

55 Christ Church Mount, Epsom, Surrey, KT19 8LZ

Demolition of existing detached dwelling house and construction of a new detached dwelling house

Ward:	Stamford
Contact Officer:	James Udall

1 Plans and Representations

- 1.1 The Council now holds this information electronically. Please click on the following link to access the plans and representations relating to this application via the Council's website, which is provided by way of background information to the report. Please note that the link is current at the time of publication, and will not be updated.

Link: <http://eplanning.epsom-ewell.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=OQTOF0G YGW100>

2 Summary

- 2.1 This application proposes the demolition of an existing dwelling and the erection of a detached house with associated parking.
- 2.2 This application has been submitted to committee at the request of Councillors Tina Mountain and Martin Olney.
- 2.3 The application is recommended for APPROVAL**

3 Site description

- 3.1 The application site, which has an area of 1,360m², is located on the north-western side of Christ Church Mount. The application site comprises of a two storey detached dwelling with a hipped roof. The property is set back from the road by a small front garden and is characterised by a two storey front projection with a gable roof and has a two-storey side projection with an integral garage. The property also has a part single/part two-storey rear projection.
- 3.2 The adjacent property to south No.53 is a detached bungalow with a single storey front projection under a gable roof. No.53 has an attached garage and single storey side projection and a rear porch. The adjacent dwelling to the north No.57 is a two storey detached dwelling with a single storey front projection under a catslide roof. No.57 has a two-storey side/rear extension with an integral garage. The property also has a single storey side/rear extension.
- 3.3 The site falls within a predominately residential area, characterised by relatively large detached dwellings of traditional appearance and scale with a number of properties being extended.

4 Proposal

- 4.1 This application seeks permission to demolish the existing dwelling and erect a new detached house in its place.
- 4.2 The replacement house would be of traditional style, with a crowned roof. The proposed dwelling would also have a two storey front projection under a gable feature. The proposed property would also have an integral garage, a single storey rear projection and a rear pergola.

5 Comments from third parties

- 5.1 The application was advertised by means of letters of notification to 11 neighbouring properties. To date (24.08.2017) 18 letters of objection have been received from 14 neighbouring dwellings regarding:
- Not in keeping.
 - Adverse Visual Impact.
 - Design.
 - Impact on Character.
 - Privacy.
 - Drainage/Flooding.
 - Generation of Noise and Disruption.
 - Contrary to policy
 - The extent of construction and the full height windows to the rear would affect the privacy of No 57 and reduce the daylight to the SW corner rooms.
 - It appears that this revised application fails to address fully all the objections that led to the refusal of the previous application, in particular, the design, bulk and layout of the proposed building is out of character with properties in the immediate and wider area.
 - The side wall is 2.0m from the boundary with No 53. The Householder Applications Supplementary Planning Guidance section 3.6 requires the distance from the side wall to the boundary to be a minimum of 2.5m.
 - The rear wall extends 1.3m beyond the rear wall of No 53. Section 3.2 of the Single Plot and other types of Residential Infill Supplementary Planning Guidance, states that the new building should not project beyond the adjoining building if it is closer to the boundary than 3m.

- The proposed increased eaves level and roof height gives an unnecessary bulky appearance for the plan area of the proposed structure. It does not complement the adjacent properties. The proposed roof level has been raised to the roof ridge level of No 57. However, the proposed structure has an 8 m by 8 m (64m²) flat roof area at this level, which significantly increases the bulk of the structure. The new footprint is stated as being 21% greater than the existing but it is much greater in volume than the existing house.
- Previously the original house has been extended to its current form.
- The introduction of roof eaves has extended the proposed building line, defined by the roof line of the proposed structure. The proposed perimeter of the North side of the proposed roof to within 500mm of the property boundary and building line of No 57.
- Drawing No.AO4.21 appears to show a fence line between No 55 and No57. This does not exist.
- The proposed first floor rear building line should not extend beyond the building line of our first floor.
- The proposed single storey extension to the rear should not extend beyond our single storey building line. The proposed single storey roof level is 0.5m above our single storey roof level. Our internal floor to ceiling height is 2.5m and so the proposed roof height appears excessive.
- The ground floor window to the garage on the north side elevation nearest the front of the proposed structure is directly opposite our lounge window in the south elevation which will affect our privacy. Our window is not shown on the submitted proposed plans. The proposed window should be removed or be above internal head height and have obscured glass.
- The numerous windows in the flank walls would also adversely affect neighbour privacy unless they were glazed with obscured glass.
- We have concerns that the design at present will allow further development under permitted development rights which will affect our privacy.
- Others have argued that the development is sustainable, however as the applicant has pointed out, the average Baufritz house take 78 years to become carbon neutral. Bearing in mind this is a prefab house, 78 years is probably longer than it will last. This also takes no account of the environmental damage, waste disposal and carbon footprint involved in demolishing a perfectly good existing house.
- The surface water design does not adequately address the surface water run-off from the rear garden and does not stop surface water from flowing on to our property.

