

29 SEPTEMBER 2020 PLANNING COMMITTEE

6d PLAN/2020/0523

WARD: PY

LOCATION: Mark House, Aviary Road, Pyrford, Woking, Surrey, GU22 8TH

PROPOSAL: Erection of a part single and part two storey rear extension following the demolition of existing rear conservatory.
Alterations to the main roof to include a rear dormer and 2no. rooflights to the rear and 3no. rooflights to the front to facilitate the conversion of the loft into habitable accommodation.

APPLICANT: Mr and Mrs Ben and Emily Young **OFFICER:** Barry Curran

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The proposal has been called to Planning Committee at the request of Cllr Graham Chrystie.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Planning consent is sought for the erection of a single storey part two storey side and rear extension along following demolition of the existing conservatory, extend the ridge of the existing roof and installation of a rear roof dormers and front and rear roof lights to facilitate a loft conversion.

PLANNING STATUS

- Urban Area
- Conservation Area
- Thames Basin Heaths SPA Zone B (400m-5km)

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be APPROVED.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is located on the south-western side of Aviary Road and includes a two storey detached dwelling constructed of painted render and red brick under a slate tiled roof. The property is situated within the Aviary Road Conservation Area and benefits from a generous plot which stretches westwards with a substantial rear garden. The boundaries enclosing the rear garden consist of dense hedging measuring approximately 3 metres in height along the southern boundary with a mix of 2 metre high close timber board fencing and hedging along the northern boundary.

PLANNING HISTORY

PLAN/2019/1034 - Proposed single storey side and rear extension following demolition of the existing conservatory, roof extension and creation of 2no rear dormers and 3No front rooflights to facilitate a loft conversion (Amended Description)
– Permitted 21.02.20

29 SEPTEMBER 2020 PLANNING COMMITTEE

PLAN/1989/0670 - Erection of a single storey side extension to provide garage, conservatory and extension to lounge – Permitted 26.09.1989

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Planning consent is sought for the erection of a single storey part two storey side and rear extension along following demolition of the existing conservatory, extend the ridge of the existing roof and installation of a rear roof dormers and front and rear roof lights to facilitate a loft conversion.

CONSULTATIONS

Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum: No comments raised

Conservation Officer: Recommends that the number of front roof lights are reduced from 3 to 2 and that 'heritage style' roof lights are incorporated on the front roof slope (29.06.20) (*Officer Note: the reduction in the number of roof lights is not considered reasonable in this instance as the extant scheme (PLAN/2019/1034) includes a similar layout with the same number of front roof lights*)

REPRESENTATIONS

There has been 1 no third party letter of objection received in relation to the proposed development. The concerns raised in this letter are summarised as follows:

- Significant loss of daylight and sunlight to main habitable room windows in the southern side of Kingswood as a result of the rear additions and roof extension
- Submitted plans does not give sufficient information demonstrating windows on neighbouring properties (*Officer Note: a site visit was carried out on 23rd July 2020 where a full perspective of neighbouring properties and window positions was gained*)
- Overlooking or the perception of overlooking and loss of privacy from the proposed northern side second floor en-suite window
- Additional bulk and mass from the rear addition and roof extension would lead to an overbearing impact on Kingswood
- Concern over the design of the additions and front and rear roof lights which would result in an imbalance and cluttered appearance.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12

Section 16

Woking Borough Core Strategy/Phase

CS20 – Heritage and conservation

CS21 - Design

Development Management Documents DPD 2016

DM20 – Heritage Assets and their Settings

Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan 2016

Policy BE 1

Policy BE 3

Supplementary Planning Documents

SPD - Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight

SPD – Design

PLANNING ISSUES

1. The planning issues that need to be addressed in the determination of this application are; whether the proposed addition would be detrimental to the character of the dwelling or character of the Conservation Area and whether the proposed side and rear and roof additions would cause harm to the amenities enjoyed by neighbours.

