

**LOCATION:** CHERRYDALE, SPRINGFIELD ROAD, CAMBERLEY, GU15  
1AE  
**PROPOSAL:** Erection of 2 two storey extensions and one single storey  
extension with associated alterations.  
**TYPE:** Full Planning Application  
**APPLICANT:** Cherrydale Care Home  
**OFFICER:** Mr N Praise

## **RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE**

### **1.0 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The current proposal relates to an existing nursing home (Cherrydale) falling within Class C2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended). The application site is on the southern side of Springfield Road and is adjoined by residential properties to the flank sides (east and west) and also to the rear (south).
- 1.2 The current proposal is for the erection of 2 two storey extensions to the side of the nursing home and one single storey extension to the rear / side section. The extensions would increase the number of bedrooms from 20 to 30. The current proposal would also reconfigure the existing parking arrangements for the nursing home increasing the parking from 11 spaces to 14. The current proposal is not CIL liable as it relates to Class C2 development.
- 1.3 While considered acceptable on residential amenity, highway safety and Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) grounds, the proposal by reason of its size, scale, width and detailed design is not considered to respect the character of the host building or the character of the surrounding area. Additionally the loss of the mature Lime tree and future pressure to remove future trees and vegetation is also considered to further harm the wooded character of the area.

### **2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION**

- 2.1 The application site known as Cherrydale is a 21 bedroom residential care home within the settlement area of Camberley. The care home offers care for dementia sufferers and is located on the southern side of Springfield Road. The application site is within a residential area, falling within the 'Wooded Hills' character area as defined within the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012. Cherrydale is a large two storey care home building with further accommodation in the roof which currently provides accommodation for 20 residents. To the front of the application site the driveway and parking area is laid to gravel with informal parking for up to 11 vehicles. The site enjoys mature vegetation and trees both within the site and to the boundaries.
- 2.2 The application site broadly fronts onto Springfield Road and is bounded by the residential properties Ferndale, Pound Ridge, Lime Tree Cottage and Bulford Lodge Cottage in Springfield Road and number 11 Chesters Road to the rear boundary. The application site is generally level however it is noted that the wider area raises from west to east. The application property is a large early 20<sup>th</sup> century style building of some historical and architectural interest which sits in a generous plot and relates well to its boundaries.

### **3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY**

- 3.1 SU/87/1463 - Erection of three storey side extension to form seven bedrooms, kitchen, dining room and ancillary accommodation together with internal alterations in connection with existing residential home – Refused 09/12/88 on neighbour amenity grounds
- 3.2 SU/92/0666 - Erection of a three storey side extension – Refused 04/11/92 on neighbour amenity grounds
- 3.3 SU/92/0658 - Erection of a single storey rear extension (sun lounge) – approved 06/11/92
- 3.4 SU/01/0614 - Erection of a single storey extension for existing ancillary operation comprising laundry, storage, staff and consulting areas following demolition of prefabricated store/garage – approved 26/07/01

### **4.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 The current proposal is for the erection of 2 two storey extensions to the side of the nursing home and one single storey extension to the rear section. The extensions would increase the number of bedrooms from 20 to 30. The proposal would also reconfigure the existing parking arrangements for the nursing home increasing the parking from 11 spaces to 14
- 4.2 The proposed two storey east side extension would have a maximum width of approximately 7.9 metres with a maximum depth of approximately 16.6 metres. This element of the proposal would have a maximum height of approximately 6.7 metres and the roof would be of a mansard style design reducing to approximately 5.5 metres at the eaves.
- 4.3 The proposed two storey west side extension would have a maximum width of approximately 7.0 metres with a maximum depth of approximately 9.8 metres. This element of the proposal would have a maximum height of approximately 6.7 metres and the roof would be of a mansard style design reducing to approximately 5.5 metres at the eaves. The applicants also propose to install a fire escape staircase to the western side of the proposed two storey extension and this would measure approximately 2.1 metres in width and approximately 4.2m in length. This staircase would have a maximum height of approximately 4.1m (to the handrail of the fire escape).
- 4.4 The proposed single storey rear extension would be of 'L' shape design and would have a maximum width of approximately 8.7 metres reducing to approximately 4.0 metres. This element of the proposal would extend to a maximum depth of 12.4 metres and would have a maximum height of approximately 3.6 metres and the roof would be of a mansard style design reducing to approximately 2.8 metres at the eaves.
- 4.5 Four trees are proposed to be felled to facilitate the development. These include a Portuguese laurel to the rear of the site and a Lime tree, a Lawson cypress an ornamental tree to the front of the site to allow for the additional car parking spaces to be created.
- 4.6 The existing access would be retained and the existing parking area would be reconfigured to provide 3 additional parking space (total therefore of 14 parking spaces) to serve this development.

