

<b>Application No:</b>	2017/0445	<b>Application Type:</b>	FULL
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Aline Goult	<b>Ward:</b>	Weybridge Riverside Ward
<b>Location:</b>	Riverside Church Walk Weybridge Surrey KT13 8JT		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Single storey side extension, 0.9m increase in ridge height incorporating front and rear dormer windows and two static moorings		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Mark Joel		
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Fabio Giulianini Dols Wong Architects The Studio 61 Brondesbury Road London NW6 6BP		
<b>Decision Level:</b>	If permit – Sub-Committee If refuse – Sub-Committee		
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Permit		

**Representations:** 22 objections from 21 households were received, commenting on the following:

- Design
- Dominance of the property in the streetscene
- Highway safety, traffic and parking
- Flood risk
- Loss of light and privacy
- Lack of affordable housing provision
- Inadequate landscaping
- Incompatibility with Green Belt policy

1 observation was also received, commenting on the risk of flooding on the application site.

**The application has been promoted by Cllr Freeman if the recommendation is to permit, and Cllr Davis if the recommendation is to refuse.**

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

## R e p o r t

### Description

1. The application site comprises a single storey end-of-terrace building located to the north-west of Church Walk and immediately abuts the River Wey on its north-west boundary. The building was formerly known as 'Church Walk Studios'.

### Constraints

2. The relevant planning constraints are:
  - Flood Zones 2 and 3b
  - Surface Water Flooding - Medium

### 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

CS4 – Weybridge

CS12 – The River Thames Corridor and its tributaries

CS17 – Local Character, Design and Density

CS26 – Flooding

#### 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  
 DM13 – Riverside development and uses  
 DM22 – Recreational uses of waterways

Design and Character SPD 2012  
 Companion Guide: Weybridge

Flood Risk SPD 2016

#### 4. Relevant Planning History

Application	Description	Decision
2016/1274	Lawful Development Certificate: Whether planning permission is required for an existing change of use from Office (Class B1) to Residential (Class C3)	Grant Lawful Development Certificate-Existing Use
2015/3135	Single storey side extension incorporating garage, single storey rear extension and front and rear dormer windows	Withdrawn
2013/4255	PD Prior Notification: Change of use from Office to Residential	Prior approval
2013/3461	PD Prior Notification: Change of use from Office to Residential	Prior approval refused
2013/2782	PD Prior Notification: Change of use from Office to Residential	Prior approval refused
2005/1612	Single storey rear conservatory extension to existing offices	Permit
2005/0594	Single storey front extension	Permit

#### Proposal

5. Planning permission is sought for a single storey side extension. This would project by 4.77m, with a depth of 8.95m, a maximum height of 5.86m and an eaves height of 2.9m.
6. Permission is also sought for a 0.9m increase in the ridge height of the existing roof over the building. The roof would incorporate front and rear dormer windows.
7. Two static moorings (one for each dwelling) are also proposed.

#### Consultations

8. British Pipeline Agency – no objection.
9. Environment Agency – no objection.
10. Surrey County Council Highways Authority - Based upon the information submitted and following a site inspection the Highway Authority has assessed the impact of the proposal on highway safety and capacity and raised no objection. The development is considered to be in accordance with Elmbridge Core Strategy Policy CS28, Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Positive and Proactive Engagement

11. In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of 186-187 of the NPPF by making available pre-application advice to

seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.

12. Pre-application advice (reference PreApp1351008) was sought prior to the submission of this application. The Officer concluded that, subject to consultation with the Highways Authority and the Environment Agency, it would be worth pursuing an application.

### **Planning Considerations**

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

- The design of the proposal and its impact on the host building, the character of the area and the streetscene
- The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties
- The impact on highway safety, access and parking
- The impact on flood risk

#### The design of the proposal and its impact on the host building, the character of the area and the streetscene

14. The single storey side extension would incorporate a pitched roof with matching side parapet detail, which would assist in its integration with the host building. The loss of the upper side-facing window is regrettable but is considered acceptable in order to accommodate the pitched roof. Although the windows on the proposed extension do not reflect the arched style of the windows on the existing building, their length mimics the style of the existing windows and it is considered that this design choice reflects the secondary role of the extension.
15. Even with the proposed increase in the ridge height of 0.9m, the ridge would be lower than that of the adjoining neighbour at 11 Camden Cottages. The dovecote feature atop the existing roof would be retained. The proposed dormer windows would be set well below the ridge height and eaves, ensuring that they do not dominate the entire roofslope. The windows themselves would mimic the arched design already present and would be broadly in alignment with the larger windows below. The adjoining terrace contains numerous examples of front and rear dormer windows, and so they are not considered to be out of character with the surrounding area.
16. The applicant has proposed a new slate roof and brick walls to match the existing building, which will help the proposal integrate into its surroundings. Bins would be located to the side of the parking area, which is considered acceptable.
17. The stretch of the River Wey on which the site is located contains a number of private moorings. The two additional moorings proposed would be of modest timber construction and are not considered to conflict with the character of the area.
18. Overall, it is not considered that the development would result in harm to the host building, the character of the area or the streetscene.

