

07th JUNE 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

6G PLAN/2022/0060

WARD: Mount Hermon

LOCATION: 5 Barrens Close, Woking, Surrey, GU22 7JZ

PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey side extension.

APPLICANT: Afsha Ahmed

OFFICER: Josey Short

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The application is brought before the Committee as the applicants father in law is a Woking Borough Council councillor.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Planning permission is sought to erect of a two-storey side extension. The extension would be positioned to the west side of the existing dwellinghouse which would appear to be to the rear when viewed from the street scene of Barrens Close.

The application follows the refusal of planning application PLAN/2021/0014. The notable changes to the current scheme are as follows;-

- Reduction in depth to 7.1 metres which would run flush with the front (north elevation) and be set back 0.5 metres from the rear (south) elevation
- Reduction in width to 7 metres
- Removal of new garage and alterations to landscaping to the front of the site from the scheme
- Reduction in maximum height to 6.375 metres, 0.5 metres below that of the existing dwellinghouse
- Alterations to style and finish through materiality and fenestration

PLANNING STATUS

- Urban Area
- Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) Zone B (400m-5km)
- TPO Area

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is located on the west side of Barrens Close within the developed area of Woking. The application site comprises a detached chalet bungalow with a detached double garage. By virtue of the land levels of the location, the dwelling is at a higher level than the public road and is accessed by steps. The detached garages are located at road level.

07th JUNE 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

PLANNING HISTORY

PLAN/2021/0014 - Proposed two storey side extension and detached garage – Refused for the following reasons;-

- 1. The proposed development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area by virtue of the proposed design and bulk of the resultant dwelling. The resultant dwelling would appear cramped and contrived on this plot location. The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site as indicated by the increased density and the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policies CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), the Woking Design SPD (2015) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)(2019).*
- 2. The proposal fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would be capable of achieving satisfactory parking provision and thus the development would result in a deficit of 2 parking spaces. More on street parking in this locality would have a detrimental impact on the character and amenities of the area by reason of the loss of landscaping features and the inconvenience caused by residents not being able to park close to their dwellings. Consequently the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that there would be no adverse effect upon car parking provision or the amenities of the local area given the location's high parking demand. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS18 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and Supplementary Planning Document 'Parking Standards' (2018).*
- 3. It has not been demonstrated that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on trees with the TPO area location. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).*

TREE/2017/8220 - T1 Sycamore -Fell. T2 and T3 Conifer Species - Fell. (Works Subject to TPO 626/0075/1966) – Permitted

0019350 - PROV OF RDS AND EREC OF 17 DET HOUSES AND GARAGES – Permitted

CONSULTATIONS

Trees - The arboricultural information provided with this application is unacceptable , I do not agree with the findings relating to T1 as previously indicated on the previous applications. Therefore full arboricultural information will be required at application stage this should reflect the current proposal and include an Arboricultural method statement.

Highways - THE COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY has undertaken an assessment in terms of the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision and are satisfied that the application would not have a material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway. The County Highway Authority therefore has no highway requirements.

REPRESENTATIONS

Three (3) letter of objection received from south neighbouring dwelling raising concerns for;-

- Concerns that the proposed works would not be built out exactly in accordance with the proposed plans and thus may impact the neighbouring dwellings

07th JUNE 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

In the event of planning permission being granted in this instance, a condition would be included which would require the works to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Any variation from the approved plans would require written permission from the LPA.

- There is limited information on the distance the proposed extension would be from the Jack and Jill steps public footpath to the west and the visual impact on this.
The proposed block plan (dwg no. 2201-05BC-001) details that the proposed extension would be 3.7 metres from the shared boundary with the Jack and Jill steps public footpath at its closest point.
- Concerns for the impact on neighbouring properties during the construction stage of the proposed works
This would not form a material planning consideration in the assessment of the application as this would be covered by Environmental Health legislation.
- The removal of trees would require replacement planting to ensure the ecology and stability of the site. Particular concern is raised for the proposed felling of tree T1 (silver birch)
Please see Trees section of this report.
- Concerns raised for the use of the path other properties share the right of way to
This would be a civil matter and thus would not form a material planning consideration in the assessment of the application.
- Concerns for the proposed material palette as this is not detailed within the submitted application form
Please see impact on visual amenity section of the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019):

Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development

Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Woking Core Strategy (2012)

CS21 - Design

CS25 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs):

Parking Standards (2018)

Woking Design (2015)

Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022)

PLANNING ISSUES

1. The main considerations within the determination of this application comprise the impact on the visual amenity, impact on neighbouring amenity, impact on highways and parking, and impact on trees.

