

LOCATION: 80 VERRAN ROAD, CAMBERLEY, GU15 2LJ
PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey side and rear extension and single storey front extension including integral garage following demolition of existing garage.
TYPE: Full Planning Application
APPLICANT: Mr Brian Keenan
OFFICER: Emma Pearman

UPDATE

This application was deferred from the 10 August 2015 Committee to enable Members to undertake a site visit. An update will be provided at the meeting on when the site visit was held and the attendees.

Following the Committee, officers invited the applicant to amend the plans in order to reduce the depth of the two storey rear extension and the impact upon the neighbour. However, the applicant has decided not to amend the plans.

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, at the request of a local ward councillor it has been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The proposal relates to a two-storey side/rear extension and single storey front extension to the garage. Two previous similar applications SU14/0583 and SU14/0087 were refused, both on character grounds because of the proposals' width, forward siting, height, scale and separation distance to the boundary, and the first application SU14/0087 also on residential amenity grounds because of a rear projection which was considered to cause harm to amenity in terms of overshadowing and an overbearing relationship with number 82 Verran Road.
- 1.2 This report concludes that although there has been an improvement in character terms from the previous two applications, this proposal has not gone far enough in addressing the character reason for refusal in that the width and lack of separation to the boundary has not been addressed. Additionally, this proposal once again introduces a rear projection of the same size as that considered unacceptable under SU14/0087 and therefore gives rise to harm in terms of residential amenity. It is therefore considered that the proposal should be refused.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application property is a two-storey detached dwelling, located on the north-eastern side of Verran Road. It is located within the settlement area of Frimley and Camberley, as identified on the Proposals Map of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012. The property has an attached garage to the northern side elevation, which is set back from the main front elevation and protrudes beyond the rear

elevation of the property. There is an open front garden and driveway to the front. The property is also located within the Post War Open Estate Housing Character Area, as identified by the Western Urban Area Character SPD.

- 2.2 Neighbouring properties are similar in architectural design and type, comprising detached dwellings with attached garages, open front gardens and driveways. There is a group Tree Protection Order which covers this part of Verran Road.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 SU/14/0087 - Erection of a two-storey side/rear extension (to include integral garage) and single storey front extension following demolition of existing integral garage

Refused 27/03/14 - the width and forward siting of the proposed extension coupled with its height and scale was considered to result in an extension which was not subservient to the host dwelling and furthermore the lack of separation to the flank boundary was considered to disrupt the spacing, rhythm and character of the area. Additionally, its depth in close proximity to the boundary with number 82 Verran Road, in combination with its height, orientation, bulk and massing was considered to cause harm in terms of overshadowing and being overbearing to the detriment of their residential amenity.

- 3.2 SU/14/0583 - Erection of a two-storey side extension (to include integral garage) and single storey front/rear extension following demolition of existing garage.

Refused 19/08/14 - the width and forward siting of the proposed extension coupled with its height and scale was considered to result in an extension which was not subservient to the host dwelling and furthermore the lack of separation to the flank boundary was considered to disrupt the spacing, rhythm and character of the area.

- 3.3 Following refusal of application SU/14/0583, the applicant entered into pre-application discussions where following submission of the latest plans they were advised to reduce the width of the extension to the size of the existing garage and reduce the height of the proposals, both of which have not been carried out.

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The proposal is for a two-storey side/rear extension following demolition of the existing garage, and single storey front extension. It would include a new integral garage to the front of the property, which would protrude 1.7m from the main front elevation, in line with the existing front projection/porch. The first floor extension would be set back from the main front elevation by 1.2m. The garage would have a width of 3.2m (from existing 2.6m), widening to 4.2m (from existing 3.7m) at the rear of the extension.
- 4.2 The ridge height of the two-storey side element would be 6.9m which is 0.3m below the existing ridge height of the property, and eaves height of 5.1m. The rear projection would have a gabled roof, with a ridge height of 6.2m and eaves height of 5.1m. There would be a mono-pitched roof over the garage at the front. At ground floor level, there would be a garage door to the front, a door and window on the northern side elevation, and a window on the southern side elevation at the rear part of the extension. At first floor level, a window is proposed to the front and rear.
- 4.3 The main differences between this proposed scheme and the two previous refused schemes are as follows:

- The proposed first floor side extension has been pulled back from the ground floor front projection by 1.2m from both previous submissions, but now protrudes 2.1m to the rear, as was the case in the original application SU14/0087
- The ridge height of the roof has been reduced by 0.3m from both previous submissions
- At ground floor level, a door is now proposed on the side elevation and no window on the rear elevation as a change from the previous application SU14/0583
- There has been no change to the width of the proposal from either of the previous applications resulting in a separation distance of 0.75m between the property and neighbouring 82 Verran Road

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 5.1 County Highway Authority No objection.
- 5.2 Council's Arboricultural Officer No objection.

6.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.1 At the time of writing, 15 letters in support of the application have been received.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The application proposed is considered against the policies within the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012, and in this case the relevant policies are Policy DM9 (Design Principles) and Policy DM11 (Traffic Management and Highway Safety). The guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is also a relevant consideration. The issues to be considered therefore are:
- Impact on character;
 - Residential amenity;
 - Impact on trees; and
 - Highways, parking and access.

The key issues in this assessment are whether the revised proposal has overcome the previous reasons for refusal set out above.