#### The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties

19. Due to the siting and scale of the proposal, it is not considered that it would result in harm to neighbouring occupiers in terms of loss of light.
20. The front-facing windows serving the single storey side extension, as well as the front dormer windows would be located in relatively close proximity to those of the opposite neighbour at 1 Camden Cottages. There is a distance of approximately 11.8m between the window serving the living room of Unit 2 and the nearest window at 1 Camden Cottages. This relationship, however, already exists between this neighbour and the large windows serving the existing building. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in additional harm to the privacy of the neighbour at 1 Camden Cottages.
21. Given that the increased ridge height would still be below that of the neighbouring property, it is not considered that an overbearing impact would arise. In addition, the single storey side extension is located a sufficient distance from neighbouring properties to ensure that it would not result in an overbearing impact.
22. Overall, it is concluded that the proposal would not result in harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, loss of privacy or overbearing impact.

### The impact on highway safety, access and parking

23. The County Highways Authority was consulted on the proposal. It was noted that the proposed development would utilise an existing vehicular access to serve the property. The building currently uses the private land fronting the site for parking. Although this area has not been included in the site as outlined on the Location Plan, it would still be available for use for parking and turning following the construction of the extension. In addition, the low vehicle speeds on this section of the road mean that the development is unlikely to result in any highway safety implications.
24. Following the construction of the extension, parking spaces on site would be available for 3 vehicles. This is in compliance with Policy DM7 (Access and parking) of the Development Management Plan 2015, which imposes a maximum parking standard of 2 spaces per four-bedroom dwelling.

### The impact on flood risk

25. An amended Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was submitted in support of this application. It identifies the site as being at risk from fluvial flooding.
26. Resistance and resilience measures have been incorporated into the scheme, including placing electrical sockets at high levels and setting the floor level 0.3m above the design flood level. These measures seek to ensure that the development remains safe for its lifetime.
27. In addition, the applicant has proposed floodable sub-floor voids as a mitigation measure. This aims to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere as a result of the development.
28. A personal flood plan was not provided. It is therefore recommended that a condition be added to the decision notice requiring the applicant to submit details of their proposed actions and escape route if flooding should occur.
29. The Environment Agency was consulted on the FRA. They had no objection to the revised FRA and recommend that the development proceeds in accordance with this document. In addition, they noted that the development may require an Environmental Permit, and an informative to this effect should be added to the decision notice to ensure that the applicant is aware of their obligations under other legislation.

### **Matters raised in Representations**

30. The material planning considerations have been addressed in the above report. The application site is not located within the Green Belt, and as such the relevant policies do not apply to this site.
31. A number of representations commented on the perceived conflict with Policy DM4 (Comprehensive development) of the Development Management Plan 2015. Although changes to Unit 3 Riverside have not been incorporated into the proposal, the plans clearly indicate that there is a separate access for Unit 3 and so it is not considered that the proposal would prevent the re-development of Unit 3 in future.
32. One objection noted that the trees previously existing on the site were felled after the purchase of the site by the current owner. These trees were not the subject of a Preservation Order and nor were they located in a Conservation Area. As such, the Council does not exercise control over their retention. The obligations of the applicant to preserve the trees under any other legislation do not form part of the planning process.
33. The disruption caused during construction and the loss of private views are not material planning considerations.
34. The application is submitted for an extension and alterations to existing dwellings. As such, the site's contribution to meeting the need for smaller houses within the Borough is not relevant. It is not eligible to pay an Affordable Housing contribution. Furthermore, given the scale of the proposed development, it is not considered that a detailed landscaping plan is required.
35. On drawing 85B, the applicant has noted that they have consulted with SKANSKA on the possible re-location of an existing lamppost at the front of the property. This is a matter outside of the remit of the Local Planning Authority.

36. One comment questioned the pre-application advice that the applicant had received. This advice is confidential and is not in the public domain. The considerations of the Officer at the pre-application stage have been re-visited in the above report.
37. One of the objections stated that an application to Historic England for the statutory listing of the existing building would be submitted. An update will be provided at the Sub-Committee meeting.

**Conclusion**

38. In light of the above and any other material considerations, it is concluded that the development is in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, the recommendation is to grant permission.