## 5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- |     |                                 |   |
|-----|---------------------------------|---|
| 5.1 | Surrey County Highway Authority | No objections.  |
| 5.2 | Tree Officer                    | Objection raised <i>[see paragraph 7.3.5 below]</i> .                 |
| 5.3 | Thames Water                    | No objections subject to informatives regarding drainage informatives |

## 6.0 REPRESENTATION

At the time of preparation of this report seven representations of objection and no letters of support have been received regarding this application. The objections raise the following concerns.

- 6.1 The proposal would lead to overflow parking problems *[See Paragraph 7.5 below]*
- 6.2 The proposal would be out of character with the immediate area *[See Paragraph 7.3 below]*
- 6.3 The proposal would lead to a loss of privacy *[See Paragraph 7.4 below]*
- 6.4 The proposal would lead to overshadowing *[See Paragraph 7.4 below]*
- 6.5 The proposal would be overbearing to neighbouring properties *[See Paragraph 7.4 below]*
- 6.6 The proposal will lead to a negative loss of trees *[See Paragraph 7.3 below]*
- 6.7 Levels of activity and noise are out of keeping with the surrounding residential area *[See Paragraph 7.4 below]*
- 6.8 Construction traffic and increased vehicular movements from the extension will damage the private road (Springfield Road). *[Officer comment, this is a civil matter between private landowners].*
- 6.9 Sewage system not adequate to deal with increased number of bedrooms. *[Officer comment, appropriate provision of private sewage systems is controlled under other (Building Control Acts) legislation].*
- 6.10 Lack of appropriate fire escape routes. *[Officer comment, this is controlled under other (Building Control Acts) legislation].*

## 7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

- 7.1 The application site relates to a residential care home falling within the settlement area of Camberley. As such, Policies CP1, CP3, CP11, CP14, DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 apply. This report also draws on the advice within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) and the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 are also relevant to the consideration of this application. The current proposal is not CIL liable, as it is for a Class C2 development.

7.2 The main issues in the consideration of this application are:

- Impact on local character and trees;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Impact on highway safety; and
- Impact on Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area;

### 7.3 Impact on local character and trees

7.3.1 The Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) identifies the application site as falling within the Wooded Hills' character area. The area is identified in the SPD as an extensive area with its character derived from the large wooded plots of the Chobham Ridges. Further, the application property is one of few remaining older buildings which sit in generous settings. The wider area is characterised by a mix of irregular plots, an unmade lane and heavy vegetation this area has a semi - rural residential character, despite its proximity to Camberley Town Centre.

7.3.2 The SPD identifies the open spaciousness around buildings as generous in size with well vegetated gardens featuring mature hedges and trees. The SPD also identifies the character of historic properties making a positive contribution to the character of the area. The SPD also recognises the progressive loss of the spacious character and urbanisation of the semi-rural character by the closure of gaps around buildings and loss of vegetation as damaging to the character area.