7.2 Impact on character

- 7.2.1 Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Paragraph 58 goes on to say that planning decisions should aim to ensure that developments respond to local character and history, reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

- 7.2.2 Policy DM9 states that development should respect and enhance the local, natural and historic character of the environment, paying particular regard to scale, materials, massing, bulk and density.
- 7.2.3 The Guiding Principles of the Post War Open Estates state that new development should pay attention to the maintenance of space between and around buildings, with particular attention paid to maintaining side gardens and the gaps between the side elevations of buildings at first floor level. It also states that development which results in the loss of gaps between buildings and the creation of a terracing effect will be strongly resisted.
- 7.2.4 The previous applications were refused for the same reason in respect of the impact on the character of the area. This application has been reduced in height by 0.3m and the first floor element has been set back from the ground floor proposal by 1.2m to the front, in comparison to the previous applications. This has resulted in a proposal which appears from the front as more subservient to the host dwelling than the previous applications. However concern was raised with both previous applications that the lack of separation to the flank boundary of just 0.75m would result in a proposal that reduced the spaciousness between the dwellings, particularly at first floor level. While the first floor element has been set back slightly, there has been no reduction in the width of the proposal, and therefore the proposal would result in the loss of the gap between 80 and 82 Verran Road, and the creation of a terraced effect. It is also considered that it would disrupt the spacing and rhythm of the properties and therefore the character of the area.
- 7.2.5 As such, it is not considered that this proposal has gone far enough to address previously expressed concerns about the lack of separation to the flank boundary and therefore the proposal remains unacceptable in character terms.
- 7.2.6 Therefore it is considered that the proposal is not in accordance with the design requirements of Policy DM9, and is contrary to Guiding Principle PO1 of the Post War Open Estate Housing Character Area, and the NPPF in this regard.

7.3 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.3.1 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy DM9 states that development will be acceptable where it respects the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and uses. It is necessary to take into account matters such as overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light and an overbearing or unneighbourly built form.
- 7.3.2 No concern was raised in the previous application with regard to residential amenity, however at first floor level the proposal was in line with the existing rear elevation and as such did not give rise to any adverse impacts in terms of amenity. The first refused application SU14/0087 included a rear projection at first floor level and as such was considered to give rise to harm in terms of overshadowing and an overbearing, unneighbourly relationship between 80 and 82 Verran Road.
- 7.3.3 With this application, the first floor rear projection has been proposed again and its ridge height of 6.2m, width of 4.2m and depth of 2.1m from the main rear elevation is no different in terms of size compared to that originally proposed under SU14/0087. There has also been no change in the separation distance between the proposal and the boundary. The applicant has submitted a plan showing that a 45 degree sight line from the neighbouring window at 82 Verran Road would not be broken, however this sight line has been drawn from the furthest point of the window rather than the middle as would normally be the case. If it had been drawn from the middle, the line would have been broken by the proposed rear projection, and the use of sight lines while useful is not set in policy. As such, the previous

reason for refusal cited under SU14/0087 is once again a concern, as it is considered that harm would be caused to the amenities of 82 Verran Road in terms of overshadowing and an overbearing and unneighbourly relationship.

- 7.3.4 It is considered therefore that this proposal gives rise to harm to the amenities of the occupiers of 82 Verran Road and as such, it contrary to Policy DM9 and the NPPF in this regard.

7.4 Impact on trees

- 7.4.1 Policy DM9 states that development will be acceptable where it protects trees and other vegetation worthy of retention.

- 7.4.2 There is a group Tree Protection Order on this area which covers the whole of the application property. There is a large silver birch tree to the front of the property on the southern side, however the extension is on the opposite side of the property. The applicant submitted a letter from an Arboriculturalist stating that no harm to the tree or other smaller trees within the vicinity was likely to occur as a result of the development.

- 7.4.3 The Council's Arboricultural Officer has been consulted and has no objections and no further conditions are required in this regard. It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of the impact on trees.

7.5 Highways, Parking and Access

- 7.5.1 Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people. Policy DM11 states that development which would adversely impact the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway network will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that measures to reduce such impacts to acceptable levels can be implemented.

- 7.5.2 There is currently a driveway to the front and side of the property, which would be reduced in size by the proposal, with no longer any space to the side of the house. However, the area at the front could still accommodate up to 2 cars, which is in line with the County Highway Authority's parking standards for a property of this size. The County Highway Authority have been consulted and have not objected.

- 7.5.3 It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of highways, parking and access.

7.6 Other matters

- 7.6.1 The proposed floorspace is less than 100m² and as such is not CIL liable.

8.0 ARTICLE 2(3) DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT)

ORDER 20

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 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.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 It is considered that while this proposal is an improvement in character terms from the two previous refused applications, it has not gone far enough to sufficiently address the character reason for refusal that was given on both previous applications SU14/0583 and SU14/0087 as there has been no change to the width of the proposal resulting in a small separation distance between the property and 82 Verran Road, which gives rise to a terraced appearance and disrupts the spacing, rhythm and character of the area. Additionally, the proposal gives rise to harm to residential amenity in terms of overshadowing and an overbearing and unneighbourly relationship with 82 Verran Road, because of the proposed rear projection, which is no different to the rear projection proposed in application SU14/0087 which was refused also on residential amenity grounds. It is not considered that the proposal gives rise to any harm in terms of trees or highways, parking and access.
- 9.2 It is therefore considered that the proposal should be refused because of unacceptable impacts in terms of character and residential amenity.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason(s):-

1. The width of the proposed two-storey extension results in a lack of separation to the flank boundary which coupled with its height and scale would appear incongruous and disrupt the spacing, rhythm and visual amenities of the area. The proposal therefore fails to respect and enhance the character and quality of the area and fails to comply with the aims and objectives of Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012, Guiding Principles P01 of the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal by reason of its depth in close proximity to the boundary with number 82 Verran Road in combination with its height, orientation, bulk and massing would result in an unneighbourly form of development having an adverse overbearing and overshadowing impact to the detriment of the residential amenities of occupants of this neighbouring property. The proposal is contrary to the objectives of Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.