Impact on Existing Dwelling/Character of the Conservation Area

2. It is proposed to demolish the existing rear conservatory which measures approximately 5 metres in width and 4 metres in depth and stems off the southern and western elevations. The replacement extension will stand on the footprint of this existing addition measuring 6.4 metres in width and 7.7 metres in total depth projecting approximately 4 metres beyond the predominant rear elevation. The proposal would include a flat roof across the primary mass of the addition with two central lanterns standing at a total height of 3.4 metres from ground level. At 8.3 metres in height, the proposed two storey element would be set out as subordinate set down 1.7 metres below the ridge line of the host dwelling adopting a dual pitched roof so as to sympathize with the existing roof form.
3. Whilst the proposed extension is considered to constitute a sizeable addition, it would remain subordinate to the main building and one which adopts a subservient form and design and respects the established character of the host building. Sited within grounds which can accommodate it with ease, the extension is not seen to significantly reduce the level of amenity available and would retain a suitable gap of between 2.7 and 6.5 metres to the shared boundary. Given this, the extension is not considered to be of detriment to the character of the existing dwelling.
4. As part of the development it is proposed to increase the length or the existing ridge line and extent it northwards. The extension would measure approximately 1.3 metres and increase the level of bulk of the roof on the northern side elevation whilst retaining the half-hipped roof form and front cat-slide which appears to be an established characteristic of this part of the area. This addition would be largely indiscernible from the existing dwelling and would not result in any further increase in the footprint whilst a small reduction in the level of roof and increase to the northern gable would occur. This addition is proposed to facilitate accommodation within the roof space with 2 rear box dormers and 3no front roof light proposed. The proposed rear dormers and front roof lights are considered to be acceptable in terms of its design and appearance on the original dwelling house and has been designed to sit within the centre of the roof slope and retain adequate separations to the eaves level. 3no roof lights are proposed on the front roof slope and although, not a characteristic which is prevalent along Aviary Road, they are considered to be suitably placed and sized so as not to materially harm the dwelling's established character remaining proportionate to the roof. The Conservation Officer has recommended for the removal one of these

29 SEPTEMBER 2020 PLANNING COMMITTEE

front roof light and the installation of a side elevation window. From a planning perspective, it is not considered reasonable to omit a front roof light which is essentially extant from a previous permission (PLAN/2019/1034) in place of a side elevation window which would introduce additional fenestration overlooking the neighbouring property. As such, it is not considered that the inclusion of 3no front roof lights would be detrimental to the character of the dwelling bearing in mind there is extant consent for such a layout. A condition has been added to ensure the proposed front roof lights are flush fitting and of a heritage style (Condition 5).

5. The proposed rear extension will replace an existing rear addition spanning across an area of hard-standing utilised as a patio area. With the adoption of complimentary materials and a design in keeping with the character of the main dwelling which, although larger, is considered to be a more sympathetic addition to the dwelling. Further to this, the proposed roof additions including the extension of the ridge line, rear roof dormers and front roof lights are considered to respect the character of the dwelling in protecting the defining architectural features and thereby, in turn, preserving the character of the Conservation Area. Notwithstanding this, the dwellings along Aviary Road are positioned along a relatively consistent building line with views into the rear of the property prohibited from the public domain thereby limiting the exposure of the proposed rear dormers and rear addition. Nevertheless, the proposed extensions are considered subordinate and are considered to preserve the character of the dwelling and in turn the character of the surrounding Conservation Area adhering to provisions outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS20 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM20 of the Development Management Policies DPD 2016, Policy BE1 and BE3 of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan 2016 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Design' 2015.

Impact on Neighbour Amenities

6. The application dwelling is bound to the North and south-east by dwellings along a similar building line on Aviary Road in line with the highway. The proposed additions will be assessed against these neighbours accordingly.
7. The proposed addition will wrap around the side and rear elevations with the two storey element extending the northern side elevation by approximately 2.5 metres. Policy BE3 of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan 2016 notes that developments must respect *"the separation between buildings, and between buildings and the site boundaries, in relation to likely impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties"*. Whilst the extension will increase the level of bulk and mass along this elevation, it would remain 2.3 metres off the shared boundary and would not extend back beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring Kingswood formed by the single storey side and rear wrap around. It is also acknowledged that the extension to the roof will increase the level of roof scape and amount of gable on the northern side elevation but this too would remain at least 2.3 metres off the shared boundary.
8. A number of habitable room windows are located on the southern flank elevation of Kingswood including a bedroom, lounge and garden room/study. This is apparently due to the orientation of the dwelling coupled with the heavily vegetated nature of the land on the northern side. Kingswood is set between 6.8 - 8.8 metres off the shared boundary which in turn results in a respective 9 and 11 metres gap between it and the application dwelling. It is

