

<b>LOCATION:</b>	13 Parsonage Way, Frimley, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 8HZ,
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Erection of single storey front/side extension and single storey rear extension.
<b>TYPE:</b>	Full Planning Application
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Terry Drew
<b>OFFICER:</b>	Miss Patricia Terceiro

**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 Cllr Mylvaganam due to concerns in respect of the loss neighbour's amenity and the size of the proposed development, which would create a large building out of keeping with the street scene in Parsonage Close.**

**RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions**

## **1.0 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The application site comprises a detached dwelling located within a residential area that falls within the Post War Open Estates Character Area. The property is located at the end of a cul-de-sac and is not prominent within the road. The closest residential property is no 11 to the south and the land adjacent to the site's northern and eastern boundaries is designated as Green Space and is occupied by the Churchyard of St Peters Church and allotment gardens. The proposal comprises the erection of a single storey side/front extension and a single storey rear extension. The current proposal would not have an adverse impact on local character and residential amenity and is therefore recommended for approval.

## **2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION**

- 2.1 13 Parsonage Way is a two storey detached dwelling located in a residential area. The property sits at the end of a cul-de-sac and is adjacent to a designated Green Space to the east and north. The plot contains an enclosed garden to the rear and parking is provided at the front in a detached garage and driveway laid to block paving.
- 2.2 The application site lies within the Post War Open Estate as defined within the Western Urban Area Character Assessment.

## **3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 99/1107 Erection of a single storey side extension. Approved, 1999. Implemented.
- 3.2 1985/0086 Erection of six detached houses and garages. Erection of ten 1-bed dwellings for elderly persons and one 2-bed warden's dwelling and provision of 10 parking spaces; erection of new Church Hall with ancillary accommodation and caretakers flat and provision of 30 parking spaces, following demolition of existing Rectory and Church Hall at St Peter's Rectory and Church Hall,

Frimley Green Road, Frimley. Approved, 1986. Condition 13 of this planning permission removed the property's permitted development rights in respect of householder extensions.

#### **4.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 Full planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey front/side extension and of a single storey rear extension.
- 4.2 The proposed single storey front/side extension would have a pitched roof projecting into a canopy and measure 2.4m in width, 2.3m in depth, 2.7m in height to the eaves and 3.5m in ridge height.
- 4.3 The proposed single storey rear extension would have a mono-pitched roof and measure with 3 no rooflights and measure 4m in depth, 9m in width, and 3.8m in maximum height with eaves at 2.7m. The proposal would extend the dwelling's kitchen and dining area.
- 4.4 As stated in the application form, the proposal would be externally finished in brick, tiles and UPVC to match the host dwelling.

#### **5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

- 5.1 At the time of preparation of this report no consultation response have been received.

#### **6.0 REPRESENTATION**

- 6.1 There were 3 no letters of notification letters originally sent to neighbouring properties on 3 August 2021. At the time of preparation of this report two letters of objection have been received which raise the following issues:
  - The proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the street;
  - Together with existing extensions the proposal would double the footprint of the original house;
  - The proposal would cause loss of light and be overbearing to the residents at no 11;
  - St Peters Church requested that the appointed contractors seek to limit their impact on the churchyard, its visitors and neighbours *[Officer comment: the proposed development is modest in scale and therefore the construction period will likely be limited. For such a small scale development, it would not be reasonable to request the submission of a Construction Method Statement. In addition, any undue noise would be dealt with under Environmental Health. In any event, an informative has been added to this recommendation advising the applicant of this matter].*
- 6.2 The following matters have also been raised, however they do not constitute material planning considerations and weight has not been afforded to the following:
  - Property devaluation;
  - The proposal would spoil the view from no 11;
  - The applicants have not notified their neighbours of the planning application;
  - The extension is not necessary as only two people live in the house;
  - Matters related to party walls *[Officer comment: the applicant has signed Certificate A of the application form and the proposal is shown to be away from the common boundary with no 11. The LPA is therefore satisfied that the proposal would not encroach onto land located outside the applicant's ownership. This would therefore be a civil matter between the applicant and the neighbours].*

## **7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The application site is located in a residential area within a defined settlement, as set out in the Proposals Map of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP). In this case, consideration is given to Policy DM9 and DM11 of the CSDMP. The Residential Design Guide (RDG) SPD 2017 as well as the Western Urban Area Character (WUAC) SPD 2012 also constitute material planning considerations.
- 7.2 The main issues to be considered within this application are:
- Impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area
  - Residential amenity

