

ANNEX B

Delegated officer report for application 19/0234/FFU:

OFFICER'S DELEGATED REPORT

APPLICATION NO: 19/0234

LOCATION: 1 Middle Close, Camberley, GU15 1NZ

PROPOSAL: Proposed single storey front extension including 2 rooflights, first floor side extension to both sides of property, change to main roof form and increase in ridge height, 6 rooflights to main front roof slope, two rear dormers and fenestration alterations to front and rear elevations (Amended plans recv'd 15/4/19 & change of description). (Additional info rec'd 08/07/2019). (Additional plan recv'd 18/7/19).

TYPE: Full Planning Application

APPLICANT: Mr B Mudgal

OFFICER: Miss Amy Myer

EXPIRY DATE: 15.05.2019

1.0 NEIGHBOURS CHECKED

1.1 Yes – Statutory consultation requirements met.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

2.1 19/0026

Erection of first floor side extensions either side of property, single storey front extension, roof extension, five front rooflights and two rear dormer windows, and two side rooflights.

Withdrawn 11.03.2019

2.3 84/0176

Two storey extension

Approved 16.04.1984

3.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

3.1 Surrey Heath Borough Council Arboricultural Officer: No objection. No trees on or adjacent to site with TPOs. No significant trees to the front of the site which would be affected by the proposed front extension. The mature cypress trees within the rear garden of the site have already been heavily pruned. Had they been in good condition then

the Council would have wanted to protect these trees from construction impacts and also potential canopy damage from the proposed first floor extension to this side of the property.

3.2 Surrey Wildlife Trust

No objection, subject to planning conditions and informatives, including: development being undertaken in accordance with the Ecology Report and bird box plan submitted, no net increase in artificial lighting and having regard to the protection of bats and wild nesting birds.

4.0 **REPRESENTATION**

4.1 At the time of preparation of this report, six letters of objection had been received. These raise the following issues:

Overdevelopment: application property has already been heavily extended/developed, proposed development would have 3 storey height across length of plot, loss of gaps between boundaries, disproportionate development in relation to existing nearby housing and street scene, out of character with spacious open character of rest of close and estate, could result in 'terracing' effect if no.3 were to develop the property in the future. [Officer comment: see section 7.3]

Overbearing/loss of outlook: proposed first floor side extension would result in high flank wall directly adjacent to the annexe occupied by elderly relatives and also a conservatory at no.3 Middle Close and would also appear overbearing to no.56 Roundway.

Overshadowing/loss of light: Proposed first floor side extension, increase to roof height and proposed dormers under amended scheme would still result in loss of light to living areas and small garden at no.56 Roundway (which is set lower than application site).

Overlooking/loss of privacy: large viewing window to front elevation at first floor landing level would directly overlook no.54 Roundway, as would rooflights. Increase to number, size and height of windows at the rear, and removal of trees and vegetative screening on rear boundary, would provide views into no.58 Roundway. [Officer comment: see section 7.4]

Hedges: being removed during wild nesting bird season, must be against regulations.[Officer comment: see section 7.6]

Highways: front extension would result in reduction in size to driveway/loss of parking on site which could result in cars parking in road and obstructions.[Officer comment: see section 7.7]

Construction works already started, noise and disturbance impacts.[Officer comment: this matter has been passed to the Planning Enforcement team to investigate and to remind the applicant of the Code of Construction hours]

Question why do applicants need a cinema when there are local cinemas and why do they need a shower room in the roof when there are shower rooms at the property at lower level.[Officer comment: the need and proposed internal layouts of the extension are not a material planning consideration]

5.0 **SITE DESCRIPTION**

5.1 The application site is located on the southern side of Middle Close, a small residential cul-de-sac, within the settlement area of Camberley & Frimley. The site is within a 'Hedged Estate' Character Area, as designated within the Western Urban Area Character SPD. This type of area is characterised by small to medium infill housing estates with a very green character, generous plots accommodating detached dwellings, mixed architectural styles, on plot parking and enclosure of the street scene with hedges and street trees.

5.2 The site consists of a two storey, detached residential property, with a double gable ended roof to the front and a dual pitched roof to the rear. The property has a single storey double length garage to the south west elevation (approved in 1987) and a two storey front/side extension (approved in 1984). The property is enclosed to the front by a medium height hedge and has on plot parking provision on the gravel driveway and within the double length garage. The property has a rear garden which includes a rear patio area, swimming pool, and a number of mature trees to the side and rear boundaries.