- Research commissioned by the Government-funded Empty Homes Agency compared the amount of carbon dioxide given off in building new homes and in refurbishing old ones. They found that building a new home emitted four and-a-half times as much carbon dioxide as refurbishing an existing dwelling.
 - The roof configuration lends itself to conversion to a living space at some point in the future and this might cause further privacy issues.
 - The demolition, basement groundworks and duration of the build, will cause unreasonable disturbance.
 - The proposed construction using prefabricated modular units is inflexible leading to infringements. The use of modular units leads to extra height and a large basement and roof space.
 - There should be a construction method statement, detailing how the prefabricated units will be delivered and craned into place, without road closures. Although residential, the road includes a large primary school, which leads to heavy traffic twice a day.
 - The local comments about flooding have not been understood by the applicant or SCC. The old field drains of the former marshy Manor Park were damaged by house building in the 1990s. Since then the back gardens of 49 to 57 flood during heavy rain and drain sideways into the ditch that runs between 57 and 59, continuing between 32 and 34. The proposed basement will attract this ground water. If heavy rain occurs during construction, the excavation could collapse.
 - Impact on outlook, overbearing, loss of daylight/sunlight and overlooking to No 53 and No.55 Christ Church Mount.
 - The submitted drawings do not show the flank windows of No.57 which would be overlooked by the proposal.
- 5.2 To date (24.08.2017) 4 letters of objection have been received from 4 dwellings situated outside Epsom & Ewell Borough Council regarding:
- Not in keeping.
 - Adverse Visual Impact.
 - Design.
 - Impact on Character.
 - Privacy.
 - Drainage/Flooding.
 - Generation of Noise and Disruption.
 - Contrary to policy

- 5.3 To date (24.08.2017) three letters of representation have been received from the Epsom Civic Society supporting the new design of proposed front elevation and the external materials but raising concerns with regard to the quality of the drawings and neighbour amenity.
- 5.4 To date (24.08.2017) 12 letters of support from 11 neighbouring dwellings have been received regarding:
- Sustainability
 - Drainage
 - Design
 - Scale

6 Consultations

- 6.1 County Highway Authority: No objections.
- 6.2 Surrey County Council: We are satisfied that the proposed drainage scheme meets the requirements set out in the aforementioned documents and can recommend outline planning permission is granted. We would however recommend that should outline planning permission be granted, that suitably worded conditions are applied to ensure that the SuDS Scheme is properly implemented and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development (please see below).
- 6.3 Ecology Officer: "I think the ecology report for this is ok. I think we should have a condition relating bat boxes built in to the building. The report suggests a bat box on a tree, however these are not as durable and only last a limited time".

7 Relevant planning history

Reference number	Proposal	Decision	Decision date
16/00544/PREAPP	demolition of existing house and construction of a new build detached dwelling on the same site	Pre-App Completed	27 July 2016
16/01074/FUL	Demolition of existing detached dwelling house and construction of a new detached dwelling house on the same site.	Application Refused	17 February 2017

8 Planning Policy

NPPF 2012

Chapter 7: Paragraphs 56-68 Requiring Good Design

Core Strategy 2007

Policy CS1	General Policy
Policy CS3	Biodiversity and Nature Conservation
Policy CS5	Built Environment
Policy CS6	Sustainable Development
Policy CS7	Housing Provision
Policy CS8	Housing Location
Policy CS16	Highways

Development Management Policies Document 2015

Policy DM4	Biodiversity and New Development
Policy DM5	Trees and Landscape
Policy DM9	Townscape Character and Local Distinctiveness
Policy DM10	Design Requirements for New Developments
Policy DM12	Housing Standards
Policy DM19	Development & Flood Risk
Policy DM37	Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Sustainable Design 2016

Parking Standards for Residential development 2015

Single Plot and Other Types of Infill Development Planning Guidance 2003

Householder Applications: Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004

9 Planning considerations

Principle of Development

9.1 The redevelopment of this site within an already developed residential area is an appropriate and sustainable location for such development and in principle accords with the policies contained within national and local planning policy.