29 SEPTEMBER 2020 PLANNING COMMITTEE

proposed to construct a part two storey part single storey rear addition which will extend the northern flank elevation by 4 metres at single storey level and 2.5 metres at two storey level. The addition has been designed around the host dwelling and incorporates a lower ridge line at 8.4 metres with an eaves level of 5.4 metres in height. This sets the addition out as subordinate and approximately 1.7 metres lower than the current ridge line. A roof extension is also proposed which would retain the current hip but would extend it by approximately 0.8 metres.

9. A bedroom and en-suite is currently served by two first floor windows in the southern elevation of Kingswood. The main bedroom is subjected to views of the flank wall of the current dwelling considering its positioning directly opposite it. This is a similar situation for the ground floor lounge which includes a window directly below this bedroom window. It is quite unusual when a layout includes the main habitable room windows located in the flank elevation particularly when it appears that both Kingswood and Mark House were constructed around the same period. Further to this, the single storey side and rear addition as erected on Kingswood under PLAN/1991/0868 resulted in a garden room/study sited 6.8 metres off the shared boundary.
10. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 requires development proposals to *“achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, or an overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or outlook”*. It is acknowledged that the proposed extension would increase the level of bulk and mass opposite these habitable room windows in Kingswood but it also has to be borne in mind that these windows are located between 9 and 11 metres opposite the flank elevation. A way of determining whether a development would have a significant impact on the living conditions on a neighbouring property, with particular reference to daylight, is to apply the 25° test as per the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight' 2008 section 6. This test has been applied to the first floor window which passes given the significant gap between properties, indicating that no significant loss of light would occur to this room. The same test is applied to the ground floor lounge which does not pass but it is a material consideration that this window would not pass under the current layout. The proposal results in additional mass but not to a level which would completely alter the outlook from this room. In fact, if we were to apply the 25° test to this lounge window to the proposed rear addition (this hasn't been carried out as the lounge window is opposite the flank wall rather than the addition) then it would pass considering the lowered ridge line of the two storey addition.
11. The 25° test has been applied to the garden room/study window opposite the application dwelling which, considering its shorter separation distance would not pass. Notwithstanding this, this addition is served by a number of other windows on the rear and south-western elevation which would provide a level of light to this room which would be sufficient. Further to this, the objection letter states that significant harm would occur to this habitable space within the garden room/study as a result of the proposal. It is evident from floor plans relating to PLAN/1991/0868 that this room is an addition to the dwelling and it has to be noted that additions carried out on properties should not stifle development on neighbouring properties which may otherwise be considered acceptable.