6.0 **THE DEVELOPMENT**

6.1 The current application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey front extension including two front roof lights, a first floor side extension to both sides of the property, a change to the main roof form and increase in ridge height, six rooflights to the main front roof slope, two rear roof dormers and alterations to the fenestration to the front and rear elevations.

6.2 The front extension to the property would be approximately 2.8m deep on the north east elevation and 1.4m on the south west elevation, 16m wide, and would have a mono pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.7m and a ridge height of 4m. The front extension to the garage would be 1.4m deep, 2.9m in width and would have a mono pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.7m and a ridge height of 4m. It would have two rooflights. The gap between the property and the garage would be retained internally at ground floor level providing an access passageway from the front to the rear of the site.

6.3 The first floor side extension (on the south west side) would be approximately 9.9m deep, 3.9m wide, and would have a dual pitched roof with an eaves height of 5.4m and a ridge height of 8.3m when taken from ground level at the front. The first floor side extension (on the north east side) would be smaller and approximately 5.6m

deep, 1m wide, and would have a dual pitched roof with an eaves height of 5.4m and a ridge height of 8.3m when taken from ground level at the front of the site.

- 6.4 The roof alterations would change the main roof from a double gable ended roof at the front and dual pitched rear roof to a dual pitched and crown roof with two front gable ends and two rear roof dormers. The height of the roof would increase at the front when taken from ground level from a ridge height of 7.2m to a ridge height of 8.3m and at the rear (as the land slopes upwards) from a ridge height of 6.7m to a ridge height of 7.8m. The proposals would also introduce six front rooflights to the main roof and two rear dormer windows.
- 6.5 The drawings confirm that the extensions would be constructed with brickwork elevations and roof tiles to match the existing property. The proposals would also include a number of alterations to the fenestration at the front and rear, including a Juliette balcony to the existing first floor rear French doors and the change from a window and door to a set of ground floor rear aluminium bi-folding doors.
- 6.6 The current application follows a previous withdrawn application (ref. 19/0026). The previous scheme proposed two full-width first floor side extensions either side of the property, the extension on the north east side of which extended at two storey deeper along the rear of the site. The current scheme proposes one first floor side extension to the south west side of the property and a small first floor side extension to the other north east side and which would not extend beyond the main rear building line. The previous scheme proposed a hipped roof design, whereas the current scheme proposes a dual pitched/crown roof form. The previous scheme also proposed to increase the height of the main roof more than the current scheme.

7.0 **PLANNING ISSUES**

- 7.1 The following policies and guidance are relevant and material considerations in the assessment of the application:
The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF)
DM9 (Design Principles), DM11 (Traffic Management and Highways Safety) and CP14 (Biodiversity and Nature Conservation) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP)
Principles 10.1 (Extensions), 10.2 (Front Extensions), 10.3 (Side Extensions) and 10.5 (Roofs) of the Residential Design Guide SPD 2017 (RDG SPD)
Guiding Principles for the 'Hedged Estates' Character Areas in the Western Urban Area Character SPD 2012 (WUAC SPD)
Surrey County Council Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance 2018
- 7.2 The main issues to be considered within this application are:
Impact on appearance of host building and character of the local area
Impact on neighbouring residential amenity
Impact on trees
Impact on ecology

