

LOCATION: 8 TURPINS RISE, WINDLESHAM, GU20 6NG
PROPOSAL: Single storey front extension.
TYPE: Full Planning Application
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Cummings
OFFICER: David Islip

This application would normally be determined under the Scheme of Delegation, however, it is being reported to Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Sturt.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission for single storey front extension. The report concludes that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character of the area, residential amenities and the highway. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site falls within the settlement area of Windlesham. It comprises a detached two storey dwelling located in a short cul-de-sac spur off Turpins Rise. This spur cul-de-sac comprises 6 two storey detached dwellings of similar age and character; however, there is some variation in materials and architectural treatments within the immediate streetscape. The dwellings are built in two rows, which are roughly parallel, on either side of the highway. They have modest front gardens with separation distances of approximately 18 to 21 metres between facing front elevations.
- 2.2 The front garden to No 8 Turpins Rise is largely open in character. There is a small border by the lounge window and an area of lawn adjacent to the mutual boundary with No 10 Turpins Rise, located opposite the application property. The remainder of the frontage is laid to hardstanding and is used for parking. The backdrop to the garden, when viewed from the road is a 5m high Leylandii hedge which has been planted in the rear garden of No 9 Newark Road located to the north of the application site, and which shares a common boundary with No 8. A mature Wild Cherry is also prominent in the view of the application site when looking along the cul-de-sac towards the front of the property. This tree which is approximately 5 metres high is planted in the lawned area between Nos 8 and 10 Turpins Rise. The front gardens to the other properties in the cul-de-sac spur are also open in character.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1	87/280 10.06.87	First floor extension and extension to garage	<i>Approved</i>
	10/0596 27.07.10	Conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation.	<i>Approved</i>
	16/0233 29.04.16	Erection of a two storey front extension.	<i>Withdrawn</i>

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The planning application relates to the erection of a single storey front extension which would enlarge the existing living room. The extension would measure 3 metres deep by approximately 4.6m wide and would extend from the northwest corner of the house up to the entrance porch which is centrally position in the front elevation. It is designed with a gable end pitched roof with the ridge set just below the cill of the first floor bedroom window directly above the extension. The eaves level of the extension would be identical to that of the single slope roof over the front entrance and adjoining family room and which projects approximately 1m forward of the principal elevation of the house. The extension incorporates two openings; a casement window matching in size and design with the bedroom window above; and a smaller casement window in its southeast flank elevation looking down the road.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|---|
| 5.1 | Surrey County Highway Authority | No objection. |
| 5.2 | Windlesham Parish Council | No objection but express concerns over loss of parking. |
| 5.3 | Council's Tree Officer | No objection subject to a condition. |

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 At the time of writing this report two letters have been received which object to the proposal. One letter has been received from the occupants of No 10 Turpins Rise. The second letter has been sent by a firm of solicitors who write on behalf of the occupants.
- 6.2 The objections are summarised below:
- Obtrusive overdevelopment of site [*Officer comment: Please see paragraph 7.3.3*]
 - Reduced separation distance between Nos 8 and 10 [*Officer comment: Please*

see paragraph 7.3.3]

- Direct overlooking and serious loss of privacy
[Please see paragraph 7.4.3]
- Loss of trees/hedge *[Officer comment: Please see paragraph 7.3.4]*
- Loss of parking *[Officer comment: Please see paragraph 7.3.3].*

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The proposal is considered against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para, Policies DM9 (Design Principles) and DM11 (Traffic management and Highway Safety) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP).

7.2 It is considered that the main issues to be addressed in assessing this application are:

- Impact on the character of the area;
- Impact on residential amenities, and;
- Impact on highway safety.

7.3 Impact on the character of the area.

7.3.1 The NPPF promotes high quality standards with the objective to achieve sustainable development. Design Principles Policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012 is reflective of the NPPF and seeks high quality design that respects and enhances the character of the area with consideration of scale, materials, massing, bulk and density.

