

<b>LOCATION:</b>	30 Bolding House Lane, West End, Woking, Surrey, GU24 9JJ,
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Single storey front extension and part-two storey, part-single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing garage.
<b>TYPE:</b>	Full Planning Application
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr Marian Baciu
<b>OFFICER:</b>	Mr Ross Cahalane

**This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it has been called-in by Cllr Alleway due to concerns regarding impact on the character of the area and neighbouring amenity.**

## **RECOMMENDATION: GRANT, subject to conditions**

### **1.0 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This application relates to a proposed single storey front extension and part-two storey, part-single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing garage.
- 1.2 Following the submission of amended plans, it is considered that the impact of the proposal on the host dwelling and within a corner plot setting is acceptable. The proposal is also considered acceptable in terms of impact on neighbouring amenity, and it is considered that sufficient off-street parking would be provided. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

### **2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION**

- 2.1 The application property comprises a two storey end-terraced dwelling forming a corner plot on the eastern side of Bolding House Lane, within the settlement of West End. The surrounding dwellings comprise a mixture of two storey terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings. These dwellings contain common post-war architectural styles and fairly regimented layouts, and several have been extended to the side at two storey level.

### **3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 19/2290/FFU      Erection of two storey side extension.  
Decision: Withdrawn at request of applicant.

### **4.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 The application proposed is for a single storey front extension and part-two storey, part-single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing garage.

- 4.2 The proposed single storey front extension consist of a monopitch roof with side gable end and would have a depth of 1m, width of 8.19m, eaves height of approx. 2.4m and maximum height of approx. 2.9m.
- 4.3 The proposed two storey side extension element would consist of a pitched roof with side gable end and would have a width of 3.3m, depth of approx. 11.3m (set back 0.5m from the adjoining front elevation), eaves height of approx. 5m and maximum height of approx. 7.2m.
- 4.4 The proposed single storey rear extension element would consist of a flat roof with roof lantern above and would have a width of approx. 4.6m, depth of 4m, eaves height of approx. 2.6m and maximum height of approx. 3.2m.
- 4.5 Amended plans have been submitted with the following changes:
- Reduction in width and roof height of side extension
  - Reduction in depth of first floor side element at front elevation
  - Change in the proposed external materials.

## **5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

- 5.1 West End Parish Council: Objection: scale and mass not be in keeping with the surrounding architecture. Out of character with the street scene and the protruding double storey extension would impact on the neighbour's conservatory and impact on their access to sunlight. A Willow tree, seen as a public amenity, would also be blocked out by this extension. There would also be a loss of off road parking which could contribute to a highways issue.

## **6.0 REPRESENTATION**

- 6.1 At the time of preparation of this report no letters of representation have been received.

## **7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION**

- 7.1 The application is considered against the policies within the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 (CSDMP), and in this case the relevant policies are Policies DM9 and DM11 of the CSDMP and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Other relevant guidance includes the Residential Design Guide SPD 2017 (RDG) and the West End Village Design Statement SPD 2016 (VDS). The main issues to be considered are:
- Impact upon the character of the area;
  - Impact on residential amenity;
  - Impact on access, parking and highway safety; and
  - Impact on infrastructure.

### **7.2 Impact on character of the surrounding area**

- 7.2.1 Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the CSDMP 2012 promotes high quality design that respects and enhances the local environment, paying particular regard to scale, massing, bulk and broader appearance. Principle 10.2 of the RDG advises that front extensions should not protrude too far forward from the main building line, or be prominent in the street scene. Principle 10.3 advises that side extensions should not erode the character of the street scene and local area. Proposals should remain sympathetic and subservient to the main building and not project beyond the building line on the street.

- 7.2.2 In addition, the application site also falls within Character Area 2 of the WEVDS. Guideline 5 (Extensions) of the WEVDS states that extensions should be complementary to the existing building in proportion, style and use of materials.
- 7.2.3 The gap from the proposed two storey side extension to the highway footpath would be 1.25, assisted by the set-back at first floor level from the front elevation and the footpath curve around the dwelling. Although the proposed two storey side extension would be greater than half the width of the host dwelling, it would have some subservient features in the form of a lower ridge height and the abovementioned set-in from the adjoining two storey front elevation. The roof and fenestration design would also reflect the simple post-war design of the host dwelling. It is considered that the above features, in combination with the separation distance to the side highway boundary, would be sufficient to avoid a cramped or incongruous appearance, or an over-dominant impact on the corner plot setting, and would respect the surrounding plot rhythms which include some generous side gaps beyond the dwellings.
- 7.2.4 Although the proposed front extension would extend across the entire front elevation of the resultant dwelling, it would be single storey with a limited projection. In this instance, it is therefore considered that the proposal would not adversely harm the immediate regimented frontages.
- 7.2.5 Principle 10.4 of the RDG also 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 including its flat roof form is considered acceptable in this instance, given the lack of view from public vantage points along the highway.

