the lack of further ecological surveys being carried out, the proposal does not adequately assess the impact of the development on protected species and therefore fails to provide suitable mitigation and compensation measures to justify the loss of a roost of a protected species. As a result, this proposal has failed to comply with Policy CS15 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and the NPPF 2012. The proposal, by reason of the lack of a Unilateral Undertaking in relation to the required affordable housing contribution, fails to provide the necessary contribution towards affordable housing contrary to the requirements of Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document 2012. The proposed development by virtue of its design, bulk and massing would represent a form of development too large for its plot, and its design would be out of character within the streetscene, which would be harmful to the character of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and Policies CS9 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Renewal of planning permission (ref: 2001/1325) for the first-floor side and rear extension over existing ground floor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/0585</td>
<td>Renewal of planning permission (ref: 2001/1325) for the first-floor side and rear extension over existing ground floor</td>
<td>Granted planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/1325</td>
<td>First floor side and rear extension over existing ground floor</td>
<td>Granted planning permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal

6. This is the fourth application for the demolition of the existing house and replacement with 3 flats (3 x 3 beds units) and associated on-site parking following three previously refused schemes, of which, two are currently being appealed with the Planning Inspectorate (see above). The proposal will provide a detached property in a traditional design containing symmetrical gabled bays and two small dormers to the front of the property. The development will be a two/three-storey property with additional accommodation in the roof space. There will be a single vehicular access point which involves the relocation of the existing roadside access to a more central position with 6 assigned off-street parking spaces, cycle storage and bin stores and landscaping provided at the front.

7. The main differences between the current scheme and the previously refused schemes have been highlighted in the tables below which are not to scale and for indicative purposes only:

8. The current scheme has sought to address the concerns of the previous refusals specifically:

- The height and the width of the scheme has been further reduced
- The flank elevation adjoining number 1 New Road only includes obscured glazing
- Side elevation adjoining number 5 New Road contains no windows and only three high level rooflights
- Removal of the front balconies
- Rear balconies are recessed further and have side walls to mitigate overlooking

Representations

9. The Council notified 20 neighbouring properties and a site notice was displayed outside the site.
10. A total of 27 objections from 25 neighbouring properties have been received in respect to the current application all objecting to the scheme and have raised the following concerns:

- Increased in traffic
- Increase pollution
- Increase in congestion
- Too large and out of keeping with the area
- Overbearing
- Harmful to privacy of neighbours
- Lack of pedestrian access
- Impacts on trees
- Parking not adequate
- Issues concerned with deliveries
- Impacts of noise and disturbance
- Impact on flooding
- Impact on wildlife
- Consultation process has not been undertaken correctly

Consultations

11. Head of Environmental Services (Environmental care) – Raises no objection

12. Surrey County Council Highways – Raises no objection, subject to suggested conditions and informatives

13. Planning – Trees - Raises no objection, subject to suggested conditions and informatives.


15. Surrey Bat Group – Previous observations stand. Surveys carried out in line with best practice and suitable for determination of application.

16. Natural England – No comment to make. Standing advice

Positive and Proactive Engagement

17. The 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.

18. No formal pre-application enquiry was submitted prior to the submission of this proposal.

Planning Considerations

19. As with the previous schemes the main planning considerations of the proposal are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Affordable Housing Contributions
- Design and impact on local character
- Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties
- Provision of suitable living conditions
- Highways impact
- Impact on trees
- Biodiversity
- Financial Considerations

Principle of Development

20. The NPPF seeks a presumption in favour of sustainable development with emphasis on the needs to secure high-quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future
occupiers of different areas. Under policy CS2 the Council will encourage appropriate housing development on previously developed land within the urban area, by delivering high density housing developments in the most sustainable locations.

21. The application is for demolition of the existing property and replacement with a flatted development providing 3 additional high-quality homes within the borough. The application seeks to provide 3 units that would be suitable for smaller families and those looking to downsize and would provide additional units of which the borough has an identified shortage and is seeking to promote. The application for additional residential accommodation in an existing residential area and as such providing that the proposal respects the character and appearance of the surrounding area and there are no other impact issues the principle is supported.