Impact on parking/highways
Community Infrastructure Levy

7.3 Impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area and host dwelling

- 7.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) promotes high quality design standards with the objective to achieve sustainable development. Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (2012) promotes high quality design. Development should respect and enhance the character of the local environment and be appropriate in scale, materials, massing, bulk and density.
- 7.3.2 The RDG SPD (2017) provides further guidance on extensions and alterations to properties within the borough. In particular, Principle 10.1 states that extensions should be subordinate and consistent with the form, scale, architectural style and materials of the original building. Principle 10.2 advises that front extensions should not protrude too far forward of the main front building line or be prominent in the street scene. Principle 10.3 states that side extensions should maintain important gaps and 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. Principle 10.5 advises that roof alterations should be sympathetic and subservient to the design of the main building and not undermine streetscene or local character.
- 7.3.3 The WUAC SPD (2012) identifies the key features of the 'Hedged Estate' Character Area and provides guiding principles for future development in these areas. Guiding Principle HE1 advises that new development should pay regard to the fact that buildings are set in spacious, regular shaped plots which provides for space between and around buildings and a verdant character. Guiding Principle HE2 states that development forms that are contrary to the prevailing development form of detached houses set in spacious individual enclosed plots will be resisted. Guiding Principle HE4 confirms that high quality contemporary designs will be welcomed.
- 7.3.4 Concern has been raised by objectors that the proposals would result in overdevelopment of the existing property, which has already undergone extensions, and that it would result in disproportionate development in relation to nearby properties. Concern has also been raised that the loss of the gap between the application property and no.3 Middle Close would harm the open spacious character of the close and estate. The proposed first floor side extension (on the south west side, adjacent to no.3) would be set in a total of 1m from the side boundary with no.3 Middle Close. The area at no.3 directly adjacent to the side boundary to the application property is currently single storey level and forms an annexe extension. Whilst it is acknowledged that there would be a reduction in the existing gap and space between these two buildings, a visual gap at first floor level would still be retained between the two buildings by reason of the set in at first floor level and adjacent single storey development at no.3. Furthermore, on the other (north eastern) side, the proposals would be set in and a substantial gap retained at first floor level between the application property and the rear boundary to no.56 Roundway. The proposals would not result in two storey development

across the entire width of the property or plot, and given the set in on one side and the retention of the gap on one side of the property, would not impact the spacious character of the street scene to such a degree as to warrant a refusal. Sufficient space would still be retained around the property and between nearby buildings and the verdant backdrop within the rear gardens (assisted by the fact the land slopes upwards) would still be visible. This accords with the key features identified and the Guiding Principles for Hedged Estates within the WUAC SPD and also guidance in the RDG SPD for side extensions. The matching materials and fenestration design would ensure the side extensions would have a sympathetic appearance in relation to the host dwelling, in accordance with policy DM9 and the Principles in the RDG SPD.

- 7.3.5 The proposals would result in a change to the roof form and an increase in the ridge height by approximately 1m to a maximum height of around 8.3m. The gable end features to the front would still be retained but the main roof would become a dual pitched/crown roof. There is currently no consistent roof form or roof height within the surrounding street scene. No.3 has a dual pitched roof, no.5 has a dual pitched and hipped roof, no.7 has a hipped roof. Therefore, the proposed change to a dual pitch with crown roof form (with the two front gable ends retained) would not be visually prominent nor harmful to the street scene, given the range of roof forms and designs in the immediate area. Due to Middle Close being set on a small hill, the properties are set at different levels, with the application being significantly lower than no. 56 Roundway, no. 3 being marginally lower than the application property and no. 5 being substantially lower than no.3, and so on as the land falls away down the hill. Whilst the application property is sited on the crest of this hill at the top of the Close, its existing roof is only marginally higher than the ridge height at no.3 next door, no.56 Roundway is set substantially higher up, and thus the proposed increase in ridge height would not be unduly prominent when viewed in the overall context. Given the variation of roof heights, the proposed change to the roof height of the application property would not break an existing uniformity that exists in the roof line of the area and this would lessen its visual prominence. The property would still essentially remain as a two storey detached property, which is characteristic for the 'Hedged Estate' Character Area. The matching roof tiles for the extended roof would ensure it would have a sympathetic appearance in relation to the existing building.
- 7.3.6 The proposed rooflights would be modest in scale. Although six rooflights to the main front roof slope could be quite dominant in the street scene, against guidance in the RDG SPD, given their small scale and that the rooflights, in themselves, be fall under permitted development, as such it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on this basis. The rear dormers would not be visible from and thus not impact the character of the street scene. In any case, they would be set back from the sides, up from the eaves and down from the ridgeline of the roof and would be an appropriate scale, in accordance with advice in the RDG SPD for dormer roof extensions.
- 7.3.7 The proposed single storey front extension would not project significantly forward of the main front building line, would be single storey, of modest depth projection, and set back from the road. As such, it would accord with the advice of the RDG SPD for front extensions. The matching materials and fenestration design would

ensure the front extension would have a sympathetic appearance in relation to the host dwelling, in accordance with policy DM9 and the Principles in the RDG SPD.