Visual Impact and Design

9.2 Planning permission was originally refused for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of a new property under reference: 16/01074/FUL. One of the reasons for refusal was because of its design, bulk, scale, siting and layout, which was at odds with the prevailing dwelling typology in the immediate and wider area, and the new dwelling was therefore seen as an incongruous element in the street scene.

9.3 The revised application has taken a traditional design approach to the front elevation, which respects the character of the area. The eaves height of the proposed dwelling, while higher than the existing dwelling, would be approximately 0.5m lower than the previous proposal, which reduces the bulk and scale of the proposed dwelling.

- 9.4 While the proposed eaves are still higher than the eaves of No.57, a detailed assessment of eaves heights has been carried out.
- 9.5 This assessment shows that there are a number of dwellings in the area, which have differing eaves levels. For example while No.33-39 have similar eaves levels, No.41 and No.43 are higher. No.55, No.57 and No.59 have similar eaves levels however, No.59 appears to have a marginally higher eaves height to No.57. Similarly on the other side of Christ Church Mount there is variation.
- 9.6 It is therefore considered that the proposed eaves would not be so much higher than neighbouring properties so as to harm the character and appearance of the area.
- 9.5 The existing dwelling has a width of approximately 11.3m while the proposed dwelling would have a width 12m. The existing dwelling has a maximum height of 8.3m while the proposed dwelling would have a maximum height of 8.8m. The proposed dwelling would not be significantly wider or greater in height than the existing dwelling.
- 9.6 The building would be sited 2m from the shared boundary with No.53 and 1.2m from the shared boundary with No.57. The gaps between the houses in this road differ in size considerably. The proposed gaps to the boundaries would not therefore be out of keeping in the area. It is felt that the proposed dwelling would sit comfortably within the application site.
- 9.7 The proposed dwelling would have a similar overall height to the existing property at No.57. The application property differs to No.57, in that the neighbouring dwelling has a taller roof and because the application property's roof is crowned, it allows a taller building to the eaves. There is some variety with the roof forms in the road, in that they differ slightly in scale and design. The proposed crown roof would therefore not harm the visual appearance or character of the area.
- 9.8 It is concluded therefore, that the proposed scheme in terms of its design, scale and massing would sit comfortably within the plot and would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of both the immediate and wider area and would therefore accord with Policy DM9 and DM10.

Residential Amenity

- 9.9 Concerns have been raised that the proposal would fail to comply with the Council's Single Plot and other Types of Infill Development Supplementary Planning Guidance and the Householder Extensions SPG.
- 9.10 The Single Plot and Other Types of Infill Development Planning Guidance advises that the rearward projection of any new building at first floor level should not normally exceed the rear building line of the adjoining building where the new building is within 3 metres of the common boundary.
- 9.11 While the first floor of the proposed dwelling would not project the rear building line of No.57 (as extended), it would project past the rear building line of No.53.

- 9.12 However, the Single Plot and Other Types of Infill Development Planning Guidance is only best practice advice and other material planning consideration must be taken into consideration when assessing an application and considering whether a proposal would harm the outlook, privacy, daylight and amenities of neighbouring occupants.
- 9.13 The two storey built form of the proposed dwelling would not encroach over 45-degree line taken from the edge of the rear windows of neighbouring occupants.
- 9.14 It is noted the proposed dwelling would encroach over a 45-degree angle taken from the edge of windows in the flank elevation of No.53 and No.57. However, this does not form part of the test criteria. Furthermore, the built form of the dwelling would be sited approximately 5.2m from the flank windows of No.53 and 4m from the flank windows at No.57. Due to the separation distance retained, it is not considered that the proposal would have a significantly harmful impact on the outlook of or light received by neighbouring occupants.
- 9.15 Concerns have been raised that the proposal would harm the daylight of neighbouring occupants at No.53. The SPG on householder extensions advises that two storey extensions should not encroach over a 43-degree daylight angle take form a point 2.5m above the shared boundary with neighbouring occupants.
- 9.16 While this is normally only used for extensions, it can also be used by proposals for replacement dwellings to ensure that the proposal would not harm the daylight of neighbouring occupants, but it is advice only. However, when using this approach a balancing exercise must be undertaken taking into account the existing property's effect on the daylight of neighbouring occupants.
- 9.17 The existing property does not breach the daylight angle with regard to No.53 but does with regard to No.57. The proposed dwelling would breach the 43-degree daylight angle with regard to No.57 but not by a significant degree and it is noted that the rooms affected by any potential loss of light would be sited approximately 5.2m from the proposed dwelling. The proposed dwelling would not therefore result in a significant loss of light to neighbouring occupants and it would not be justified to recommend that planning permission be refused in this instance.
- 9.18 Concerns were also raised by occupants at No.57 that due to the height, depth and design of the proposed dwelling, the proposal would result in a loss of light to the nearest first floor rear bedroom window at No.57, which has a flank and rear window.
- 9.19 It is noted that the two-storey rear element of the proposed dwelling would encroach over a 43-degree daylight angle taken from the shared boundary with No.57 however the new dwelling would be sited 4m from the side of the first floor window, which would leave enough space to allow daylight into the first floor bedroom.