### **7.3 Impact on character of area**

- 7.3.1 Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (CSDMP) 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. The RDG provides further guidance on extensions and alterations to a dwellinghouse. In particular, Principle 10.4 states that rear extensions should be sympathetic and subservient to the design of the main building. Principle 10.2 goes on to say that front extensions should not protrude too far forward from the main building line.
- 7.3.2 The application site lies within the Post War Open Estate as defined within the WUAC SPD. Guiding Principle P01 states that new development should maintain the space between and around buildings and continue to use designs that reflect the post war architecture. Guiding Principle PC2 advises against developments that result in the creation of a terracing effect and Guiding Principle PC3 goes on to say that development that erodes the integrity of the post war architectural style will be resisted.
- 7.3.3 The streetscene of Parsonage Way contains detached dwellings on the northern side whereas to the south there are block of flats and Scout Hut, which is occupied by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Frimley (St Peters) Scout Group. As such, there is some variety in terms of built form within the road. The application site is located at the end of the cul-de-sac and, as such, it does not occupy a prominent position in the streetscene.
- 7.3.4 The proposed single storey front/side extension would be visible from public vantage points. However, owing to its modest size and set back from the main road, this element of the proposal would not be considered harmful to the character of the area. The host dwelling is set back from no 11 and, as such, the proposal would not protrude beyond the prevailing building line. This extension would retain sufficient space around itself, in keeping with the spacious character of the road. This element of the proposal, by virtue of its modest scale, design and materials would be considered in keeping with the character of the host dwelling.
- 7.3.5 The proposed single storey rear extension would not be visible from public vantage points and, as such, it would not be harmful to the character of the area. It is considered that its single storey height would provide a degree of subservience when seen against the host dwelling. The proposed design and materials would form a sympathetic addition to this post war building.
- 7.3.6 As such, the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would be in accordance with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP, the RDG and the WUACSPD.

### **7.4 Impact on residential amenity**

- 7.4.1 Policy DM9 CSDMP 2012 states that development should respect the amenities of the adjoining properties and uses. Principle 10.1 of the RDG indicates that householder extensions should not materially erode neighbour amenities.

- 7.4.2 The proposed front/side extension would retain a gap of approximately 2.8m to the common boundary with no 11 to the south. Due to the staggered relationship between both dwellings, the proposal would face no 11's side wall. Although no 11 contains a ground floor side window facing the application site, this would not directly face the proposal and, in addition, it is a secondary source of light to the room it serves. Given the proposal's modest size, together with the distance to the common boundary with no 11 (which would increase to approximately 4.1m to its flank wall) it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to overbearing or overshadowing impacts. The boundary treatment between both properties in this location (i.e. a 1.8m close boarded fence) would block views from the extension's side window. As such, the proposal would be considered acceptable in terms of privacy.
- 7.4.3 The proposed single storey rear extension would retain a separation distance of approximately 0.9m to the common boundary with no 11. Both properties sit in a staggered relationship with the application dwelling already projecting well beyond no 11's rear elevation as existing. Although the proposal would add to this projection, it is noted it would be at single storey height. In addition, the extension would be sited further away from no 11's rear windows and primary amenity area. For these reasons, it is not considered that the proposal would be so unduly overbearing as to warrant a refusal of this application.
- 7.4.4 A loss of light assessment has been undertaken in accordance with para 8.12 of the RDG and concluded that the centre of no 11's rear patio doors would fall within 60 degrees of a line drawn from the edge of the proposed rear extension and, as such, the proposal would obstruct the light received by these doors. However, this same para advises that this is only an indicator and the acceptability of a development proposal will also be dependent on ground levels on site and the orientation of buildings. In this case, the levels are flat. The proposal would however be sited to the north of no 11 and, given this orientation, the proposal would not block the light received by these neighbours. In addition, due to the staggered relationship, no 11 is already partly affected by the application dwelling. As such, this element of the proposal would be considered acceptable in this regard.
- 7.4.5 The proposed rear extension would not contain any windows facing these neighbours and, as such, would not give rise to loss of privacy.
- 7.4.6 The application site is adjacent to a green space to the north and east which does not contain residential properties. On this basis, there would be no concerns in terms of residential amenity.
- 7.4.7 As such, the proposal would not be considered to affect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties and would be in accordance with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and the RDG.

## **7.5 Other matters**

- 7.5.1 Surrey Heath's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule was adopted by Full Council on the 16<sup>th</sup> July 2014 and the CIL Charging Schedule came into effect on the 1<sup>st</sup> 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.

## **8.0 WORKING IN A POSITIVE/PROACTIVE MANNER AND PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY**

- 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 to 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.

8.2 Under the Equalities Act 2010, the Council must have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation of persons by reason of age, disability, pregnancy, race, religion, sex and sexual orientation. This planning application has been processed and assessed with due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty. The proposal is not considered to conflict with this Duty.

## 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. Therefore, the proposal complies with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP, the RDG and the WUACSPD and is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

## 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, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

- Drawing no AD4563 sheet 2 rev B - proposed plans and elevations, received 27 July 2021

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 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.

### 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. 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.
3. The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Walls (etc) Act 1996.
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.
5. 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.
6. The applicant is advised to carry out the construction works in such a manner to limit their impact the churchyard, its visitors and neighbours.