Impact on Character of the Area

2. Section 12 of the NPPF (2021) states ‘*permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents*’.

07th JUNE 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

3. Policy CS21 'Design' of the Woking Core Strategy 2012 states that *'proposals for new development should... respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area in which they are situated paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings'*.
4. Supplementary Planning Document 'Woking Design' (2015) states *'the additional mass should respect the existing building proportion, symmetry and balance'* and *"Side extensions are often the most convenient extension but the character of streets. Proposals must maintain rhythm and visual separation"*.
5. Detached chalet bungalows on spacious plots, such as the host dwelling as existing, are characteristic of the street scene of Barrens Close. Though it is noted that there are examples of dwellings within the street scene which have been previously extended, the additions remain subordinate to the dwellings they serve and thus do not appear inconsistent within the street scene. By virtue of the positioning of the existing host dwelling, the east side elevation fronts the public realm. Additionally, the gradient of the road locates the dwelling at a higher level than the road and the existing garages, with access gained via a staircase from the public highway.
6. In terms of materiality, the extension would be constructed in matching brick and tile to the existing dwelling. It is considered that the material palette proposed would appear sympathetic to the locality.
7. The proposed two storey extension would project from the west side elevation of the existing dwelling with a width of 7 metres and a depth of 7.1 metres. The depth would run flush with the front (north) elevation of the dwelling and would be set back from the rear (south) elevation by 0.5 metres. The total width of the resultant dwelling would be 15 metres. The extension would encompass a gable ended roof which would front the west boundary of the site, with 4 dormer windows (2 to north roof slope and 2 to south). The extension would have a ridge height of 6.375 metres which would sit 0.5 metres lower than that of the main dwellinghouse. Though the extension would be set behind the main dwelling when viewed from the street scene due to the dwellings orientation, given that the site is at a higher level than the street scene, the extension would be visible from several vantage points within the public realm. Irrespective of this, it is considered that the scale, mass, bulk and material palette would appear sympathetic to the host dwelling and thus its visibility would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area or locality in general.
8. The proposed extension would be positioned 3.7 metres from the west boundary of the site at its closest point, which adjoins the Jack and Jill steps public footpath. This distance would comply with the Woking Design SPD which states that two storey side extensions should maintain a minimum of 1 metre gap between the extension and the side boundary. Given this distance and the proposed ridge height, it is considered that the extension would not have an overbearing impact on the public footpath and that the spacious character of the plot would be maintained.
9. The proposed scheme subject of this report is considered to comply with policy CS21 of the Core Strategy (2012), the Woking Design SPD (2015) and section 12 of the NPPF (2021). Consequently, it is considered that the proposed development has overcome the previous reason for refusal relating to impact on visual amenity under application PLAN/2021/0014.

07th JUNE 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

10. The Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD (2022) details the minimum layout dimensions for outlook, amenity, privacy and daylight based on the distance between the elevations, which elevations they are and the number of storeys of the buildings. By virtue of the positioning of the dwelling, the front elevation of the resultant dwelling would front the rear boundary of No. 5 Barrens Brae whilst the rear elevation would front the rear boundary of No. 1 Barrens Close. The distance between the rear elevations of the host dwelling and 1 Barrens Close would be approximately 21.5 metres, whilst the distance between the host dwelling and 5 Barrens Brae would be approximately 29 metres. With this taken into account, the distance would comply with the Outlook SPD. With this taken into account, though it is noted that both the front and rear elevations would encompass first floor windows which would serve habitable rooms, they would not result in overlooking by virtue of the distance. By virtue of the positioning of the proposed extension and the distance it would be set away from the nearest neighbouring dwellings, it would not adversely impact the sunlight and daylight these dwellings currently receive.