- 9.20 Furthermore, the window continues along the rear elevation and as previously noted the proposed two-storey element of the new dwelling would not encroach over a 45-degree angle taken from the edge of the rear window.
- 9.21 Concerns were raised that the full height doors at ground floor level on the flank elevation facing No.53 would result in a loss of privacy. The proposed doors would be sited 2m from the shared boundary with No.53 and would face onto screening which would obscure views. Due to the separation distance and screening retained, the proposed doors would not significantly harm the privacy of neighbouring occupants.
- 9.22 The proposed dwelling would have ground and first floor flank windows close to the boundary with neighbouring occupants. However, the privacy of neighbouring occupants could be adequately protected by the imposition of a condition requiring the first floor windows to be obscure glazed and fixed shut up to a point 1.7m above internal floor area.
- 9.23 The applicant has stated that the chosen windows would not fix shut but that the window would be only openable in such a way as to reduce any overlooking concerns. It is considered that this could be acceptable but the detail would need to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for assessment. A suitably worded condition is recommended.
- 9.24 Concerns were also raised by neighbouring occupants that the proposal would have full height rear windows at first floor level which would cause overlooking. The SPG advises that two storey extensions should avoid full height windows. However, it should be noted that this is guidance only and provided there was no significant loss of privacy, this would be acceptable,
- 9.25 In this instance, the proposed windows would be sited approximately 3.3m from the shared boundary with No.53 and 2.7m from the shared boundary with No.57. It is considered that an adequate separation distance would be retained to ensure that the proposed windows would not harm the privacy of neighbouring occupants.
- 9.26 Comments were received by neighbouring occupants that the proposed windows should not be used as balconies. The proposed windows would not have balconies and planning permission would be required should the owner wish to install any.
- 9.28 Given that the proposed single storey rear projection could potentially be used as a balcony a condition is recommended to address this issue.
- 9.29 In conclusion, the proposed scheme will not result in any significant loss of light, outlook privacy or be overbearing such that permission should be refused. The proposals would therefore accord with Policy DM10.

Amenity Space

- 9.30 The rear garden of the dwelling would be in excess of the minimum required depth and area of 10m and 70m² respectively, and would therefore comply with policy DM12's requirement for amenity space for new dwellings.

Layout

- 9.31 Policy DM12 requires a minimum of 128m² of internal floor area for a 5 bedroom 8 person two storey dwelling. The proposed dwelling, with a gross internal floor area of approximately 142.7m², would meet this requirement. The scheme can therefore be considered to be compliant with Policy DM12

Parking/Access

- 9.32 The new dwelling would provide one parking space within a detached garage, and a further two spaces could be accommodated within the paved driveway. This would comply with the Council's adopted parking standards, which require 4+ bedroom houses to provide 3 spaces per unit.
- 9.33 The Highway Authority has no objection in principle to the development.

Sustainability and Renewable Energy

- 9.34 Core Strategy Policy CS6 requires proposals to demonstrate how sustainable construction and design can be incorporated to improve the energy efficiency of development. A Sustainability Statement has been submitted to demonstrate how the proposal would secure an energy efficient design and minimise its environmental impact.
- 9.35 An appropriate condition requiring these details could reasonably be imposed on any permission granted.
- 9.36 It is noted that concerns have been raised by neighbours over how long it would take for the property to become carbon neutral and comments have been received stating that it would better for the applicant to retain the dwelling and add sustainable technology.
- 9.37 The Sustainability Statement submitted states that Baufritz Houses have triple glazed windows and due to their construction would have a high degree of airtightness, which would reduce the amount of energy required to heat the building. The Statement also advises that an average Baufritz house can effectively store CO² emissions for a period of 78 years and would normally include ventilation systems with heat recovery and rain water harvesting while the timber used for the house would be logged from sustainable forests. It is considered that this could be controlled by a suitably worded condition.
- 9.38 Furthermore, the submitted plans show that the proposed dwelling would have solar hot water panels.
- 9.39 It is considered that on balance, the proposed dwelling would comply with this part of Policy CS6. No objection is raised in this instance.

