

LOCATION: LITTLE ROSEWARNE, 1 ROSEWARNE GARDENS,
MYTCHETT, CAMBERLEY, GU16 6GT

PROPOSAL: Single storey side and rear extensions, including attached
garage and revised vehicular access and landscaping.

TYPE: Full Planning Application

APPLICANT: Mr Foster
Rio Homes & Estates Ltd

OFFICER: Ross Cahalane

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it has been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Helen Whitcroft due to concerns regarding overdevelopment.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This application seeks planning application for a single storey side extension (including an attached garage) and a single storey rear extension, with revised vehicular access and landscaping.
- 1.2 The proposed scale and design of the extensions would respect the design of the original bungalow and would not form an over-dominant or incongruous addition. The low single storey subservient form is sufficient to avoid a cramped appearance. The proposed development would also be at sufficient distance from all surrounding boundaries and elevations to avoid adverse harm to residential amenity. Surrey County Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposal, which would provide the same number of bedspaces and off-street parking spaces as approved under the wider redevelopment. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site relates to the existing detached bungalow of Little Rosewarne, within the settlement of Mytchett and now with a revised vehicular access off Coleford Close, forming part of the wider redeveloped site providing 8 dwellings. The bungalow is of probable late 1950s origin and is also now surrounded by the recently approved two storey dwellings, with the semi-detached properties of Robert Close to the rear. Public footpath No. 31 runs along the front of the site (temporarily diverted to the rear during the redevelopment), leading to Potteries Lane on the other side.
- 2.2 At the time of the officer site visit, construction of the surrounding additional dwellings had mostly completed.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 18/0001 Erection of 6 No. three bedroom and 2 No. two bedroom houses with landscaping, parking and accesses (to Potteries Lane and Coleford Close) whilst retaining existing dwellings on reduced residential curtilages and footpath link..
- Decision: Granted (implemented)
- 3.2 19/0021 A minor material amendment pursuant to planning permission SU/18/0001 to allow amendment to the approved dwellings to include changes to roof for all of the dwellings along with an increase in the width of the dwellings for plots 3, 5 and 6, addition of an integral garage with accommodation over (instead of a detached garage), for the dwellings at plot 4 (increasing the number of bedrooms for this dwelling from 3 to 4) and amendment to the parking layout (with no loss of parking provision).
- Decision: Granted (implemented)
- 3.3 19/0021/2 A non-material amendment application pursuant to permission SU/19/0021 to allow amendment to the approved dwellings to include changes to roof for all of the dwellings along with an increase in the width of the dwellings for plots 3, 5 and 6, addition of an integral garage with accommodation over (instead of a detached garage), for the dwellings at plot 4 (increasing the number of bedrooms for this dwelling from 3 to 4) and amendment to the parking layout (with no loss of parking provision), to allow internal amendments to provide dwellings for flats 5 and 6 as three bedroom units rather than two bedroom units.
- Decision: Pending

4.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 4.1 County Highway Authority: No objection [*See Section 7.4*]
- 4.2 Council Scientific Officer: No objection, subject to condition [*See Section 7.6*]

5.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 5.1 The application proposed is for a single storey side extension (including an attached garage) and a single storey rear extension, with revised vehicular access and landscaping.
- 5.2 The proposed side extension would comprise a crown roof and would have a depth of approx. 8.85m, width of approx. 3.2m, eaves height of approx. 2.9m and maximum height of approx. 3.97m.
- 5.3 The proposed rear extension would also comprise a crown roof and would have a depth of approx. 3.71m, width of 4.22m, eaves height of approx. 2.9m and maximum height of approx. 3.97m.

- 5.4 The proposal also includes a pitched roof hipped at the side, above the existing side catslide roof to enclose the side porch to facilitate an ensuite bathroom. This roof would have an eaves height of approx. 2.9m and ridge height of approx. 4m. The supporting statement also advises that the front elevations of the dwelling and proposed extension would have a render finish.
- 5.5 The proposed extensions would not normally require planning permission individually. However, the proposed crown roof forms would adjoin each other and as such, the proposal would form a “wraparound” extension for the purposes of the permitted development legislation.
- 5.6 The proposed revised vehicular access would be located further to the southwest, replacing the double-width parking bay at the front with a single-width access to facilitate the side garage and a turning bay. This would still provide two off-street spaces as originally approved.
- 5.7 The proposed revised landscaping would provide a repositioned boundary hedge along the front.

