

LOCATION:	39 Commonfields, West End, Woking, Surrey, GU24 9JA,
PROPOSAL:	Erection of single storey side/rear extension following the demolition of detached garage
TYPE:	Full Planning Application
APPLICANT:	Mr Graham Alleway
OFFICER:	Michelle Fielder

This application would normally be determined under the Council Scheme of Delegation. However, it is being reported to the Planning Applications Committee because the applicant is Councillor Mr. G Alleway.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT, subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension following the demolition of the existing garage and car port. The proposal also includes an amended roof design to the existing dining room so this element and the proposed extension would appear as one unified extension to the host dwelling.
- 1.2 The proposal is a revised scheme to the extant planning permission 21/1302 which proposed a single storey rear and side extension. The revised proposal would also be in keeping with the character of the property and subservient in size. In addition, the proposed works are of an appropriate design and are not considered to be harmful to the appearance of the street scene, nor is the development considered to cause any adverse amenity impacts to occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.
- 1.3 It is noted that the proposal involves the demolition of the existing garage and car port, however sufficient space would be retained to the front of the dwelling to meet parking guidance.
- 1.4 The proposal is therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site contains a two storey, detached dwelling and is located within the settlement area of West End. The property has a single storey garage to the side with an attached carport and a rear garden enclosed by a fence. The property has an open front garden and there is also hardstanding for parking towards the front of the property.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 91/0974 Erection of a single storey rear extension (conservatory).
Granted and implemented.

- 3.2 21/1302 Erection of a single storey side and rear extension following demolition of the existing garage.

Decision - Granted 21/02/22. Not implemented.

A copy of the Committee papers for this application are provided as Annex 1 to this report.

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The proposal is for a single storey side and rear extension following demolition of the existing garage and carport. The extension would have an overall depth of approximately 9.3m (of which 0.75m would project beyond the rear elevation of the existing dining room extension) and would be between 2.1m and 4.2m in width.
- 4.2 The development would provide a mock pitch to the front elevation standing to a height of 3.7m with an eaves height of 2.2m. above the front door. This element would be 1.2m deep before the width increases from 2.1m to 3m. At this point a flat roof is proposed with a height of 2.8m. This would extend the depth and width of the proposed extension. The roof to the existing dining room would also be removed and replaced with a continuation of the roof to the proposed extension. This would allow the proposed and existing extensions to blend seamlessly. Two roof lanterns are proposed with an apex height of 3.2m.
- 4.3 As seen from the front elevation the flat roof behind the mock pitch would be visible due to an increase in width from 2.1m to 3m. The proposal would be sited between 2.8 and 0.8m metres away from the adjoining neighbours
- 4.4 The main differences between permission 21/1302 and the current application are:
- The front elevation of the side extension is set further back from the front elevation of the host dwelling;
 - The extension is narrower with a reduced floor area; and,
 - The mock pitch roof to the front elevation has a width of 2.1m for a depth of 1.2m at which point the width increases to 3m and a flat roof would be provided.

An amended plan was requested and received 31 August 2022 to correct a drafting error (this related to the position of a ground floor window in the side wall of the existing dwelling and therefore no re-notification was needed).

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 5.1 West End Parish Council No objection.

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 In total, 3 notification letters were sent on 8th August 2022. At the time of preparation of this report, no letters of representation have been received.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

- 7.1 The application site is located within the settlement of West End as set out in the proposals map included in the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies document 2012 (CSDMP). For this proposed development, consideration is given to policies DM9 and DM11 of the CSDMP, the Residential Design Guide (RDG)

Supplementary Planning Document 2017, West End Village Design Statement (WEVDs) and the NPPF. The proposal is not CIL liable.

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

- Impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area and host dwelling;
- Impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties; and,
- Transport and highways considerations.

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

7.3.1 Para 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires good design principles; subparagraphs b and c clarify that a visually attractive extension which is sympathetic to local character should be acceptable. Policy DM9 of the CSDMP states that development will be acceptable where it achieves a high-quality design which respects and enhances the local character in its urban setting, paying particular regard to scale, materials, massing and bulk.