Ecology

- 9.40 Policy DM4 of the Development Management Policy Document states that every opportunity should be taken to secure net benefit to the Borough's biodiversity.

- 9.41 The applicants have submitted a Bat and Bird Scoping Survey, which found no evidence of roosting bats or birds. The Local Planning Authority Ecology Officer has found the report to be acceptable.
- 9.42 The Ecology Officer has requested a condition requiring bat boxes to be built in to the dwelling. The report suggests a bat box on a tree, however the Ecology Officer is of the opinion that these types of boxes are not as durable and only last a limited time. Notwithstanding the above, the proper placement of bird and bat boxes could be controlled by the imposition of a condition requiring, details and location of the installation of bat and bird boxes to enhance the biodiversity interest of the site to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
- 9.43 In view of the above and the proposed mitigation measures, it is considered that the proposed scheme would be in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS3 and Policy DM4.

Drainage and Flooding

- 9.44 Concerns have been raised by neighbours that the proposal would result in an increase in risk of flooding. A Site Runoff and SUDs Report has been submitted as part of the application and has been assessed by Surrey County Council Sustainable Drainage and Consenting Team who have raised no objection to the proposal but have advised that drainage conditions be imposed on any grant of planning permission.
- 9.45 It is noted that neighbouring occupants have stated that “the local comments about flooding have not been understood by the applicant or SCC. The old field drains of the former marshy Manor Park were damaged by house building in the 1990s. Since then the back gardens of 49 to 57 flood during heavy rain and drain sideways into the ditch that runs between 57 and 59, continuing between 32 and 34. The proposed basement will attract this ground water. If heavy rain occurs during construction, the excavation could collapse”.
- 9.46 As previously noted SCC have assessed the proposal and have not raised any objection to the scheme. The application site is not within a flood zone and any further drainage matters would be a building control matter. It would therefore not be justified to recommend that planning permission be refused on this basis.

Other Matters

- 9.47 Concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupants that the proposed dwelling could be further extended at a later date, without planning permission under permitted development rights, which would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring occupants.
- 9.48 It is justified in this instance to impose a condition removing permitted development rights.

Community Infrastructure Levy

- 9.27 The proposed scheme is CIL liable.

10 Conclusion

- 10.1 The proposal seeks to erect a new residential building in a location, which is considered appropriate. The new building would not harm the wider character of the area, nor lead to a loss of neighbouring residential amenities. In light of the above, it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

11 Recommendation

- 11.1 Planning permission is GRANTED subject to the following conditions:**

Conditions:

- (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.**

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (2) Prior to the commencement of development, details and samples of the external materials to be used for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To secure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the visual amenities and character of the locality in accordance with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies 2015.

- (3) No development shall take place until full details, of both hard and soft landscape proposals, including a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved landscape scheme (with the exception of planting, seeding and turfing) shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved and thereafter retained.**

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of an appropriate landscape scheme in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM5 and DM9 of the Development Management Policies 2015.

- (4) Prior to the commencement of the development details of sustainability measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall demonstrate how the development would be efficient in the use of energy, water and materials including means of providing the energy requirements of the development from renewable technologies. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the building, shall be maintained as such thereafter and**

no change shall take place without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that measures to make the development sustainable and efficient in the use of energy, water and materials are included in the development in accordance with Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy (2007).

- (5) The residential unit hereby approved shall not be occupied until they have achieved a water efficiency standard using not more than 110 litres per person per day maximum indoor water consumption.**

Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of water to comply with Policy DM12 of the Development Management Policies 2015.

- (6) No development shall take place until details and location of the installation of bat and bird boxes to enhance the biodiversity interest of the site have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved and thereafter maintained.**

Reason: To enhance biodiversity and nature habitats in accordance with Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policy DM4 of the Development Management Policies 2015.

- (7) Access to the flat roof area of the development hereby permitted shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only and the flat roof shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden, patio or similar amenity area.**

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of the occupants of adjoining properties in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Development Management Policies 2015.