7.3.2 Although the proposed extension would be seen in views along the cul-de-sac spur it is considered that its impact would be relatively modest. It would project just 2m beyond the front of the entrance porch/family room. Its scale and design is considered sympathetic to the host dwelling and as No 8 is located at the northern end of the row of houses the proposal would be seen against the tall conifer screen which together with the Wild Cherry dominates the street scene.

7.3.3 The size and siting of the proposed extension would result in the loss of a moderate area of amenity space to the front of the dwelling. However, it is not considered that proposal would be visually intrusive or cumulatively with the previous extension to the property result in an overdevelopment.

7.3.4 A tree report has been submitted with the application. Although this identifies the loss of a small specimen of Laurel, adjacent to the front corner of the dwelling it is not considered that its removal would be detrimental to the character of the area. Tree protection measures are set out in the report for those works within the root zone of both the boundary hedge and the Wild Cherry. These measures are considered acceptable by the Council's Arboricultural Officer subject to conditions.

7.3.5 In light of the assessment above the proposal is considered to be acceptable and

compliant with the aims and objectives of Policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012 and the NPPF.

7.4 Impact on residential amenity

7.4.1 The NPPF sets out a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy DM9 ensures that any new proposals respect the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and uses.

7.4.2 The dwelling most affected by the proposed development is No 10 Turpins Rise, located opposite the application property. This neighbouring dwelling is similar in style to No 8, as originally constructed, and is built of identical materials with a lounge window in the front elevation. The proposed extension would result in a reduction from approximately 18m to 15m in the separation distance between the facing front elevations of the two properties. The height and width of the proposed extension combined with the separation distance would be sufficient to prevent any significant overbearing impact and loss of light to the front of No 8. The fundamentally open character of the front garden to the application property would be retained. Consequently it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the outlook of the neighbouring property.

7.4.3 Turning to the issue of overlooking and loss of privacy it should be noted that the front elevations to the two properties are not precisely parallel and their alignment is slightly off set so that lounge windows to both properties, which are currently identical in size and design, are facing each other but not directly opposite one another. This gives a marginally obscure view between the facing windows and on balance when taking into account this relationship and the separation distance it is not considered that it would enable the occupants of the application property to see beyond the neighbour's front window into the depth of their lounge. In the light of this it is considered that the proposed front extension would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy.

7.4.4 The proposed development is considered a sufficient distance from all other neighbouring properties as to not give rise to any harm. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of Policy DM9 and the NPPF.

7.5 Impact of the highway.

7.5.1 Policy DM11 encourages the provision of safe and high quality design particularly when considering vehicle access, egress and layouts which considers the needs and accessibility of all highway users as well as cyclists and pedestrians.

7.5.2 The proposed extension would result in the loss of a very small area of hardstanding at the front of the property. However, space would be retained for the parking of two vehicles and there would be no reduction in the level of onsite parking. It is therefore envisaged that the proposed development would not conflict with the aims of Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

7.7 Other matters

7.7.1 The proposal is not CIL liable.

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 by providing feedback through the validation process including information on the website, correcting identified problems and ensuring the application was correct and could be registered.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1. The proposal is considered acceptable to the character of the area and would cause no adverse impact on residential amenities or any other harm. Accordingly it is recommended the application be approved.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions and in accordance 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. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing Plans, Elevations and Location Plan - Sheet 1 and Proposed Plans, Elevations and Site Plan - Sheet 2 unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and as advised in ID.17a of the Planning Practice Guidance.

3. The building works, hereby approved, shall be constructed in external fascia materials; brick, tile, bonding and pointing, to match those of the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Development Tree Report prepared by SMW (Tree) Consultancy Ltd dated 28 May 2016. No development shall

commence until photos have been provided to and approval received from the Council's Arboricultural Officer of the tree protection measures having been implemented in accordance with this Method Statement. The tree protection measures shall be retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.