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 At the time of preparation of this report, five objections have been received (including one from the Mytchett, Frimley Green and Deepcut Society), raising the following concerns:

Character

- Cramped development on a small site.
- Overdevelopment.
- Out of keeping with streetscene.
- Area already densely packed with development.
- Will footings damage tree roots?

[See Section 7.2]

Residential amenity

- Loss of privacy.
- Overbearing.
- Loss of light.

[See Section 7.3]

Highways

- Insufficient space for additional parking.

[See Section 7.4]

Other

- Impact on flooding from loss of trees.
- Noise , dust and debris from construction works.

[See Section 7.6]

- Not one of the properties on the surrounding development site are as the original plans.
- Current extension could be thin edge of the wedge.
- Will set precedent for further relaxations and additions to the planning permission for the wider redevelopment site.

[Each planning application must be considered on its own individual merits.]

7.0 PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 This application site falls within the settlement area of Mytchett. The site is also within the "Historic Route - Lanes" character area as defined under the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document. The proposal is considered against the principles of Policies DM9 (Design Principles) and DM11 (Traffic Management and Highway Safety) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy & Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP), the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document (WUAC) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (RDG) was adopted in 2017 and therefore forms an additional material consideration in the determination of this application. The main issues to be determined are:

- Impact on character and trees;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Impact on parking and highway safety;
- Impact on local infrastructure; and
- Other matters

7.2 Impact on character and trees

7.2.1 Policy DM9 (Design Principles) seeks to promote high quality design that respects and enhances the local environment, paying particular regard to scale, materials, massing, bulk and density. The Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document (WUAC) reiterates achieving good design that respects and enhances character of the area as a key objective. The application site is within the "Historic Route - Lanes" character area as defined by the WUAC. This area is characterised by their narrow gravel roads, intense, small scale forms of development and a high number of buildings that date from Victorian or earlier periods. All of the lanes have their origins in the Victorian era or earlier and most formerly provided access to a business or farm.

- 7.2.2 Guiding Principle L1 of the WUAC advises that within the "Historic Routes - Lanes" character area, development should have high quality architectural detailing and scale and massing in all development. Guiding Principle L3 advises that proposals that seek to introduce development that is out of keeping with the strong historic character of the Lanes will be resisted. Particular regard will be had to building scale and massing, roofscapes and architectural detailing, including materials.
- 7.2.3 Principle 10.3 of the RDG advises that side extensions should remain sympathetic and subservient to main building and not project beyond the building line on the street. Important gaps between buildings should be maintained. A minimum gap of 1m between the building and the side boundary should normally be retained to provide for access and servicing. The proposed single storey side extension element would contain a crown roof form. However, this design approach would lead to the proposed maximum height being significantly lower than the ridge height of the host dwelling, and would allow for a hipped form to the side to reflect the form of the original dwelling. The proposed extension would also be set back approx. 0.7m from the adjoining front elevation, and the projecting width would be considerably less than half that of the original host dwelling.
- 7.2.4 It is therefore considered that the proposed side extension would respect the design of the original bungalow and would not form an over-dominant or incongruous addition. Although the side extension would be sited approx. 0.5m-0.8m from the side boundary, in the officer's opinion a side extension with a higher ridge height of 4m could be built fully adjacent to this boundary under permitted development rights outside of the control of the local planning authority. In any event, the low single storey subservient form is considered sufficient to avoid a cramped appearance. On the other side, the proposed hipped pitched roof, above the existing side catslide roof to enclose the side porch, would match the height of the other proposed extension, to assist its integration. Given that part of the existing front elevation contains a render exterior, it is not considered that the proposed full render finish along the front elevation would lead to adverse harm to the character of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
- 7.2.5 Principle 10.4 of the RDG advises that rear extensions should be sympathetic and subservient to the design of the main building. Eaves heights of single storey extensions should not exceed 3m within 2m of a side or rear boundary. The proposed rear extension would not be widely visible from surrounding public vantage points. It is considered that the modest scale and depth would not lead to an overdominant relationship with the host dwelling.
- 7.2.6 Policy DM9 of the CSDMP states that development will be acceptable where they protect trees and other vegetation worthy of retention and provide high quality hard and soft landscaping where appropriate. Guiding Principle L1 also requires new development to provide opportunities to soften the closely set buildings with vegetation and protection of hedgerows as boundaries. There is a line of trees proposed for retention along the rear garden side boundary with the Robert Way dwellings. These were surveyed under the tree report submitted under 18/0001 for the wider site redevelopment. Based on this, the proposed extensions would not fall within the root protection areas of these trees. It is however considered appropriate to impose a planning condition to ensure that the agreed tree protection fencing remains installed during the proposed works. The proposed revised landscaping would provide a repositioned boundary hedge along the front. This can also be protected by a landscaping condition.
- 7.2.7 In light of all the above, it is considered that the proposed development as a whole would comply with the design requirements of Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and the relevant supporting guidance of the RDG and the WUAC.