- (8) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending those Orders with or without modification), planning permission shall be required in respect of development falling within Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H of that Order.**

Reason: To ensure that development within the permitted Classes in question is not carried out in such a way as to prejudice the appearance of the proposed development or the amenities of future occupants of the development or the occupiers of adjoining property in accordance with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM10 and DM12 of the Development Management Policies 2015.

- (9) The first floor flank windows and the garage window of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscure glass of no less than obscurity level 3, and shall thereafter be permanently retained as such.**

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of the occupants of adjoining properties in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015.

- (10) Prior to the commencement of development, details and samples of the proposed windows, especially the side windows, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To secure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the visual amenities and character of the locality in accordance with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies 2015.

- (11) Works related to the construction of the development hereby permitted, including works of demolition or preparation prior to building operations shall not take place other than between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 hours Mondays to Fridays; 08.00 to 13.00 hours Saturdays; with no work on Saturday afternoons (after 13.00 hours), Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays.**

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Development Management Policies 2015.

- (12) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until the detailed design of the surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. Those details shall include:**

a) A design that satisfies the SuDS Hierarchy and follows the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy

b) Detailed drawings showing drainage layout, long or cross sections of each drainage element, pipe sizes and invert and cover levels.

c) Appropriate calculations to the elements above showing how the national SuDS standards have been met (if different from approved strategy).

d) Details of outline construction phasing and how surface water and any associated pollution risk will be dealt with during the construction of the development, and how any on site drainage systems will be protected and maintained

e) Details of where any exceedance flows (i.e. rainfall greater than design or flows following blockages) would run to, avoiding risks to people and property.

Reason: To ensure the design meets the technical stands for SuDS, does not increase flood risk on or off site and is suitable maintained throughout its lifetime in accordance with Policy CS6 of the Core

Strategy (2007) and Policy DM19 of the Development Management Policies 2015.

- (13) Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the Sustainable Urban Drainage System has been constructed as per the agreed scheme.**

Reason: To ensure the Sustainable Drainage System is designed to the technical standards in accordance with Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policy DM19 of the Development Management Policies 2015.

- (14) No part of the development, hereby approved shall commence until evidence has been submitted to, and approved by the council, outlining how the development shall achieve not less than a 10% saving in energy requirements.**

Reason: To ensure that measures to make the development sustainable and efficient in the use of energy, water and materials are included in the development in accordance with Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy (2007).

- (15) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:**

- A03.01 Proposed Site Plan**
- A04.01 Proposed Basement Plan**
- A04.02 Proposed Ground Floor Plan**
- A04.03 Proposed First Floor Plan**
- A04.04 Proposed Attic Plan**
- A04.05 Proposed Roof Plan**
- A04.10 Proposed Section**
- A04.20 Proposed Front Elevation**
- A04.21 Proposed Rear Elevation**
- A04.22 Proposed South Elevation**
- A04.23 Proposed North Elevation**
- A04.25 Existing & Proposed Street Elevation**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning as required by Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy 2007

Informatives:

- (1) The Council confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of paragraph 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- (2) The water efficiency standard required under condition **5** has been adopted by the local planning authority through the Development Management Policies 2015. This standard is the 'optional requirement' detailed in Building Regulations 2010, Part G Approved Document (AD) Buildings Regulations (2015), at Appendix A paragraph A1.

The applicant is advised that this standard can be achieved through either:

(a) using the 'fittings approach' where water fittings are installed as per the table at 2.1 in the AD or

(b) using the water efficiency calculation methodology detailed in the AD Part G Appendix A.

- (3) The applicant should note that under the terms of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, it is an offence to disturb nesting birds or roosting bats which are also European Protected Species.

You should note that the work hereby granted consent does not override the statutory protection afforded to these and other protected species and you are advised to seek expert advice if you suspect that the demolition would disturb any protected species. Please note that a European Protected Species Licence will be required to allow the proposed development to proceed lawfully. Further details can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/environmental-management/wildlife-habitat-conservation>

- (4) This form of development is considered liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). CIL is a non-negotiable charge on new developments which involve the creation of 100 square metres or more of gross internal floorspace or involve the creation of a new dwelling, even when this is below 100 square metres. The levy is a standardised, non-negotiable charge expressed as pounds per square metre, and are charged on the net additional floorspace generated by a development.

You will receive more information regarding the CIL in due course.

More information and the charging schedule are available online

<http://www.epsom-ewell.gov.uk/NR/exeres/74864EB7-F2ED-4928-AF5A-72188CBA0E14,frameless.htm?NRMODE=Published>