29 SEPTEMBER 2020 PLANNING COMMITTEE

12. Concern has been raised in relation to how the addition will significantly change the outlook from these windows. It is acknowledged that the additions will alter the outlook from Kingswood. It also has to be borne in mind that protection of views out over third party land are not protected and are not considered a material planning consideration unless the proposed development would detrimentally reduce light or cause an overbearing impact. It has been established in the previous paragraph that the 25° test for access to light as per the Council's SPD on Outlook has been applied to the first floor bedroom and ground floor lounge and is considered to be acceptable. Section 3.1 of the Supplementary Planning Document 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight' 2008 states that the protection of one's particular view from a property is not considered as a material planning consideration and, as such, loss of these views is not something by which a refusal could be substantiated.
13. A second floor side elevation window is proposed in the flank elevation to serve an en-suite bathroom at loft level. Concern has been raised on the insertion of this window which could lead to the perception of overlooking from this window into habitable room windows in Kingswood. It has to be noted that the flank elevation of Kingswood is set almost directly opposite the flank elevation of the application dwelling. Under the current layout a first floor northern side window serving a bedroom within Mark House provides views over the southern flank elevation of Kingswood. There is an existing relationship evident with habitable room windows in both properties sited directly opposite each other. The proposed second floor window is a single pane window and proposed to serve an en-suite bathroom. Given the space it is to serve, it is considered reasonable to assume that no significant loss of privacy or perceived loss of privacy would occur as a result on the installation of this window. It is also considered reasonable to attach a condition to ensure this window is non-opening below 1.7 metres of floor level and obscurely glazed (Condition 4).
14. Given the above, it is considered that the proposals, by way of their positioning and modest size, will not have a significantly harmful impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of Kingswood in terms of loss of light, overbearing or loss of privacy.
15. Pinehurst is sited to the south-east of the application site and adopts a slightly tapered relationship to the application dwelling where they splay away from each other towards the rear. The proposal will replace the existing addition with an increase of approximately 4 metres in depth. Whilst this represents a sizable increase in the depth of the addition, a minimum gap of 2.7 metres is retained between the addition and shared boundary and increases to approximately 6.5 metres towards the rear of the addition.
16. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight' 2008 recommend a separation distance of at least 1 metre between built structure and boundary which is satisfied in this case. Further to this, the existing boundary treatment along this shared boundary consists of 3 metres high hedging which provides a natural concealment to the proposed extension thereby mitigating any potential impacts associated with the proposal in terms of loss of light or overbearing impact. The proposed rear dormers would provide views out over the rear garden of the application dwelling and given the splayed relationship between sites, would not result in

29 SEPTEMBER 2020 PLANNING COMMITTEE

any views over the amenity space of Pinehurst above or beyond the existing views offered from the first floor windows.

17. From the above points, the proposed replacement extension is considered to comply with guidance outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012, Policy BE3 of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan 2016 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight' 2008.

Highways and Parking Implications

18. Supplementary Planning Document 'Parking Standards' 2018 recommends a minimum of 3 parking spaces per dwelling of 4 or more bedrooms. A large area of hardstanding as well as an integral garage are existing elements on site which provide on-site parking capable of meeting the minimum requirements of the SPD.
19. The 'Parking Standards' SPD 2018 also sets out cycle parking standards of 2 cycle spaces per dwelling. There is considered to be sufficient space within the garage to provide secure cycle parking to serve the replacement dwelling.
20. The proposal therefore accords with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012, Supplementary Planning Document 'Parking Standards' 2018 and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

21. The proposed development has been assessed against its impact on the character of the existing dwelling and the character of the surrounding Conservation Area and is considered to result in adequately subservient features with no material harm on the host dwelling and would preserve the character of the surrounding Conservation Area. The impact of the extensions and roof additions have been assessed against the impact of adjacent neighbours and are not considered to result in a level of detrimental harm by which a recommendation for refusal could be substantiated.
22. As such the development is considered to adhere to provisions outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS20 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM20 of the Development Management Policies DPD 2016, Policies BE1 and BE3 of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan 2016 and Supplementary Planning Documents 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight' 2008 and 'Design' 2015 and is accordingly recommended for approval subject to the attached conditions.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Site visit photographs.
2. 1no third party letter of objection

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that planning permission be Granted subject to the following Conditions:

29 SEPTEMBER 2020 PLANNING COMMITTEE

1. The development for which permission is hereby granted must be commenced not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason:

To accord with the provisions of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby approved shall match those outlined in the submitted application form.

Reason:

To ensure that the development protects the visual amenities of the area.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plan;

Proposed Site Plan (Received 18.06.20)
Drawing No. 2123/P/02.C
Drawing No. 2123/P/01.A
Drawing No. 2123/E/01.B

Reason:

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

4. The window in the second floor northern elevation hereby permitted shall be glazed entirely with obscure glass and non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed. Once installed the window shall be permanently retained in that condition unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining properties.

5. Notwithstanding the details outlined on plans hereby approved, the proposed 3no front roof lights should be of heritage type flush fitting specification.

Reason:

To ensure the works hereby approved do not adversely affect the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Informatives:

1. The Council confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

29 SEPTEMBER 2020 PLANNING COMMITTEE

2. You are advised that Council officers may undertake inspections without prior warning to check compliance with approved plans and to establish that all planning conditions are being complied with in full. Inspections may be undertaken both during and after construction.