7.3.2 Principle 7.8 of the RDG sets out guidelines for designers detailing that design which positively contributes to the character and quality of the area will be supported. Principle 7.9 focuses on window design and principles 10.1, 10.3 and 10.4 focus on side and rear extensions and as such, are relevant.

7.3.3 The site lies in Character Area 5 as set out in the WEVDs. Guideline 3 of the WEVDs states any new development in this area should be complementary to the existing buildings regarding construction materials. Guideline 5 of the WEVDs states that extensions should be complementary to the existing building in proportion, style and use of materials.

7.3.4 The proposed extension would be set back by approximately 6m from the front elevation of the dwelling, would be single storey in height with a mock pitch roof and would accommodate the relocated main entrance. It would be constructed in materials to match and would harmonise well with the design form of the existing dwelling. The proposed width would be less than half that of the existing property and is considered appropriate against Guideline 5 of the WEVDs. It is noted that the flat roof would be visible from the street scene, however due to the dwelling being setback from the highway, coupled with its set back from the front elevation of the dwelling, the visual impact of the proposal on the streetscene would be very limited. It is also noted that a small flat roof element on the host dwelling is already visible from the public domain, as are the flat roof elements on some neighbouring properties. In this instance, the extension would be in keeping with the character of the existing property and would not result in an over-dominant or incongruous addition to the street scene.

7.3.4 In character terms, the proposal would not be contrary to the NPPF, Policy DM9M9 DI CSDMP, the RDG or the WEVDs.

7.4 Impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties

7.4.1 Policy DM9 of the CSDMP states that development will be acceptable where the proposal respects the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and uses. This is supported by para 130(f) of the NPPF, which seeks to create a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. The importance of appropriate design for extensions, so as not to result in a material loss of amenity for the occupiers of neighbouring properties, is set out in principles 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 10.1, 10.3 and 10.4 of the RDG.

- 7.4.2 The application site shares a boundary with 41 Commonfields to the west. The single storey extension would be largely concealed from this property by the built form of the existing dwelling and the proposed new roof to the existing dining room is not considered to result in significant harm to the amenities of this neighbour.
- 7.4.3 To the east, the proposed side extension would be set at its closest point approximately 0.8m away from the shared boundary with No.37 Commonfields. Given its proposed height, together with the separation distance, no significant overbearing or overshadowing impacts would occur. There are windows proposed in the side elevation facing this neighbour, however, taking into consideration the existing situation in terms of windows at ground floor level and existing close boarded fence, the proposed development would not result in materially different patterns of overlooking. It would also not be materially different from that found acceptable under the planning application 21/1203. In addition, this revised scheme has a greater set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling, and in turn its forward projection beyond the nearest point of No.37 has been reduced, giving it a reduced mass in relation to this neighbour, as such resulting in limited amenity impact.
- 7.4.4 It is therefore considered that the proposal would comply with the NPPF, Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and the RDG.

7.5 Transport and highways considerations

- 7.5.1 Policy DM11 of the CSDMP states that developments will be not acceptable where the proposal adversely impacts the safe and efficient flow of traffic. All development should ensure safe and well-designed vehicular access, egress and layouts which consider the needs and accessibility of all highway users including cyclists and pedestrians. Principles 6.7 and 6.8 of the RDG sets out the importance of well-designed parking arrangements, without parking visually dominating the street scene. Surrey County Council recommends a minimum of two vehicle parking spaces for a dwelling of this size. This can be provided within the dwelling's front drive.

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 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 proposal is acceptable in principle as the proposal would not impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the host dwelling. The proposed extension would not cause any impact on residential amenity. Furthermore, the proposal would have no adverse highway impacts. Therefore, the proposed development would comply with the NPPF, policies DM9, and DM11 of the CSDMP, the RDG and WEVDs. The application is therefore recommended for conditional approval.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

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:

Drawing Number reference; AD4596 SHEET 2 Rev F received on 31st August 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.

Informative(s)

1. 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.
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. Please see the Officer's Report for further details.
3. 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.