22. The site falls within the definition of previously developed land given that the it is currently occupied by a single family dwellinghouse. Also, there are examples of other flatted developments within the immediate area specifically at 1 New Road adjoining the site to the front and also Esher Heights adjoining the site at the rear, as such the scheme does not set a precedent or would be out of keeping in the area.

23. Furthermore, the principle of flatted development has already been found acceptable as part of the assessments of the previous planning applications and it would be unreasonable to reach an alternative view here.

Affordable Housing provision

24. 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.

25. 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.

26. 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…’

27. 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.

28. 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.

29. 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.

30. 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.

31. The applicant has previously submitted a viability assessment and additional information in relation to open market valuations and build costs. This has been previously reviewed by an independent Financial Viability consultants (DSP) in December 2018, who concluded that based on the current costing and sales values there would be a nil contribution for affordable housing. DSP have once again been consulted on the current scheme and have confirmed that as the only change is the size of the proposed units which have been reduced by approximately 8sq.m, it is considered that their previous review carried out remains an appropriate basis for considering the viability of the scheme.

32. The previous scheme was subject to a late stage review mechanism and given the lack of an unilateral undertaking this was included as a reason for refusal. Given the relatively minor nature of the scheme and the fact that it will not be a phased development, the applicant has sought to make a financial contribution of £15,000.00 in lieu of the late stage review mechanism. This is considered an acceptable approach in this case given that the current scheme is less viable than the previous refused scheme and it is unlikely that a late stage review mechanism would be applicable here. The applicant has agreed to make this contribution, and this would be secured via a Unilateral Undertaking.

**Design and impact on local character**

33. The NPPF places weight on achieving well-designed places highlighting that the creation of high-quality buildings and places and is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Policy CS17 identifies Elmbridge’s unique environment and characteristics and requires new development to deliver high quality inclusive and sustainable design to maximise the efficient use of the urban land.
34. Policy DM2 highlights that development proposals must be based on an understanding of local character including any specific local designations and take account of the natural, built and historic environment. Development proposals will be expected to take account of the relevant character assessment companion guide in the Elmbridge Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The application site is located in Esher in the New Road, Esher Park Avenue and Milbourne Lane (ESH02) sub area which highlights that the area is mostly comprised of large detached houses in generous plots. Most of the larger houses in this character area are between two and three storeys, and there is often use of the attic storeys lit by dormers or rooflights. The SPD further states that any further development in this area should seek to maintain the scale and quality of the existing architecture to maintain the sub-area's strong identity.

35. The existing property does not hold any significant architectural merit and therefore the demolition and redevelopment can be supported. The scheme has been designed in a traditional style and responds to the surrounding area in terms of scale, height and mass. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal is for three units rather than a single house, the position and scale of massing sits comfortably on the plot and in terms of character and appearance the property would read more as a large detached house, akin to the area, rather than as a block of flats and as such would not appear out of keeping.

36. It is acknowledged that the previous schemes were considered unacceptable in terms of design, bulk & mass however the current proposal has sought to address these concerns by specifically reducing the height from 9.6m to 9.5m and a reduction of 1.35m in the width of the proposal from 21.6m to 20.25m. The current scheme would represent a successful design response to the site in keeping with the local pattern of development. The articulation of the front and the back of the scheme through use of bays at the front and varying the depths of the rear façade would also successfully break down the overall mass of the proposal, to the benefit of the street scene.

37. Furthermore, the removal of the balconies to the front of the site further reduce the appearance of a flatted scheme and provides an appearance akin to a large detached dwellinghouse rather than a block of flats which is in character with the surrounding area. The overall height of the proposal would be similar to the adjoining properties and again would be an acceptable relationship between eaves and ridge heights. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal would provide two/three storeys with accommodation in the roof space, the proposal has been designed to appear similar to a two-storey dwelling-house with additional accommodation in the roof space.