7.3.3 The application site sits within a large plot which enjoys generous spacing between the flank boundaries and the built form. Properties within the wider character of the area also relate contribute toward a sense of spaciousness. Guiding Principles WH1 and WH2 of the SPD state that new development should pay particular regard to character of buildings set in spacious plots which provide for extensive space between, and around buildings and which allow for the maintenance/ development of a verdant character. The side wings of the proposal are large with the east side extension having a maximum width of approximately 7.9 metres and a maximum height of approximately 6.7 metres. The west side extension would have a maximum width of approximately 7.0 metres and a maximum height of approximately 6.7 metres. Both these flank extensions would seriously reduce the spacing around the property reducing the gaps to the west flank boundary from the current 11 metres (approx.) to 4 metres (approx.) This in combination with the east flank side extension which would leave a gap of 7.0 metres reducing to 3.5m (approx.) at its closest points. Such loss of spacing around the building in the context of this spacious character area would result in a building which would appear cramped with minimal provision of side gardens.

7.3.4 Guiding Principle WH6 of the SPD seeks high quality design that reflects the wooded, hilly character of the area in terms of materials and building form will be expected. Opportunities should also be taken to enhance the architectural quality of buildings in the area. Therefore it is pertinent that any proposal protects the existing character of these buildings. This earlier 20<sup>th</sup> century building is of interest which benefits from architectural features and linkages reminiscent of its time which include small paned windows, a period chimneystack and uniform materials of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The proposed two storey extensions by reason of their width, with the east side extension having a maximum width of approximately 7.9 metres and the west side extension having a maximum width of approximately 7.0 metres; in relation to the existing host building, are not considered to be subservient or respond appropriately to the size of the host building. Additionally the mansard style roof as proposed on top of the extensions, with the large expanses of crown

style flat roof, do not, it is considered, relate well to the character of the host building. On this basis it is concluded that the proposed two storey extensions are not of a design that reflects the character of the host dwelling. This in combination with the lack of spaciousness around the proposed side extensions to the building (as set at paragraph 7.3.3, above) would, it is considered, result in a development which would not harmonise satisfactorily with the design of the host building; appearing cramped and at odds with the spacious character of the Wooded Hills Character Area.

- 7.3.5 As noted above trees make a significant contribution to the character of the area and the Wooded Hills Guiding Principles seeks to retain mature trees and vegetation. Four trees are proposed to be felled to facilitate the development. These include a Portuguese laurel (T4) to the rear of the site, a Lime tree (T11), a Lawson cypress (T12) and ornamental tree T14) to the front of the site. The Applicant's Arboriculturist has classed these four trees as category C (Low Quality). The Council's Tree Officer has considered the submitted report and raises the following objection:

*A review of the supplied plan [OS 883-14.1] confirms that RPA [root protection area] intrusion in relation to Lime T11 would be 64.9% and far exceeding the 20% permissible under the BS. This is clearly not acceptable irrespective of the adoption of no dig and cellular confinement systems and porous wearing surfaces and the likely reason why this tree would be lost should the development proceed. I do not accept that this is a Category C tree and would place it firmly as a B1 (Moderate quality). I also consider its loss to car parking to be unacceptable...Retained vegetation on the southern boundary comprises large and dense areas of trees and understorey. The close proximity of the proposed extensions will lead to increased pressure for reduction or removal of the vegetation due to light restriction and perception of threat.*

Given the proposed loss of the Lime tree, and increased pressure to remove the vegetation to the southern boundary, the proposal is therefore also considered to conflict with the Wooded Hills Guiding Principles by harming the verdant character of the application site and wider area.

