

LOCATION:	8 Orchard Close, West End, Woking, Surrey, GU24 9NS,
PROPOSAL:	First floor side extension to south side; and, part 2-storey, part first floor extension to north side of dwelling.
TYPE:	Full Planning Application
APPLICANT:	Mr Sujid Bhatti
OFFICER:	Navil Rahman

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, the application has been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr. Alleyway due to concerns over the unneighbourly impact of the development, overlooking and insufficient parking to accommodate the increase in occupancy on site.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT, subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The application relates to extensions to an existing single-family dwelling. There is no policy restricting the principle of development on this site. There would be no harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider surrounding area, nor any undue amenity impact to neighbouring residents' amenity. The proposal would also be considered acceptable from a highway perspective.
- 1.2 The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site relates to a detached, two-storey, single-family dwellinghouse situated on the western side of Orchard Close, within the settlement area of West End. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, comprising detached and semi-detached properties of a similar scale and size.
- 2.2 The existing property has a single-storey front projection and single-storey elements to either flank, with the northern aspect forming a single-garage that sits immediately adjacent to the rear garden of No.6.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 21/0774 First floor side extension to south side; first floor front/side extension to north side above kitchen, breakfast room and part of garage; ground floor front extension to kitchen and new porch. *Refused 13/09/2021*
- 3.2 21/1258 Erection of two storey side extensions, two storey front extension, and roof alterations. *Refused 6/1/22 for the following reason:*

1. The proposal, by reason of the height of the proposed first floor extension on the northern side of the property, and its proximity to the side boundary of the garden of 6 Orchard Close which is limited in depth, would result in an overbearing outlook and overshadowing in the mornings to the rear garden of No 6, that would unacceptably diminish the residential amenities that the occupants of No 6 currently enjoy in using their rear garden area. This would be contrary to the provisions of Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, Principles 8.3, 10.1 and 10.3 of the Residential Design Guide SPD 2017, and Paragraph 130 of Section 12 of the NPPF.

4.0 PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The current planning application proposes the construction of a part two-storey front/side extension together with first-floor side extensions to both the northern and southern aspect of the dwelling together with the installation of one roof-light to the northern flank. This submission seeks to overcome the reason for refusing 21/1258 planning application.
- 4.2 The proposed front extension would result in the dwelling being extended at two-storey level up to the existing porch building line and partially stepped in by 0.25m. Towards the front of the development it would have a width of 3.2m for a depth of 3.9m (previously extending a width of 4.3m for a depth of 5.9m) before being set in further to a width of 1.125m for a depth of 1.8m.
- 4.3 Towards the opposing (southern) flank, the proposed side extension would be setback from the front elevation by 1.3m, adding an additional 1m width to the property up to the rear building line at first-floor level.
- 4.4 No new flank or rear window openings are proposed to the extensions. The proposed extension would seek to match the host dwelling's roof form and materials.
- 4.5 The proposal was amended during this application resulting in further reductions to the scale of the side extension.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 5.1 West End Parish Council Objects due to the scale and mass of the development not being in keeping with the street scene; overdevelopment of the site; and, detrimental impact upon neighbours.

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 A total of 5 letters of notification were sent out on the 28 April 2022 relating to the original submission. One letter of representation was received with the comments summarised below. A further 14-day consultation was carried out on the 16th August 2022 following the receipt of revised drawings. Any further comments received will be outlined in any update report.

- Loss of light and privacy and close to adjoining properties.
[Officer comment: See section 7.4 of this report]
- Proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site.

[Officer comment: See section 7.3 of this report]

- Two-storey extension not in keeping and development is too high.
[Officer comment: See section 7.3 of this report]
- Insufficient parking to accommodate increased occupancy
[Officer comment: See section 7.5 of this report]
- Would conflict with the local plan
- Covenant restricting development to single-storey level to the northern aspect of the build *[Officer comment: This is not a material planning consideration. Any grant of permission would not override any legal stipulations or rights of the applicant or neighbouring residents]*

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 In considering this proposal regard has been had to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the National Design Guide (NDG), Policies DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 (CSDMP) and guidance within the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide SPD 2017 (RDG) and the West End Village Design Statement SPD 2016. The previous refusals are material considerations.

7.2 The main issues to be considered within this application are:

- Impact on character and appearance of the area;
- Impact on residential amenity; and,
- Highways and parking impacts

7.3 Impact on the character and appearance of the 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, Principles 10.3 and 10.4 state that side and rear extensions should be sympathetic and subservient to the design of the main building.

7.3.2 No objections were raised to the proposed design and scale of the works in the previously refused application 21/1258/FFU and the proposed development represents a comparatively reduced scale of development with increased setbacks.

7.3.3 To the front of the property, the proposed works would not impede the foremost front projection, respecting the established building line of this property and retaining the existing setback from the public highway. The front extension would bring forward the existing ridge line and roof form, consistent with existing architectural design, minimising its visual impact whilst the setback of the side extension would help to create a visual separation between the front and side extensions. The side extension is designed with a hipped roof set down 0.3m from the main ridge, whilst being a width less than half that of the existing dwelling, further helping limit its overall visual impact and creating a more subordinate form.