38. The proposal would be sufficiently set off the front boundary and would retain a distance to the side boundaries. The separation on the side boundaries are 3.0m and 5.0m and thus in excess of the desired minimum of 1m separation to the side boundaries, as recommended within the Elmbridge Design and Character SPD. In this case, it is considered that the resulting building would retain comparable distances to others in the vicinity and not result in a terraced appearance and the setting ensures that the development does not appear overly cramped in its plot.

39. It is acknowledged that part of the front garden would be given over to hard-standing to allow for off street parking for the new dwellings, however there are areas of soft landscaping and retention of the majority of trees along the boundary of the site. A number of the other properties along New Road already have significant areas of off-street parking in the front gardens and consequently the proposal scheme would reflect the arrangement of the neighbouring buildings and would be acceptable.

40. Given the overall scale of the development, the extent of hardstanding would not be excessive. The site offers sufficient opportunities for soft landscaping to the frontage as well as between the proposed development and the neighbouring property to the rear and can be secured by way of a condition.

41. Having considered all of the above, against the backdrop of housing need, officers are of the opinion that the proposed development would comply with the objectives of the above policies in terms of respecting local character.
Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties

42. Policy DM2 states that to protect the amenity of adjoining and potential occupiers and users, development proposals should be designed to offer an appropriate outlook and provide adequate daylight, sunlight and privacy. The properties most effected are a) the flats at number 1 New Road; b) number 5 New Road; c) flats at Esher Heights to the rear and d) properties in Carrick Gate to the front of the site.

43. It is acknowledged that the previous scheme (2018/2251) was refused due to the impacts on the amenities of the surrounding properties with specific regard to the harm caused to the living conditions of the occupants of 5 New Road by reason of a loss of privacy and outlook from the rear. The proposed scheme has sought to address these concerns through the provision of recessed balconies. Pushing the balconies back into the property will mitigate any potential or perceived overlooking. The difference between the previous scheme and the current scheme are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract to show second floor balcony layout of refused scheme (2018/2251)</th>
<th>Extract to show improved second floor balcony layout of current scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| a) 1 New Road (flats) |

44. When considering the relationship between buildings the Home Extensions Companion Guide (2012) advises the use of the 45-degree angle test. The 45-degree angle test applies to two-storey extensions which are closer than 15 metres measured along the sight line of a 45-degree angle from the edge of the nearest adjoining neighbours window, or 8 metres in the case of a single storey extension. The proposal does not breach the 45-degree line at either the front or rear facing windows and would therefore be acceptable in this regard.

45. There are five windows on the flank elevation (two at ground floor; two at first floor and one in the roof) all of which serve bathrooms and will be fitted with obscured glazing which can be secured by way of a condition. There is a closed board fence and a significantly well-established vegetated boundary between these two properties which is to be retained as part of the application and can be secured by way of a condition to assist in further screening of the proposal from number 1 and vice versa. There would be no harm to living conditions experienced by occupants within the dwelling as a result of the scheme, which was also the conclusion of the previous scheme.

| b) 5 New Road (dwellinghouse) |

46. Number 5 New Road is sited to the south of the site and located at an angle with the proposed development. The proposed development sits further away from the boundary than the existing building and the previous applications, albeit that there will be an increase in the height of the development from the existing. The proposal has been further moved away from the boundary and now sits 5m from the boundary with this property. The scheme now sits outside the 45-degree line at 15m for the front windows. As such the scheme would not provide any significant loss of existing sunlight or daylight levels of adjoining occupiers. Given the set back and the angle of the scheme the flank wall has been designed to minimise visual intrusion from the neighbouring property.
47. There are three small roof lights on the flank elevation that face this property, these serve a kitchen/dining area, however these are high level windows with cill heights at 1.7m from the relevant floor level as such given the acute angle and high level it is unlikely that these would cause additional overlooking or loss of privacy.

