

7 April 2016

**Planning Applications Committee  
Update**

Item No.	App no. and site address	Report Recommendation
4 Page 13	15/1043 – 34 Curley Hill Road, Lightwater	Grant

UPDATE

A letter of objection was circulated to Members and Officer's yesterday. Officers have reviewed this and comment on the main points below:

1. The letter of complaint referred to and appended as Appendix 1 has been dealt with as a stage one complaint and a response issued on 15 March 2016.
2. The matter of the missing consultee response from Windlesham Parish has been investigated by the Technical Services Team Leader who advises that only one response has been received (dated 4/3/2016) and this is publically available.
3. There are 9 letters of objection to the proposal and two letters of support. The Parish Council comments are reported as an objection at paragraph 5.2 of the committee report in line with Council procedures.
4. The summary of objections in the committee report at 6.3 should include a reference to the proposal's impact on the privacy of No.32 as this was raised in a letter of objection rec'd 24/2/2016. This omission does not, however, affect the validity of the officer assessment as the proposal's impact on the privacy of the occupiers of No.32 is considered in full in the committee report.
5. Appendix 2 – repeats a list of applications the author considers comparable to the current application. However, as Members are aware, each application has to be assessed on its own merits. Moreover, amenity considerations are site specific and as such just because an extension was considered to be harmful in one location does not mean that the same extension would be harmful in another. In addition, officers are of the opinion that none of the applications listed as being 'comparable' are materially similar to the current application.
6. The comments made in respect of para 7.3.7 are noted, however the officer's assessment is considered appropriate.
7. The comments made in respect of para 7.4.3 are noted – for the avoidance of doubt this para refers to the side elevation facing the shared boundary with No.32. With regards to Appendix 3 – the diagrams and details provided are noted, however the two storey element of the extension is set a minimum of 4.3m from the shared boundary with No.32 and this, as set out in the officer's report, is considered acceptable.
8. The comments made in respect of para 7.4.4 and Appendix 5 are noted. It should be noted that while a document titled 'sun survey' was submitted with the previous application this was not a full survey or report, however

notwithstanding this officers did not object to that application on any overshadowing or loss of light grounds – indeed officers cited the following in the report prepared before the application was withdrawn *‘It is noted that the applicant has submitted a sun survey but this does not address the concern above. It is unclear what the survey is based upon and what technical standards have been used to create this plan. In any event there is no objection raised in respect of overshadowing effects or a loss of light, given the orientation of the properties’*. Having regard to the information supplied by the objector, it is not considered this provides robust evidence to demonstrate that harm significant harm would arise. Neither does the Council have any policy requirement for a technical sun study to be submitted by the applicant.

9. With regards to concerns about the impact of the proposal on a bedroom window, the reports cite existing windows on the rear elevation. In addition, the visibility of a proposal is not indicative that it would be harmful.
10. With regards to the comments about Para 7.5.3 – the impact on an un-adopted road is not a material consideration and is a private matter.
11. The format of the committee report and the citation and reference of national and local policies is in accordance with Council procedures and follows that of all other reports prepared for consideration by the Planning Applications Committee. The Committee Report is considered to address all material considerations and policy constraints.

It is noted that the wording of proposed **condition 6** could be more specific and as such it is recommended that this is **amended** as detailed below:

6. Other than for the first floor terrace shown to front elevation of the development hereby approved (above the ground floor cloak, hallway, re-treat/media room), the roof areas of the dwelling hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not affect the amenity of existing properties by overlooking in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

It is also recommended that permitted development rights for further extension or alterations to the property be removed. An **additional condition (10)** is proposed below:

10. Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any subsequent Order updating or re-enacting) there shall be no further extensions or alterations to the dwelling.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in the interests of character and amenity and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Management Policies 2012, the Lightwater Village Design Statement and the NPPF.

5 Page 33	15/1100 – Hawk Farm, Church Lane, Bisley	Grant
<p><u>UPDATE</u></p> <p>Correction to paragraph 7.6.1 – The development is not CIL liable. Therefore, delete informative 1 on page 40.</p>		
6 Page 45	77/0405/3 – Hawk Farm, Bisley	Grant

UPDATE

None.

7  
Page 49

16/0055 – 7 Tekels Way, Camberley

Grant

UPDATE

It has been brought to officers attention that the GIS map on page 59 of the committee papers incorrectly defines the application site and does not extend to its full depth.

A proposed **amendment to condition 4** is detailed below:

4. The development hereby approved shall be occupied only as residential accommodation ancillary to the use of the dwelling currently known as 7 Tekels Way and shall not be used as an independent residential unit or business premises (other than as a home office for the sole use of the occupiers of 7 Tekels Way).

Reason: To ensure that the dwelling remains in single family occupation and does not give rise to harmful impacts upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, infrastructure, character, amenity or parking provision in accordance with Policies DM9, CP11, CP12 and CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

This page is intentionally left blank