7.3 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.3.1 Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 requires that the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and uses are respected. Principle 8.3 of the RDG advises that developments should not result in occupants of neighbouring dwellings suffering from a material loss of daylight and sun access. Paragraph 8.5 further advises that although there is no right to a view, residents should be able to enjoy good quality outlook to the external environment from habitable rooms, without adjacent buildings, walls, parked vehicles or storage materials being overbearing or visually intrusive.
- 7.3.2 The proposed side extension would be sited approx. 9m from the main rear elevation of the approved two storey semi-detached Unit 2 facing Robert Way to the southwest, and would be sited approx. 10m from the adjoining inset elevation of Unit 1. Unit 2 benefits from a corner plot layout with noticeable garden space to its side as well as to its rear. It is considered that this layout, along with the parking area of Unit 2 sited in its rear garden in front of the proposed side extension, would mitigate adverse impact in terms of loss of outlook or overbearing impact. It is considered that the proposed separation distances, the site orientation and the existing juxtaposition between the dwellings would be sufficient to avoid adverse harm in terms of loss of light. A planning condition can be imposed to ensure that the proposed side WC room would be obscure-glazed with high-level opening.
- 7.3.3 Principle 8.1 of the RDG SPD advises that developments which have a significant adverse effect on the privacy of neighbouring properties will be resisted. Paragraph 8.4 further advises that a minimum distance of 20m is a generally accepted guideline for there to be no material loss of privacy between the rear of two storey buildings directly facing each other (i.e. a back to back relationship). For two storey rear-to-side relationships it may be possible to reduce the separation distance to 15m.
- 7.3.4 The proposed rear extension would be sited approx. 3.6m from the rear garden boundary of the two storey semi-detached dwelling of No. 2 Robert Way to the southwest, and approx. 16m at an angle from its nearest rear elevation. The proposed secondary side elevation window would not directly face the elevations of this neighbour. These separation distances and built form relationships are considered sufficient to avoid adverse harm towards this neighbour in terms of loss of light, outlook, privacy or overbearing impact.
- 7.3.5 The proposed rear extension would also contain a window on the other side facing Unit 4. However, it is considered that the single storey form and separation distance of approx. 8m to its rear garden side boundary would be sufficient to avoid loss of privacy, light, outlook or overbearing impact. The pitched roof above the existing side catslide roof would not be adjacent any primary ground floor windows of this neighbour.
- 7.3.6 It is considered that the proposed development as a whole would be sited at sufficient distance from other neighbouring boundaries and elevations to avoid material harm to amenity.
- 7.3.7 In light of all the above, the proposal is considered to be in compliance with the amenity requirements of Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and the advice of the RDG SPD.

7.4 Impact on parking and highway safety

- 7.4.1 Policy DM11 (Traffic Management and Highway Safety) states that development which would adversely impact the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway network will not be supported by the Council, unless it can be demonstrated that measures to reduce such impacts to acceptable levels can be implemented.

