

LOCATION: 24 The Close, Lightwater, Surrey, GU18 5RH,
PROPOSAL: Erection of a single storey rear extension.
TYPE: Full Planning Application
APPLICANT: Mr Mark Harding
OFFICER: Ms Louise Fuller

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it is being reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of the Executive Head of Regulatory.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of the existing rear conservatory.
- 1.2 The proposal would not have an adverse impact on local character, highway safety nor would it give rise to a significant impact on residential amenity. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is situated within the settlement area of Lightwater. It is a semi-detached two storey dwelling sat in a corner plot to the northern side of the highway. The site is enclosed by a hedge and post and rail fence to the front boundary and a solid fence to the side boundary facing the highway. The property benefits from an area of off road parking formed by gravel located to the side / front of the site. The surrounding area is characterised by residential development.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 93/0300 Two storey side extension – approved and implemented.
- 3.2 20/0309 Certificate of lawful development for a loft conversion with rear dormer and 3 roof lights to front. Agreed.
- 3.3 20/0492 Certificate of lawful development for a rear extension 3m deep, 6m wide, 2.5m to eaves and 3.2m to mono pitch ridge. Agreed.

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Full planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of the existing conservatory. The proposed extension would have a depth of 3.8m, a width of 9m and a maximum height of 3.6m with a full hip and eaves height of 2.5m.
- 4.2 Corrected plans were been received on 14 July to address a scaling issue between the floor and elevation plans of the proposal. This addressed a discrepancy where, using the Council's scaling software, the floor plan of the proposal scaled deeper than the proposed elevations. The agent has addressed this by submitting a revised floor plan which scales to just under 3.8m deep. The assessments made within this report are based on this measurement.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 5.1 Surrey County Highway Authority No objections

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 A neighbour consultation was undertaken and this generated extensive comments of objection. However the objections have now been withdrawn in full.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

- 7.1 The application site is located in a residential area within the defined settlement of Lightwater, as set out on the Policies Map of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011 - 2028 (CSDMP). As such, consideration is given to Policies DM9 (Design Principles) and DM11 (Traffic Management and Highway Safety) of the CSDMP. Regard is also had to guidance contained within the Residential Design Guide (RDG) SPD 2017, in addition to the Lightwater Village Design Statement 2007 (LVDS).
- 7.2 The main issues to be considered within this application are:
 - Impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area
 - Residential amenity
 - Transport and highways considerations.

7.3 Impact on character of area

- 7.3.1 Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 (CSDMP) seeks to promote high quality design that respects and enhances the local environment, paying particular regard to scale, materials, massing, bulk and density. The Lightwater Village Design Statement (LVDS) also seeks good design that respects and enhances village character of the area as a key objective. The RDG provides further guidance on extensions and alterations to a dwelling house. In particular, Principle 10.4 states that rear extensions should not materially erode neighbour amenity and should be sympathetic and subservient to the design of the main building.
- 7.3.2 The scale and design of the rear extension is considered to be acceptable to that of the host dwelling. Given the rear siting the proposal it would not be visible from the front elevation nor impact on the street scene from that vantage point. There is screening to the side / rear boundary however due to the corner plot siting of the application site there may be glimpsed views of the proposal from the highway which runs along this boundary. However, the single storey form and hipped roof reduce the mass of the proposal such that it would not appear dominant or incongruous from any glimpsed view that may be obtained.

7.3.3 The proposed external materials would match in appearance those of the existing dwelling and, in light of the comments above it is not considered that the proposal would have any significant affect upon the character of the property or wider street scene. In light the above, it is not considered that the proposal would conflict with Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the CSDMP or principles B1 to B4 and B8 of the LVDS or principles 10.1 and 10.4 of the RDG.

7.4 Impact on residential amenity

7.4.1 Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (CSDMP) states that development should respect the amenities of the adjoining properties and uses. Principles 10.1 and 10.4 of the RDG indicates that extensions should not result in a material loss of amenity to neighbouring properties as a result of overshadowing, eroding privacy or being overbearing.

7.4.2 The proposal would extend 3.8m along the side shared boundary with No.23 to the west. There would be a set in at floor level of 0.20m off this boundary and the roof / eaves would be flush with it. This neighbour has a ground floor rear facing window. The eaves height would be 2.5m and the pitch of the hipped roof would pull the mass of the roof away to an overall height of 3.6m. This maximum height would be set 4m off the shared boundary. This arrangement would not result in a material breach of the 60 degree guidance set out in para 8.12 and figure 8.7 of the RDG. In addition having regard to the fact the eaves height proposed is 2.5m, and that the maximum 3.6m height of the proposal would be set 4m off this shared boundary it is considered no significant overbearing or loss of light impacts would arise.

7.4.3 No wide facing windows are proposed and the rear facing openings would not give rise to any new patterns of overlooking. All other neighbours are considered to be sited sufficient distance as to not be impacted upon by the proposal.

7.4.4 As such, the proposal is not considered to affect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties and would be in accordance with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and guidance contained within the RDG.

7.5 Parking and access

7.5.1 Policy DM11 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. The proposed development would not affect the existing parking and access arrangements serving the site and as such, the proposal is considered to be in line with Policy DM11 of the CSDMP.

7.6 Other matters

7.6.1 As the proposal relates to a net increase in residential floor area less than 100 square metres the development is not CIL liable.

8.0 WORKING IN A POSITIVE/PROACTIVE MANNER

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

a) 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 proposed development would not result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area, nor on the residential amenities and highways. Therefore, the proposal complies with Policies DM9 and DM11 of the CSDMP, the RDG and the LVDS. The application is therefore recommended for conditional 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 building works, hereby approved, shall be constructed in external fascia materials 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.

3. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans:

Existing / Proposed elevation 3603 P02 Rear elevation (3-a)

Existing / Proposed elevation 3602 P02 side elevation (2-a)

Existing / Proposed elevation 3601 P03 side elevation (1-a)

Existing / Proposed level 01 plan 3002 P02

Existing / Proposed level 00 plan 3001 P03

Existing / Proposed roof plan 3003 P02

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.

Informative(s)

1. This Decision Notice is a legal document and therefore should be kept in a safe place as it may be required if or when selling your home. A replacement copy can be obtained, however, there is a charge for this service.
2. The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Walls (etc) Act 1996.
3. Whilst it would appear from the application that the proposed development is to be entirely within the curtilage of the application site, care should be taken upon commencement and during the course of building operations to ensure that no part of the development, including the foundations, eaves and roof overhang will encroach on, under or over adjoining land.
4. The applicant is advised that this permission is only pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and is advised to contact Building Control with regard to the necessary consents applicable under the Building Regulations and the effects of legislation under the Building Act 1984.