48. One of the previous reasons for refusal was the incorporation of the balconies at the rear of the site and the impact that these would have on this property. It is acknowledged that the new application also has balconies at the rear, however these have been set back inside the projecting gabled bay, providing screened cheeks to further minimise any overlooking from the proposed balconies. Furthermore, there is a significant established vegetated boundary that will be retained to further mitigate any perceived overlooking issues. Whilst there could be a degree of overlooking to the garden as a consequence of the rear fenestration, this is not uncommon in a suburban location and is deemed acceptable to ensure no undue impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

49. As with the previous scheme, the swimming pool in the rear garden of 5 New Road will be located approximately 31m away from the proposed new building. Given the new building will be to the north west of the neighbouring swimming pool and considering the trees that are to be retained along the boundary, it is not considered that the proposed building would result any adverse impact in terms of shadowing the swimming pool.

c)  Esher Heights (flats)

50. There will be no impact on amenity to this property that would warrant a refusal stating given the distance and angle between the two sites, and that the two gardens are separated by a high evergreen hedge. There would be no significant impact on its occupants by reason of a loss of privacy or outlook.

d)  Properties in Carrick Gate (dwellinghouses)

51. There are windows in the upper floors of the existing house that face these properties, given this existing arrangement; the road between the properties and the fact that the separation is in excess of 35m will ensure this relationship is acceptable.

52. In regard to noise and disturbance the proposed development would not result in undue noise, light or air pollution as a result of an increased number of occupants on the site given the proposal is for three flats. The use would intensify the vehicular movement at the site, but this would not be significant given the surrounding residential area. Overall subject to suitable conditions any harm to amenity can be mitigated.

Provision of suitable living conditions

53. Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy states that the council will seek to secure a range of housing types and sizes on developments across the borough in order to create inclusive and sustainable communities reflecting the most up to date SHMA in terms of size and type of dwellings. The proposal would provide 3 x 3 bed flats which would help meet the identified housing need for the Borough.

54. Policy DM10 and the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) sets out the minimum internal space standards that should be applied to all new housing development. All of the residential units significantly exceed the minimum internal floor areas and would provide a high standard of accommodation. The proposed development would provide spacious accommodation throughout with suitable outlook, natural lighting and ventilation.

55. The applicant has provided rear balcony/terrace areas which will provide future occupants access to private amenity space, which as stated above have been specifically designed to mitigate overlooking and loss of privacy to the adjoining residents. The proposed communal garden area would be adequate and commensurate to the sizes and number of units. There would also be adequate space for the suitable storage of refuse and recycling facilities.

56. The development will result in a high-quality development all with adequate amenities and provides a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers in accordance with policy.
Highways impact

57. The Highways Authority has made an assessment relating to the impact that this development would have in terms of additional traffic on the nearby public highway. This proposal is not considered to create any significant impact upon highway safety or capacity grounds.

58. The Highways Authority raised concerns with the applicant with regard to difficulties relating to pedestrian access for the development, and for existing residents on New Road and Carrick Gate, and sought to encourage the provision of a footway between the site and Portsmouth Road, in order to link to the existing footway at this location. Unfortunately, this was unsuccessful. However, given the planning history, and the likely minimal impact of the development on the local highway network the Highways Authority has taken the view that to pursue this as a planning condition would not be reasonable. The additional traffic generated by the two (net) new dwellings is not considered sufficient enough to warrant requiring the developer to provide this facility.

59. The Highways Authority is also aware of local residents’ concerns regarding additional traffic during construction and on occupation, as previously noted, the final net increase in trips associated with the site is not expected to be significant. Construction traffic can be managed through the use of Construction Management plan which can be secured by condition.

60. Policy DM7 states that “The proposed parking provision should be appropriate to the development and not result in an increase in on-street parking stress that would be detrimental to the amenities of local residents”. Appendix 1 sets out the maximum car parking standards of 2 car parking spaces per 3 bed unit. The plans propose a total of 6 car parking spaces, two of which are disabled spaces to the front of the proposed building. The level of parking being proposed is acceptable and would comply with maximum parking standards and support national policies which seek to encourage less reliance on the car.