7.3.8 The more contemporary fenestration design, of the ground floor double doors with fixed sidelights and the first floor gable end window on the front elevation would give the property a more contemporary appearance. However, this would not itself be harmful to the appearance of the building nor area, and accords with Guiding Principle HE4 which confirms that high quality contemporary designs in Hedged Estate areas will be welcomed. The proposed fenestration alterations at the rear of the property would not be visible in public views, only in a limited range of private views from neighbouring properties, and would not impact the character or appearance of the street scene.

7.3.9 In conclusion, the proposals would maintain the appearance of the host building and the character of the area. As such, the proposals would accord with the NPPF, CSDMP Policy DM9, the RDG SPD and the WUAC SPD.

7.4 Impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties

7.4.1 Policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012 states that development should respect the amenities of the adjoining properties and uses. Principle 10.1 of the RDG SPD states that extensions should not result in a material loss of amenity to neighbouring properties as a result of overshadowing, eroding privacy or being overbearing. Paragraphs 8.3-8.4 of the RDG SPD provides guidance on privacy, paragraphs 8.5-8.7 on outlook and paragraphs 8.8-8.17 on daylight and sunlight.

7.4.2 The proposed first floor side extension on the south western elevation of the property would be adjacent to the side boundary with no.3 Middle Close. The extension would be set in at first floor level by around 1m from this boundary to no.3. The area at no.3 directly adjacent to the boundary with the application property consists of a single storey annexe, with a rear facing and side facing window (which appear to serve a kitchen) and rear facing double doors (serving a dining/living room). Concern has been raised by objectors that the proposed extension would result in significant overbearing impacts and loss of outlook, in particular to the residents of this annexe. It is acknowledged that the proposals would result in development being brought closer to the boundary with no.3 with an increased mass and bulk due to the side and roof extensions. This is likely to result in some increased enclosure to the nearest rear facing kitchen window and dining area double doors. However, it is necessary to take into account; that the extensions would be set in from the boundary by 1m, the orientation of the nearest openings at no.3 in relation to the proposed extensions and the limited depth projection beyond these, and that the openings to no.3 are secondary openings to these rooms and not the sole/primary outlook/light source to these rooms. On this basis, it is concluded that the extension would not result in a significant overbearing impact nor loss of outlook to these occupants. In addition, the 45 degree indicator (for daylight impacts of two storey extensions), as set out in the RDG SPD, has been undertaken in relation to the nearest rear facing opening to the annexe at no.3. This demonstrates that the proposed first floor extension would not breach a 45 degree angle when taken from the nearest rear kitchen window at no.3, which indicates the proposed extension would not result in significant overshadowing nor

loss of daylight to this window. In terms of sunlight, the proposals would be sited to the south west of no.3 and thus may have some impact on late afternoon/evening sunlight levels to the nearest openings at no.3. Notwithstanding this, given the orientation of the neighbouring openings in relation to the proposed extension and that the nearest openings to no.3 are secondary openings to these rooms and not the sole/primary outlook/light source to these rooms, it is concluded that the extension would not result in a material overshadowing nor loss of sunlight.

- 7.4.3 The proposed first floor side extension on the north eastern elevation of the property would be modest in scale, and would retain a significant gap between the side of the application property and the boundary with no.56 Roundway and would therefore have limited impact. The proposals would still result in a change to the roof form, the ridge height of the property being increased by around 1m, and two rear dormers in the roof, the impact of which on no.56 has been considered. Concerns have been raised by objectors that the changes to the roof would result in an overbearing and overshadowing impact to the garden area and living rooms at no.56 (the garden area of which is set at lower ground level than the application property). However, on consideration of the proposed increase in the scale of the roof and the scale and distance of the new dormers, it is concluded that, whilst it may have some impact, the development would not result in a significant overbearing or overshadowing impact to the adjacent garden area at no.56. Given the separation distance between the proposed development and the nearest habitable room windows (around 18m) at no.56 and, taking account of the fact that no.56 is on higher ground than the application property, the proposals would not have a significant overbearing impact and loss of outlook to these openings at no.56. The 25 degree indicator (for daylight impacts, for development opposite neighbouring windows) as set out in the RDG SPD, has been undertaken in relation to the nearest rear facing habitable room openings at no.56. Given that no.56 is set much higher than the application property, even after proposed development, the 25 degree angle would rise well above the highest point of the proposed side and roof extension when taken from these openings. This indicates the proposed extensions would not result in significant overshadowing nor loss of daylight to these openings at no.56. In terms of sunlight, the proposals would be sited to the north east of no.3 so would have limited impact on sunlight levels to this neighbouring property. Notwithstanding this, given the orientation and distance of the neighbouring openings in relation to the proposed extension, it is concluded that the extension would not result in a material overshadowing nor loss of sunlight.
- 7.4.4 Objection has been raised with regard the proposed gable end window on the front elevation, and its potential impact of overlooking toward the garden and property at no.54 Roundway. Given the existing boundary treatment to the side of no.54 which would provide vegetative screening, and given the separation distance of 19m between this new window and the boundary to no.54 and further to the nearest windows at no.54, it is concluded that this new window would not result in significant overlooking and loss of privacy to no.54. The front rooflights would be angled skyward and, given this orientation and the separation distances to neighbouring properties, would therefore not have any impact on the privacy of neighbouring occupants. At the rear, there already exists a first floor a set of doors and the proposals only seek to add a Juliette balcony railing to this, so this would not result in any increased overlooking to neighbours. At ground floor level, the