7.3.4 Towards the southern aspect of the building, the proposed side extension following amendments reducing its width to 1m together with its setback from the front elevation (1.3m), would not raise any significant concerns, with the existing form essentially

widened to a limited degree at first floor level, and thereby not unduly harming the character and architectural integrity of the property.

- 7.3.5 Noting the preceding assessment, together with the use of matching material finish and appropriate fenestration design and positioning, the proposed extension would sufficiently satisfy the objectives of Policy DM9 of the adopted Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (CSDMP) 2012, the RDG and the West End Village Design Statement SPD 2016.

7.4 Impact on residential amenities

- 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 advises that householder extensions should not materially erode neighbour amenities. Para 8.3 of the RDG advises regarding privacy matters and Principle 8.1 goes on to say that developments which have a significant adverse effect on the privacy of neighbouring properties will be resisted.

No.6 Orchard Way

- 7.4.2 The previous submission 21/1258/FFU was refused due to the unacceptable amenity impact to No.6, raising objection to the side extension which was considered to have an overbearing outlook and overshadowing impact to the neighbouring rear garden.
- 7.4.3 To address this issue, the applicant has reduced the width of the side extension towards the rear by 3.25m from the northern aspect, ensuring that it does not extend above the existing garage rather containing the extension to that above the existing kitchen area of the main dwelling.
- 7.4.4 No.6 benefits from a rear garden measuring approximately 9.9m depth x 11m width. In the previous submission the proposed extension sat to the flank end of the neighbouring rear garden. The application has been amended during the course of the application and as a result the proposed extension would instead sit beyond the end of the rear garden, thus reducing its overall impact where originally it was proposed to sit adjacent to the end of the rear garden extending partially above the existing garage.
- 7.4.5 The proposed side extension has been designed so that where it projects rearwards it falls short of extending directly opposite the rear face of No.6, although indirect views of the extension would nonetheless remain.
- 7.4.6 With the reduced width of the proposed extension, noting its position not directly sitting opposing No.6, and relative separation distance of approximately 7.3m from the rear windows to the extension, it is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in neighbouring amenity terms.
- 7.4.7 The proposed extension when considering its overall reduced scale and size, position, proposed roof design and the existing context and relationship between the two sites, it would not be considered that the proposed development significantly compromises the amenities of No.6 over and above any existing harm to warrant a reason for refusal. It is considered that the proposed development has sufficiently reduced its overall scale towards its northern aspect and subsequently overcome the previous reason for refusal.
- 7.4.8 The opposing side extension would be screened from No.6 by way of the existing dwelling and therefore no concerns are raised.

No.10 Orchard Way

- 7.4.9 In relation to No.10 Orchard Way, the proposed front extension would bring forward the first-floor level by 1.3m depth albeit set away from the shared boundary by 2.8m whilst there is a further 1m separation between No.10 and the shared boundary. Owing to this separation and limited increase to the overall depth it is not considered there would be any significant harm resulting from the development here.
- 7.4.10 The proposed side extension would have a limited width of 1m, setback 1.3m from the front projection and 1.8m from the shared boundary. The position of this element of the proposal would run in line with the neighbouring property not projecting forward. A window is located to the flank elevation of No.10 facing the application site, however this is obscure glazed indicating it serves a bathroom, a non-habitable space. The opposing flank extension, owing to its position, would not raise any amenity concerns for the occupiers of No.10.
- 7.4.11 As such, the proposal is considered to have sufficiently addressed the previous amenity concerns raised and would not be considered to significantly harm the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties over and above the existing harm, thus satisfying the objectives of Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and the RDG.

7.5 Highway and parking impacts

- 7.5.1 Surrey County 'Vehicle, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance for New Development' (Nov 2021) sets out for a minimum of 2+ spaces to be provided for 4+ bedroom dwellings in edge of centre, suburban and suburban edge locations.
- 7.5.2 An objection has been raised that the proposed works would facilitate an increase in occupancy on site resulting in potential additional parking stress. In this instance, the property would retain the same number of bedroom spaces albeit it is acknowledged that these spaces would provide the capacity for increased occupancy in theory owing to their upgrading to all double bedrooms. Notwithstanding this, the property would also retain its off-street parking provision, comprising the existing garage and two areas of hard landscaping to the front garden space which allow for up to two vehicles to be parked.
- 7.5.3 Given the above, it is considered that there would be no justified objection on this ground. The proposal would not result in any undue increased parking stress to the detriment of the highway network, in compliance with Policy DM11.

8.0 POSITIVE/PROACTIVE WORKING 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 38-41 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 The proposed works would be considered to be of a design and scale that would not conflict with local plan design policies whilst maintaining the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and not impeding the highway network. The proposal would therefore sufficiently accord with the local plan policies.

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: Location Plan, Existing Block Plan, and 07/21 received 21/04/2022 and 07/21/7 Rev B received 30/07/2022 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 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 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. No additional windows shall be created in the flank elevation(s) of the development hereby permitted 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.

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 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.
 3. The applicant is expected to ensure the safe operation of all construction traffic in order to prevent unnecessary disturbance obstruction and inconvenience to other highway users. Care should be taken to ensure that the waiting, parking, loading and unloading of construction vehicles does not hinder the free flow of any carriageway, footway, bridleway, footpath, cycle route, right of way or private driveway or entrance. Where repeated problems occur the Highway Authority may use available powers under the terms of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the safe operation of the highway.
-