61. Whilst the proposal creates a substantial amount of hardstanding, a number of the neighbouring properties benefit from a similar amount and therefore this element of the proposal is considered sufficient to address parking need and a condition could be imposed to address the screening of the hardstanding.

62. The plans show a sliding gate to the vehicular access. No elevations have been provided, so to ensure that this would complement the character of the streetscene a condition for further details would be appropriate.

63. The plans show that 3 cycle storage sheds would be provided to the sides of the building. They indicate that each of these could store 2 bikes. It is considered that this provision is secure and sufficient and in line with expectations of the council.

64. Given concerns relating to access and highway safety, it is considered prudent to impose a condition requiring a Construction Method Statement to be provided.

Impact on trees

65. Neighbours to the site and local residents have raised concerns with regards to trees being lost as a result of the proposal. The report submitted identifies 6 U grade and 4 C grade trees that would be removed to facilitate the development. These either have a low amenity value, are dead or are ornamental and none of these trees would impact on the loss of screening at the site. 5 C grade trees would be pruned. This would ensure that the verdant and mature landscaping on the boundaries would be retained, so would continue to have a visual amenity value as well as a screening effect.

66. The arboricultural method statement includes measures to protect the retained trees during construction, this includes supervision, hand excavation, cellular confinement system as foundation, ground protection and protective fencing. These methods would be satisfactory to ensure that that risk to the retained trees would be managed.
67. The Council’s Tree Officer has been consulted as part of the application and has raised no objection on arboricultural grounds similar to the previous application. The supporting arboricultural information submitted demonstrates how important trees will be afforded adequate protection throughout the development process. The Council has no objection to the proposal on arboricultural grounds subject to the use of suitable planning conditions.

Biodiversity

68. The Phase 2 Bat Emergence/re-entry Surveys and Mitigation Plan Report prepared by Darwin Ecological Ltd dated July 2018 identifies an active bat roost in the building to be demolished. Bats are a European protected species.

69. The report has been assessed by Surrey Bat Group who have identified that the findings are from well-resourced surveys, stating that “the surveys appear to have been conducted in line with current best practice and the recommendations made seem appropriate for the loss of roosts of this size” and are satisfied the works can progress subject to a licence from Natural England and the mitigation, compensation and enhancement actions set out in the report. This can be secured by condition.

70. As the trees around the development site offer foraging opportunities bat friendly lighting should be used, to preserve and enhance biodiversity. This is set out in the biodiversity enhancements of the reports submitted.

71. Other biodiversity enhancements are set out in recommendations of the report, in relation to hedgehogs, breeding birds and using native species, these can be secured by a condition.

Financial Considerations

72. 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.

73. 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.).

74. 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)

75. The proposed development is liable for CIL. The applicant has provided the relevant forms in accordance with the relevant regulations. The CIL payment would be £58,218.75.

Matters raised in Representations

76. Representations have raised issues in respect to flooding. The application site is located in Flood Zone 1 as such a flood risk assessment is not required given that the proposal is smaller than one hectare. Furthermore, the scheme is located in an area at low risk from surface water flooding and as such impacts of flooding would be negligible and would not form a material consideration of the scheme.

77. Representations have been made in respect to the consultation of the planning application. This scheme has been advertised by direct neighbour notification and site notice and as such the Council has fulfilled its statutory obligations as the Local Planning Authority.
Conclusion

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

Recommendation A

79. Permit, subject to the receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement securing a commuted sum of £15,000.00 within 3 months of the Committee resolution. Delegated authority is given to the Head of Planning Services to extend the period for completion of a satisfactory legal agreement.