change from a window and double doors to a five panel set of doors would not increase overlooking given their siting at ground floor level and distance from neighbouring properties. Concern has been raised that trees and vegetation on the side and rear boundary of the application property that provide screening between it and nos 56 and 58 Roundway is being removed and this will allow views into these neighbouring properties from the proposed rear dormer windows. However, the proposed dormers would not provide any additional, intrusive angles of view nor facilitate any significant increase in overlooking towards these properties than is already possible from the existing first floor openings below at the application property. The angles of view towards the rear gardens of no.56 would also be primarily oblique rather than direct. The separation distance between these new dormer windows and the boundary with the garden at no.58 would be around 22m and to the nearest openings at no.58 would be around 29m. Given these separation distances and the existing pattern of overlooking, the proposed dormers would not give rise to significant additional overlooking nor loss of privacy to these neighbouring occupants.

7.4.5 The proposals would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity, and would accord with the NPPF, policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012 and the Principles of the RDG SPD 2017.

7.5 Impact on trees

7.5.1 Policy DM9 requires trees and vegetation worthy of retention are protected from development. The site is also located within a 'Hedged Estate' Character Area, which is characterised by its green and verdant nature and enclosure with hedges. Guiding Principle HE1 advises that front gardens should be enclosed by hedges and that the green character should be retained by the retention of existing large trees and mature vegetation. The property is not in a conservation area and there are no trees with Tree Protection Orders on or in close vicinity of the site. There are a range of hedges around the front and sides of the site, Cypress trees on the side boundary with no.3 Middle Close (which appeared to have been heavily coppiced at the time of the site visit in February 2019), and a number of trees and some vegetation at the end of the rear garden.

7.5.2 The Council's Arboricultural Officer has been consulted on the application and raised no objection. They have confirmed that there is no significant trees or vegetation to the front of the site which would be affected by the proposed front extension. The mature Cypress trees within the rear garden of the site, adjacent to the side boundary with no.3 Middle Close, had already been heavily coppiced at the time of the site visit in February 2019). Had they been in good condition then the Council would have wanted to protect these trees from construction impacts and also potential canopy damage from the proposed first floor extension to this side of the property.

7.5.3 A Tree Protection Plan has been submitted which shows that hedging and trees would be protected from construction impacts, by the erection of protective Heras fencing around them, and the creation of Construction Exclusion Zones to ensure that no construction vehicles/materials or equipment would be stored or used in

these areas. Subject to a planning condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with these tree protection measures, the proposals would protect vegetation and trees worthy of retention and the green and verdant character of the area, in accordance with policy DM9 of the CSDMP and the Guiding Principles of the WUAC SPD.

7.6 Impact on ecology

7.6.1 The NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and minimising the impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. Policy CP14A of the CSDMP states that the Council will seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity and development that results in harm to or loss of features of interest for biodiversity will not be permitted.

7.6.2 An Ecology Report (Bat survey) has been submitted during the course of the determination period of this application. Surrey Wildlife Trust have been consulted and have advised that, on the basis of the report, bats do not appear to present a constraint to development. Subject, therefore, to advisory informatives and conditions being imposed as recommended by SWT (including: development to be undertaken in accordance with all recommendations for precautionary measures and enhancements contained in the Ecology Report and the bird box plan, no net increase in external artificial lighting and an informative prohibiting the removal of dense shrubbery/vegetation during the main wild bird nesting season) no objection is raised on ecology grounds, with the proposal complying with CSDMP policy CP14A.