- 7.3.6 In conclusion the current proposal is not considered to be acceptable in design terms and would harm the visual amenity of the local area. While it is accepted that the principle of development is acceptable any need for expansion should not be at the expense of design. The proposal is therefore not considered to be acceptable on character grounds, conflicting with the Wooded Hills Guiding Principles of the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

## **7.4 Impact on residential amenity**

- 7.4.1 The closest elements of the proposal are sited approximately 6.5m from Pound Ridge. This neighbouring property and the application property share a flank to flank relationship and the proposal extends approximately 5m beyond the rear wall of this neighbour. Given the separation distance, built relationships and boundary screening no objections are raised in regard to overbearing impact or overshadowing. Additionally the proposed flank windows facing this neighbour at first floor are high level therefore no objections are raised in regard to loss of privacy.
- 7.4.2 The two storey elements of the proposal are sited at least 15 metres from 11 Chesters Road (and the single storey element 14 metres). These separation distances in combination with the mature vegetative screen to the rear boundary, is considered sufficient to protect the residential amenity enjoyed at 11 Chesters Road.

- 7.4.3 All other residential properties are sited in excess of 20 metres from the proposal as such no further objections are raised on residential amenity grounds.
- 7.4.4 Given the mature boundary screening and separation distances to the surrounding neighbours, it is considered that the extension to the care home would not lead to levels of activity or noise that would materially harm the current level of amenity that neighbours enjoy.
- 7.4.5 The current proposal is considered to be acceptable on residential amenity grounds, conforming with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

## **7.5 Impact on highway safety**

- 7.5.1 The application includes the provision of 14 car parking spaces; given that the occupants of the development are unlikely to own cars these spaces would be for staff and visitors. While the application indicates that there would be 22 staff members, these would operate in shift patterns and would not all be on site at the same time. It is also noted that the application site is located in a sustainable location served by bus stops within walking distance. The County Highway Authority has undertaken an assessment in terms of the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision and are satisfied that the application would not have a material impact on the safety and operation of the public highway. The County Highway Authority therefore have no highway requirements. It is therefore considered that the level of parking is appropriate to meet the demand of the development. The access to the site is to remain as currently exists although there would be a marginal increase in the intensity of the use of the access due to the increase in staff and potentially, visitors.
- 7.5.2 Having regard to the above it is concluded that the development would deliver an appropriate level of car parking and would not give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway safety. Accordingly it is considered that the application meets the objectives of Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **7.6 Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area**

- 7.6.1 The application site is located within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and Natural England are currently advising that new residential development has the potential to adversely impact on the protected sites due to increase recreational pressure. In this instance the development proposes an extension to a care home for the elderly which would fall within Use Class C2 of the Use Classes Order. The future residents of the extensions would require a level of care and it is considered that the proposal is acceptable subject to the provision of an information pack relating to the value and fragility of the SPA to be provided for each new member of staff and resident, confirmation that staff and/or residents will not be taken on designated trips and/or outings to the SPA and the preclusion of the keeping of dogs within the development. These provisions are considered to limit the impact of the current proposal on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. So long as a legal agreement is provided by 9 January 2015, no objection is raised to the proposal on these grounds. Accordingly it is considered that the application meets the objectives of Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **8.0 ARTICLE 2(3) DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) ORDER 2012 WORKING IN A POSITIVE/PROACTIVE MANNER**

8.1 In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 186-187 of the NPPF. This included 1 or more of the following:-

- a) Provided or made available pre application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.
- b) Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered.
- c) Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

9.1 The proposal by reason of its size, scale, width and detailed design is not considered to respect the character of the host building or the character of the surrounding area. Additionally the loss of the mature Lime tree is also considered to further harm the wooded character of the area. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

Refuse for the following reason(s):

1. The proposal by reason of the combined size of the west and east side extensions and their proximity to the flank boundaries would result in a cramped form of development at odds with the spacious character of the Wooded Hills Character Area; and, the overall expanse of flat roofs would appear incongruous and not harmonise satisfactorily with the design of the host building. Furthermore, the development would result in the loss of a mature Lime tree (T11) of amenity value and put future pressure for the removal of further vegetation on the southern boundary, all of which makes a significant contribution to the verdant character of the area. The proposal would therefore fail to deliver high quality design and would not respect and enhance the character of the area, contrary to Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012; Guiding Principles WH1, WH2, WH3 and WH6 of the Western Urban Area Character SPD 2012; and, the National Planning Policy Framework.