Recommendation B

80. If a satisfactory legal agreement is not completed within 3 months of the Committee resolution, or an extended period as agreed by the Head of Planning, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning Services to Refuse for the following reason:


The proposed development does require a CIL payment

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: 1931-5-01; 1931-5-02; 1931-5-03; 1931-5-04; 1931-5-05; 1931-5-06; 1931-5-07; 1931-5-08; 1931-5-09; 1931-5-10; 1931-5-11 3D Image; 1931-5-12; 1931-5-13 and 1931-5-14 all received on 29th April 2019.
   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 at the first-floor level and above on the northerly (side) elevation serving en-suites and bathrooms of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscure glass that accords with level three obscurity as shown on the Pilkington textured glass privacy levels
(or similar) and only openable above a height of 1.7m above the internal floor level of the room to which it serves. The window(s) shall be permanently maintained in that condition thereafter.

Reason: To preserve the reasonable privacy of neighbouring residents in accordance with Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

5 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.

6 BAT MITIGATION STRATEGY

Prior to the commencement of any works affecting bats:

a) obtain a Bat Low Impact Class Licence (BUCL) from Natural England; and

b) carry out the development hereby approved in accordance with the details in the Method Statement, based on the mitigation, compensation and enhancement actions in Section 7 of the Phase 2 Bat Emergence/re-entry Surveys and Mitigation Plan Report prepared by Darwin Ecology dated July 2018.

Should works not commence within two years of the mitigation measures hereby approved, new surveys would be required.


7 BIODIVERSITY ENHANCEMENTS

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the enhancements set out in Table 7 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Survey by Arbtech dated 13.12.17 using native species when planting new trees and shrubs, where practicably possible.


8 HARDSTANDING & GATE DETAILS

Prior to first occupation details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of the surface materials for all hardstanding surfaces including car parking areas and driveways. All approved materials shall be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policies DM2 and DM7 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

9 NEW ACCESS

Prior to first occupation, the proposed vehicular and pedestrian accesses to New Road shall be constructed and provided with visibility zones in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 1.05m high.

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.
10 EXISTING ACCESSES
Prior to first occupation, any existing accesses from the site to New Road shall be permanently closed and any kerbs, verge or footway fully reinstated.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

11 CAR & CYCLE PARKING
Prior to first occupation, space shall be 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 purposes.

Reason: To ensure parking provision is maintained and prevent any obstructive parking, in accordance with Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

12 ELECTRIC CHARGING POINTS
The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until at least two of the available parking spaces are provided with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirement: 7kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230 v AC 32 amp single phase dedicated supply) 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 the NPPF.

13 METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION STATEMENT
NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL COMMENCE UNTIL A CONSTRUCTION TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT PLAN, TO INCLUDE DETAILS OF [DELETE WHERE APPROPRIATE]:
(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) PROVISION OF BOUNDARY HOARDING BEHIND ANY VISIBILITY ZONES
(f) HGV DELIVERIES AND HOURS OF OPERATION
(g) VEHICLE ROUTING
(h) MEASURES TO PREVENT THE DEPOSIT OF MATERIALS ON THE HIGHWAY
(i) BEFORE AND AFTER CONSTRUCTION CONDITION SURVEYS OF THE HIGHWAY AND A COMMITMENT TO FUND THE REPAIR OF ANY DAMAGE CAUSED
(j) NO HGV MOVEMENTS TO OR FROM THE SITE SHALL TAKE PLACE BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 8.30 AND 9.15 AM AND 3.15 AND 4.00 PM (ADJUST AS NECESSARY ACCORDING TO INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL START AND FINISH TIMES) NOR SHALL THE CONTRACTOR PERMIT ANY HGVs ASSOCIATED WITH THE DEVELOPMENT AT THE SITE TO BE LAID UP, WAITING, IN (SPECIFY NAMED ROADS) DURING THESE TIMES
(k) 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.

14 VISIBILITY ZONES
The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the proposed vehicular and pedestrian accesses to New Road have been constructed and provided with
visibility zones in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 1.05m high.

Reason: The above conditions are required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

15 ACCESS REINSTATEMENT
The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until any existing accesses from the site to New Road have been permanently closed and any kerbs, verge or footway fully reinstated.