Trees

11. The application site is located within a TPO area (reference 626/0075/1966) and as such the Council's Arboricultural Officer required arboricultural information prior to the determination of the application. The application seeks to remove T1 (silver birch tree) located on the north boundary of the site. The arboricultural information provided in support of the application is unacceptable and the finding relating to T1 are not agreed with. It is noted that this was previously indicated on previous application PLAN/2021/0014. Therefore, full arboricultural information will be required at application stage this should reflect the current proposal and include an Arboricultural method statement. No arboricultural information to this effect was submitted in support of the application.
12. For this reason, it is considered that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the TPO area, particularly T1. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) and the Woking Design SPD (2015).

Highways and Parking

13. Table 3 of the Parking Standards SPD (2018) sets out the minimum on site vehicle parking spaces required per dwelling and makes clear that these standards would only be relaxed in Woking Town Centre. The proposed works would create an additional bedroom at the dwellinghouse, resulting in a 3 bedroom property which would require off street parking provision for 2 vehicles in line with the standards.
14. The Parking Standards SPD (2018) also states that "*Garages only contribute 50% towards overall parking provision*" and "*The minimum size of a garage, when contributing towards parking provision, should be 6m x 3m*".
15. The proposed works would create an additional bedroom at the dwelling, resulting in a 3 bedroom property which would require off street parking provision for 2 vehicles. The existing dwelling has a single detached garage which is illustrated as 4.8 metres by 2.8

07th JUNE 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

metres on the proposed block plan (dwg no. 2201-05BC-001) submitted in support of the application and thus the existing garage cannot contribute towards parking provision as it falls below the minimum dimensions detailed within the parking strategy. There is sufficient hardstanding to the front of this garage to provide off street parking for 1 vehicle. As such the proposed works would result in a deficit of 1 parking in line with the Parking Strategy (2018).

16. Consequently, the proposal would result in an increase of on street parking pressure resulting in residents having to park their cars in locations away from their homes, which in turn would cause inconvenience to the detriment of the amenities of the area. Though it is noted that there are no parking restrictions on Barrens Close, there are limited opportunities for on street parking which would be further exacerbated by the proposed development. Additionally, it is noted that due to the width of White Rose Lane, where Barrens Close is accessed from, there is also no capacity for safe on-street parking bays within the wider locality. Irrespective of this, whilst the proposal may result in a deficit of 1 space, given that there is space for on street parking and no parking restrictions on Barrens Close, it would not be justifiable to recommend refusal on this basis. Though it is noted that the proposed works would not constitute permitted development and no certificates of lawfulness have been submitted or approved at the site, additional regard is had for the permitted development fall back position the dwelling which could, in theory, allow the applicant to extend the dwelling to the west to create an additional bedroom without planning permission and parking provision would not be required. With the above taken into account, it would not be justifiable to warrant refusal of the scheme on parking grounds and therefore it is concluded that this parking provision would be acceptable.

Local Finance Considerations

16. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a mechanism adopted by Woking Borough Council which came into force on 1st April 2015, as a primary means of securing developer contributions towards infrastructure provision in the Borough. The proposed new build residential floor space would not exceed 100m² and thus would not be liable for a financial contribution under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

CONCLUSION

The application site is located within a TPO area and it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the TPO area.

The proposed development is contrary to policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) and the Woking Design SPD (2015). It is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Site Photographs dated 18th May 2022.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason(s):

1. It has not been demonstrated that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on trees with the TPO area location. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM2 of the

07th JUNE 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Informatives:

1. The plans relating to the application hereby refused are numbered:

Site and Proposed Block Plan – 2201-05BC-001 – dated January 2022 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 24.01.2022
Proposed Elevations - 2201-05BC-003 Rev A dated January 2022 - received by the Local Planning Authority on 24.01.2022
Proposed Floor Plans and Roof Plan – 2201-05BC-005 Rev A – dated January 2022 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 24.01.2022
Proposed 3D Views and Sections – 2201-05BC-006 Rev A - dated January 2022 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 24.01.2022

02. 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, however, it is considered that the principle issue of the insufficient parking provision could not be overcome through negotiation as part of the current planning application and the scheme is therefore fundamentally contrary to relevant policy. Additionally, it is noted that pre app has not been sought for the proposed development prior to the submission of the application.