7.7 Highways/parking impact

7.7.1 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 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.

7.7.2 Concern has been raised by objectors that the proposed front extension would result in a reduction in the size of the existing driveway and thus loss of parking on site which could result in cars parking in the road and causing obstructions. The driveway would still retain vehicular parking for 3 vehicles and 1-2 spaces within the garage, providing a total of 5 car parking spaces after development. Surrey County Council's Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (2018) advises that for 4 bedroom + properties within a location such as this ('suburban') a minimum of 2 parking spaces should be provided on site.

7.7.3 As such, the proposals would retain adequate parking provision on site, and would not result in a material impact on local parking conditions nor highways safety. The proposals would accord with Surrey County Council's Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (2018) and policy DM11 of the CSDMP

7.8 Community Infrastructure Levy

7.8.1 The Council implemented a CIL Charging Schedule on 1 st December 2014 and all new dwellings and extensions over 100sqm are CIL liable, though exemptions can be applied for in some cases. The amount of CIL payable would be dependent on floorspace. The proposals would result in a net increase in floor space of 137.7sqm. This application site is located within the Western Charging Zone for which the charge is £180 per square metre of floorspace. On this basis, the proposals would be liable for a total CIL charge of £24,786. However, a Self-Build Residential Extension Exemption form has been submitted.

8.0 **CONCLUSION**

8.1 Subject to planning conditions and informatives, the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the host building and character of the local area, on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants, on trees, ecology or parking/highways. The proposals would accord with the NPPF and Policies DM9, DM11 and CP14 of the CSDMP 2012. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

9.0 **POSITIVE/PROACTIVE WORKING**

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 the following:

- 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.
- Have suggested/accepted/negotiated amendments to the scheme to resolve identified problems with the proposal and to seek to foster sustainable development.
- Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.

Conditions(s)

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 Ground Floor Plan (C01 Rev C), Proposed First Floor Plan (C02 Rev C), Proposed Second Plan (C03 Rev C), Proposed Roof Plan (C04 Rev C), Proposed Elevations (C05 Rev D), Proposed Elevations (C06 Rev D) and Proposed Site Plan (C07 Rev C) received 15/04/2019, 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; 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 approved shall be undertaken in accordance with with all recommendations for precautionary measures and enhancements of Section 7 "Recommendations" of the " Protected species report: Bat Presence and Absence Surveys" prepared by Brindle & Green and dated July 2019, and the Proposed Site Plan: bird box details (C08) received 18/07/2019.

Reason: To ensure the protection of protected species and to contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity, in accordance with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Tree Protection Plan (C09 Rev F) received 30/07/2019. Prior to commencement of development, digital photographs shall be provided by the retained Consultant and forwarded to and approved by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. This should record all aspects of any facilitation tree works and the physical tree and ground protection measures having been implemented and maintained in accordance with Tree Protection Plan. 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.

Informative(s)

1. This decision notice is a legal document and therefore should be kept in a safe place as it may be required at a later date. A replacement copy can be obtained however there is a charge for this service.
2. The decision has been taken in compliance with paragraphs 38-41 of the NPPF to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. Further information on how this was done can be obtained from the Officer's report.
3. The applicant is reminded that if during development, including site clearance or demolition works, a bat is seen then work should cease immediately and advice sought from Natural England or a qualified specialist. There is a requirement to apply for a European Protected Species derogation Licence for any activity that may adversely impact on a potential bat roost or disturb bats, in order to avoid contravention of Section 9(1) and Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
4. The applicant is informed that if the proposed development would involve the removal of dense shrubbery/vegetation, then this should be done outside of the main bird nesting season (March-August) to avoid adverse effect on nesting wild birds. Alternatively, if this is not possible and only a small area of dense vegetation would be affected, an ecologist could inspect the site for active nests immediately prior to clearance, and if any are found they should be left undisturbed with a buffer zone around it until it can be confirmed that the nest is not in use. This is in order to avoid contravention of Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Countryside and Right of Way Act 2000.
5. The applicant is advised to use native species when planting new trees and shrubs, preferably of local provenance from seed collected, raised and grown only in the UK, suitable for site conditions and complimentary to surrounding natural habitat. Planting should focus on nectar-rich flowers and/or berries as these can also be of considerable value to wildlife.