Reason: The above conditions are required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

16 TURNING SPACE
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 purposes.

Reason: The above conditions are required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

17 TREES PRE-COMMENCEMENT MEETING
No development including groundworks and demolition shall take place and no equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site for the purposes of the development until a pre-commencement meeting has been held on site and attended by a suitable qualified arboriculturist, representative from the Local Planning Authority and the site manager/foreman. To agree working procedures and the precise position of the approved tree protection measures or/and that all tree protection measures have been installed in accordance with the approved tree protection plan(s) Dryad Tree Specialists 3 New Road Esher Tree Protection Plan Drawing No. D2468.A 1.TPP.Rev2.Scheme3 The tree protection measures shall be maintained for the course of the development works.

To arrange a pre-commencement meeting please email tplan@elmbridge.gov.uk with the application reference and contact details.

Reason: To protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality and reduce the risk to protected and retained trees. This is required to be a pre-commencement condition as the details go to the heart of the planning permission.

18 TREES PROTECTION MEASURES
No development including groundworks and demolition and no equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site for the purposes of the development until all tree protection measures have been installed in the positions identified on the approved tree protection plan(s) Dryad Tree Specialists 3 New Road Esher Tree Protection Plan Drawing No. D2468.A 1.TPP.Rev2.Scheme3 and maintained for the course of the development. The development thereafter shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details and method statements contained Dryad Tree Specialists Arboricultural Report 3 New Road Esher November 2017.

Reason: To protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality and reduce the risk to protected and retained trees. This is required to be a pre-commencement condition as the details go to the heart of the planning permission.

19 TREES SITE SUPERVISION
The completion schedule/report of all the agreed arboricultural site supervision and monitoring as approved in the arboricultural information Dryad Tree Specialists Arboricultural Report 3 New Road Esher November 2017 Section 24.0, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within 20 working days of the substantial completion of the development hereby approved, these details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by
the Local Planning Authority. This shall include evidence of compliance through supervision and monitoring of the agreed activities by a suitably qualified arboriculturist.

Reason: To protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality and reduce the risk to protected and retained trees.

20 TREES RETENTION
All existing and trees, hedges or hedgerows shall be retained, unless shown on the approved drawings as being removed 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, hedge or hedgerow shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be pruned other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars. Any pruning shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998: 2010 (tree work) and in accordance with any approved supplied arboricultural information.

b) if any retained tree, hedge or hedgerow is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree, hedge or hedgerow of similar size and species shall be planted at the same place, in the next available planting season or sooner.

Reason: To protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality and reduce the risk to protected and retained landscape features.

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 DRAINAGE CHANNEL/CULVERT OR WATER COURSE
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 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/beama-guide-to-electric-vehicle-infrastructure.html for guidance and further information on charging modes and connector types.

4 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.
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- **FRONT ELEVATION - extension as approved (ref 2006/0585)**
  - EAVE 54.515
  - RIDGE 56.656

- **FRONT ELEVATION - as existing**

- **REAR ELEVATION - extension as approved (ref 2006/0585)**
  - EAVE 54.515
  - RIDGE 56.656

- **REAR ELEVATION - as existing**

- **SIDE ELEVATION - extension as approved (ref 2006/0585)**

- **SIDE ELEVATION - as existing**

- **FIRST FLOOR - extension as approved (ref 2006/0585)**

- **GROUND FLOOR**

Note: windows were granted approval in side elevation facing no. 5. This would have caused overlooking. The new proposed scheme DOES NOT have side facing windows.

Note: there is a window in the existing side elevation facing no. 5. The new proposed scheme DOES NOT have side facing windows.