### **7.3 Impact on amenities of neighbouring properties and future occupiers**

- 7.3.1 Policy DM9 (Design Principles) states that the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties should be respected by proposed development. The thrust of one of the core planning principles within the NPPF is that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
- 7.3.2 Principle 8.1 of the RDG states that new residential development should be provided with a reasonable degree of privacy to habitable rooms and sensitive outdoor amenity spaces. Developments which have a significant adverse effect on the privacy of neighbouring properties will be resisted. Paragraph 8.4 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).
- 7.3.3 Paragraphs 8.5-8.6 of the RDG 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 being overbearing or visually intrusive. Para 8.12 of the RDG further advises that potential design solutions to prevent material loss of daylight to neighbouring windows and overshadowing of habitable external spaces include ensuring that the centre of an existing window serving a habitable room does not fall within 45 degrees towards a proposed two storey development, or 60 degrees towards a proposed single storey development.
- 7.3.4 The proposed two storey side extension would project beyond the rear elevation of the adjoining terraced dwelling of No. 32 Bolding House Lane to the northwest. However, this neighbour has a rear conservatory and due to its set-in distance from the side boundary, the extension would not breach a 45 degree line from midpoint of the nearest first floor rear window of No. 32. The proposed single storey rear extension adjacent this side boundary would be roughly the same depth as this neighbour's conservatory. The proposed single storey front extension would not breach the abovementioned 60 degree rule of thumb. It is therefore not considered that the proposal would lead to adverse harm to the amenity of No. 32 in terms of loss of light, privacy, outlook or overbearing impact.

- 7.3.5 The proposed two storey side extension would contain a first floor rear elevation window sited approx. 8m from the rear garden side boundary of the two storey detached dwelling of No. 16a Commonfields to the northeast. However, as this serves an ensuite bathroom a planning condition could be imposed to ensure the window is obscure-glazed with high-level openings. The rear elevation of No. 16a is sited to the east at an angle away from the proposed extension. In this instance, it is considered that the separation distance would be sufficient to avoid adverse harm to the amenity of No. 16a in terms of loss of light, privacy, outlook or overbearing impact.
- 7.3.6 The proposed side extension would also include two first floor side elevation windows that would serve the main bedroom/dressing room area. However, it is considered that the angled distance of approx. 17m to the nearest neighbouring end-terraced front elevation of No. 28 Bolding House Lane to the southeast would be sufficient to avoid adverse harm in terms of loss of privacy. It is also envisaged that the site orientation and overall separation distances would be sufficient to avoid adverse harm to this neighbour in terms of loss of light or overbearing impact.
- 7.3.7 It is considered that the overall proposal would be sited at sufficient distance from other neighbouring boundaries and elevations to avoid material harm to amenity.
- 7.3.8 In light of all the above, it is considered that the proposed development would comply with the amenity requirements of Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and the RDG.

#### **7.4 Impact on access, parking and highway safety**

- 7.4.1 Policy DM11 of the CSDMP 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.
- 7.4.2 The proposal would involve a new dropped kerb proposed at front to provide one parking space. The existing side/rear garage would be demolished, but would provide space for two further vehicles. Although the dropped kerb will lead to some loss of off-street parking, this would be on a turn in the road and three spaces within the site would be provided. It is therefore not envisaged that the proposal would lead to an adverse impact on highway safety and capacity.

#### **7.5 Impact on infrastructure**

- 7.5.1 Surrey Heath's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule was adopted by Full Council on the 16th July 2014, and came into effect on the 1st December 2014. An assessment of CIL liability has therefore been undertaken. Surrey Heath charges CIL on residential extensions only if the net floorspace increase is above 100sq m. The proposal is therefore not CIL liable.

### **8.0 POSITIVE/PROACTIVE WORKING**

- 8.1 In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive, creative and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 38-41 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 suggested/accepted/negotiated amendments to the scheme to resolve identified problems with the proposal and to seek to foster sustainable development.
  - d) Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 It is considered that the impact of the proposal on the host dwelling and within a corner plot setting is acceptable. The proposal is also considered acceptable in terms of impact on neighbouring amenity, and it is considered that sufficient off-street parking would be provided. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

## **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:

Proposed elevations (Drg No 3047-2); Proposed floor plans and roof plan (Drg No 3047-3) - both received on 11 June 2020;  
Proposed site plan (Drg No 3047-10) - received on 19 June 2020, 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 annotated on the approved Dwg No. 3047-2 received on 11 June 2020.

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 ensuite bathroom window in the first floor rear elevation facing No. 16a Commonfields 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. No additional openings shall be created in this elevation without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

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.