7.4.2 The proposal would not result in an increase in the number of existing bedrooms (three). The proposal includes a revised vehicular access located further to the southwest, replacing the approved double-width parking bay at the front with a single access to facilitate the side garage and a turning bay. This would still provide two off-street spaces as originally approved. The County Highway Authority has raised no objection, commenting that the proposal is unlikely to have a material impact on highway safety issues. As such, it is considered that this proposal would not have any detrimental impacts on parking or highway safety.

7.5 Community Infrastructure Levy

7.5.1 Surrey Heath's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule was adopted by Full Council on the 16th July 2014 and the CIL Charging Schedule came into effect on the 1st December 2014. Surrey Heath charges CIL on residential and retail developments where there is a net increase in floor area, however, as the proposal relates to a net increase in residential floor area less than 100 square metres the development is not CIL liable.

7.6 Other matters

7.6.1 The Council's Scientific Officer has commented that the proposed development is on land that was historically used as a potteries and as such, there is the potential to discover contamination. The Scientific Officer has commented that whilst the developer is aware of this, it would be appropriate to impose a planning condition stating that if, prior to or during development, ground contamination is suspected or manifests itself, no further development shall be carried out until the developer has submitted an appropriate remediation strategy to the Local Planning Authority and the written approval of the Local Planning Authority has been received. The remediation strategy should detail how the contamination shall be managed and any agreed remediation verified.

7.6.2 Concerns have been raised in respect of impact on flooding from loss of trees, and noise, dust and debris from construction works. The application site falls within an area of low flood risk (Zone 1). As such, the current proposed domestic extension would not require the provision of a flood risk assessment or drainage strategy. Any statutory noise nuisance can be reported to the Council's Environmental Health Department for investigation. Construction works and hours of operation are controlled by Environmental Health legislation and an informative can be added in this regard.

8.0 **CONCLUSION**

8.1 The proposed scale and design of the extensions would respect the design of the original bungalow and would not form an over-dominant or incongruous addition. The low single storey subservient form is sufficient to avoid a cramped appearance. The proposed development would also be at sufficient distance from all surrounding boundaries and elevations to avoid adverse harm to residential amenity. Surrey County Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposal, which would provide the same number of bedspaces and off-street parking spaces as approved under the wider redevelopment. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

9.0 WORKING IN A POSITIVE/PROACTIVE MANNER

9.1 In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive, proactive and creative manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 38-41 of the NPPF. This included:

- 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.

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:

Proposed site plan, roof plan, floor plan and elevations (Drawing No. 1369/P-301A - received on 07 August 2019), 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 as stated in Section 5 of the application form received on 28 August 2019.

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. Before first occupation of the development hereby approved the ground floor WC window in the southwest side elevation facing Unit 1 shall be completed in obscure glazing and any opening shall be at high level only (greater than 1.7m above finished floor level) and retained as such at all times.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities enjoyed by neighbouring residents and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

5. The tree protection measures as agreed under the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and BS:5837 Tree Survey by Sapling Arboriculture Ltd, dated July 2018 [Ref; J1045.03] and received on 23 July 2018 provided for SU/18/0001, shall be implemented and retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

6. All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved proposed site plan. All plant material shall conform to **BS3936:1992 Parts 1 – 5: Specification for Nursery Stock**. Handling, planting and establishment of trees shall be in accordance with **BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape**. Any trees or plants, which within a period of five years of commencement of any works in pursuance of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of similar size and species, following consultation with the Local Planning Authority, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

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.

7. A strategy for monitoring and reporting on ground conditions and actions to be taken should there be the discovery of contamination will be adopted. If, prior to or during development, ground contamination is suspected or manifests itself then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted an appropriate remediation strategy to the Local Planning Authority and the written approval of the Local Planning Authority has been received. The remediation strategy should detail how the contamination shall be managed and any agreed remediation verified.

Reason: To comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF paragraphs 120 & 121) which requires development to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from unacceptable levels of contamination.

Informative(s)

1. Discovery and Remediation Strategy Informative
In seeking to address and discharge the 'discovery' condition above, the applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that the application site is situated on or in close proximity to land that could be potentially contaminated by virtue of previous historical uses of the land. The applicant should contact the Councils Scientific Officer Garry Carter on 01276 707328 Garry.carter@surreyheath.gov.uk for further advice.