Approved GIA area 369sqm

Existing GIA area 277sqm

Note: windows were granted approval in side elevation facing no. 5. This would have caused overlooking. The new proposed scheme DOES NOT have side facing windows.
It is not possible to look into the house at no. 5 from these windows.

obscured glazing to windows - these are WC windows

width and height reduced from previous scheme

width and height reduced from previous scheme

note - there is NO looking into opposite house at no. 5

balcony set back within side piers - there is no overlooking to no. 5 and it is not possible to lean over railings
The Manor Farm, 124 Manor Road, North Thames Ditton, KT7 0BH
Tel: 020 8191 6812
email: jmartinarchitects@btconnect.com

This drawing is copyright © 2019 J Martin Architects Ltd.
FLAT ROOF
Grey finish
(fibre glass, single ply membrane or similar)

FALL ARREST SYSTEM TO BE FITTED

ROOF PLAN

SECOND FLOOR PLAN
FLAT 3 = 184sqm (1980 sqft)
balcony area = 5sqm

TOTAL GIA FLATS
(exc common parts)
538sqm (5790sqft)

TOTAL GIA BUILDING
(inc common parts)
599sqm (6447sqft)

This drawing is copyright © 2019 J Martin Architects Ltd.

The footprint is similar to existing buildings on site, and is considerably less than adjacent buildings. Therefore, it cannot be considered as overdevelopment of site.

Position of building within the plot is better than existing - gaps between adjacent property is better.

The impact of elevational massing is better than approved extension to existing.

The elevational massing of both neighbouring buildings is much greater.

It cannot be considered the building has excessive bulk or mass compared to neighbouring building or compared to what had previously been approved.
EXISTING HOUSE

EXISTING HOUSE WITH EXTENSION AS APPROVED (ref 2006/0585)

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
PEDESTRIAN ACCESS TO ADJACENT FLAT DEVELOPMENT AT NO. 1 NEW ROAD. THERE IS NO PAVEMENT ALONG NEW ROAD FROM THE GATE - ONLY A CROSSING POINT. THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS ON PORTSMOUTH ROAD - SEE BELOW.

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS TO ADJACENT FLAT DEVELOPMENT AT NO. 1 NEW ROAD. THERE IS NO PAVEMENT ALONG NEW ROAD FROM THE GATE - ONLY A CROSSING POINT. THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS ON PORTSMOUTH ROAD - SEE BELOW.

RE: NEW DEVELOPMENT AT 3 NEW ROAD, Esher

PROPOSED NEW FLATS
3 NEW ROAD ROAD, Esher KT10 9PG

Drawing
CAR TURNING & PEDESTRIAN ACCESS
Scale: 1:250(A3) OR 1:500

This drawing is copyright © 2019 J Martin Architects Ltd.
Bellus Double Wheelie Bin Storage for 240 Litre Bins Dimensions

**Proposed Bin & Bike Storage**
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**Proposed New Flats**
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**Project**

**Scale**

**Date**

**Drawing No.**

---

**Project**

**Proposed New Flats**

3 New Road Road, Esher KT10 9PG

**Scale**

**Date**

**Drawing No.**

---

**Proposed Bin & Bike Storage**

---

**Plot 1, 2 and 3**

Pent house bike shed (Tigersheds)

size = **7'x3'** (2050 x 850 x 1590)

---

**BIN STORAGE**

Individual propriety bin store enclosures to hold:

- 3no. 240l bin for general waste (GW)
- 3no. 240l litre bin for recycled waste (RW)
- 3no. individual food bins

2no. 240l bins for garden waste provided in behind communal access gate

---

**BIKE STORAGE**

---

**Wheelie Bin Storage Direct**

---

---

---

---

---
PROPOSED NEW FLATS
3 NEW ROAD ROAD, Esher KT10 9PG

TREES

Screening retained to rear boundary

Existing hedge to be trimmed & thinned back as necessary

Reduce number trees as per tree report recommendation

NOTE: there will be NO trees removed along this boundary therefore screening retained

Existing hedges to be trimmed back

position of building taken from OS plan

line of proposed building

line of existing house

screening retained

NOTE: this drawing is copyright © 2019 J Martin Architects Ltd.