

8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

6B PLAN/2022/0343

WARD: Pyrford

LOCATION: Milestones, Pyrford Road, Woking, Surrey, GU22 8UP

PROPOSAL: Erection of a first-floor side extension and internal alterations.

APPLICANT: Mr K Parmer

OFFICER: Josey Short

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The application was called to Committee by the Ward Councillor, Cllr Elson, in the event of an officer's recommendation for approval as it is considered to be contrary to local policies.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a first-floor side extension.

The proposed extension would project beyond the north side elevation, directly above the existing single-storey side extension. The first-floor extension would have a width of 3 metres and be set back from the principal elevation by 1.5 metres. The extension would run flush with the first-floor rear elevation of the existing dwelling. The extension would mirror the eaves height and pitch of the existing roof, with a ridge 0.3 metres lesser than that of the existing.

Whilst it is noted that the application form submitted also sought planning permission for internal alterations, these would not constitute development and therefore would not require planning permission in themselves.

The extension would not increase the number of bedrooms at the dwelling but would provide 6 x larger bedrooms all served by ensuite bathrooms.

PLANNING STATUS

- Pyrford Neighbourhood Area
- TBH SPA Zone B (400m-5km)
- Urban Areas

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT planning permission subject to conditions.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is located on the west side of Pyrford Road and comprises a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with an existing single-storey side/rear extension which wraps around the north-west corner of the dwelling. It has hardstanding to the front which provides off-street parking provision for 3 vehicles. The dwelling has a grassed garden to the rear with a detached outbuilding close to the rear boundary. The 'other half' of the pair of semi-detached properties, Fermain, has itself been extended.

8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

The property is currently a house of multiple occupancy (HMO) with 6 bedrooms. (Note: no Planning Permission is required to move between a residential dwelling [Class C3] and an HMO for up to 6 persons [Class C4] and back again).

The site is located within the developed area which is characterised primarily by residential dwellings. The street scene provides examples of both detached and semi-detached dwellings of both single and two storey heights. The dwelling's immediate neighbour to the north; Elm Cottage is Locally Listed. It is a nineteenth century, detached, three-bay cottage of red brick and tile-hanging under clay-tiled roof.

PLANNING HISTORY

| Ref. | Proposal | Decision | Date |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| COND/2018/0115 | Discharge of condition 4 to PLAN/2016/1375 (Proposed single storey side and rear extensions following the demolition of existing garage). | Permitted | 12.08.18 |
| PLAN/2016/1375 | Proposed single storey side and rear extensions following the demolition of existing garage. | Permitted | 07.09.17 |
| PLAN/2014/0879 | Subdivision of existing house into 2 no. 3 bedroom flats following the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension and associated landscaping and parking. (Amended Description) | Refused | 28.11.14 |
| PLAN/2013/0890 | Demolition of existing garage, erection of new end terrace house to the north and erection of first floor rear extension to Milestones over existing rear ground floor extension. | Refused | 13.11.13 |
| PLAN/2008/0023 | Erection of a two-storey side extension. | Permitted | 13.02.08 |
| 0012271 | 8 semi-detached houses and garage | Permitted | |

Though not planning related, the following licencing case is also relevant in this instance;

| Ref. | Proposal | Decision | Date |
|--------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| 19/00034/HMO | House in Multiple Occupation | - | 24.06.19 |

CONSULTATIONS

| | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Conservation Officer | The proposed two storey extension would not have a significant effect on the setting of the adjacent LL building, as this building sits in a generous plot. So, I have no objections on heritage asset grounds. |
| Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum | <p>The Forum objects to this development as it is a) out of character with the area, b) overbearing high brick side wall, c) overlooks Elm Cottage, a local listed building of townscape merit (Heritage 2000).</p> <p>It should be refused due to its "size density, layout design and proximity" to and impact on Elm Cottage. There have been many applications in the past for this site. One such relevant one was PLAN/2013/0890 which turned down a similar first floor extension where the garage is now due to its "negative impact on the setting of the Locally Listed building". Policy DM20 in the Woking Core Plan also relevant. It says that "any proposal affecting the character, appearance</p> |

8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

| | |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>and/or setting of heritage assets (including locally listed) will be required to show" a number of requirements. The most relevant sub para (iv).</p> <p>The Forum view is that the extension will impact "the views or from the heritage asset". The Forum also believes that the extension breaches its Policies in particular BE1 which in particular refers to the need to A) "take into account the important contribution that Listed buildings make to the character of the neighbourhood (NB Listed in includes locally listed) B) "Ensure the specific context of the site and wider character of the street scene are fully taken into account in relation to scale appearance and materials" Policy BE2 requires "proposals MUST demonstrate that they will not result in on-road parking". This seems to be a current problem in Pyrford Road around this location. 3 spaces for 6 bedrooms in a House of Multiple Occupation.</p> <p>Policy BE3 all new developments MUST respect "the separation between buildings and between buildings and the site boundary in relation to the likely impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>(Officer's note: the proposal refused under PLAN/2013/0890 was for an additional dwelling which would have extruded the form of the original house at two-storeys to the boundary with Elm Cottage. It was refused for 7 reasons, none of which related to the impact on the built form on the setting of the Locally Listed Building but one of which was related to the impact on its setting through potential loss of trees and landscaping. It is not considered that granting permission for the current scheme would be inconsistent with that decision).</p> |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

REPRESENTATIONS

Seven (7) representations have been received. They raise the following issues:

1. The number of bedrooms and plot size creates high-density living which is out of character in this area.
2. The structure will be overbearing and will not maintain the visual separation existing in the street scene.
3. The proposal would detract from the locally listed building which neighbours the site.
4. The proposal would have an adverse impact on the light the neighbouring dwellings currently receive.
5. The proposal would result in a greater shortfall in parking which will increase the parking issues caused by the dwelling's current residents.
6. The increase in bedroom numbers would in turn increase the bin storage required at the site.
7. Works appear to have started on the roof of the single-storey side/rear extension, to the rear of the dwelling, which is bigger than is being applied for by this application.
8. Smell of drugs from the garden of the site and parties.

Where these comments relate to material planning considerations, they are addressed as appropriate below: points 1- 3 are addressed within impact on character of the area, point 4 is addressed within impact on neighbouring amenity, points 5 and 6 within the impact on parking and highways.

8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

It is noted that concerns for works having already started on site would not form a material planning consideration in the assessment of this application. However, any works carried out on site without planning permission may subsequently be the subject to enforcement action.

Point 8 raised concerns about drugs and parties at the site. Though this does not form a material planning consideration in the assessment of this application, the police have been informed of these concerns.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021

- Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
- Section 4 – Decision making
- Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
- Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Woking Core Strategy (2012):

- CS20 – Heritage and conservation
- CS21 – Design

Development Management Policies DPD (2015):

- Policy DM7 - Noise and Light Pollution
- DM20: Heritage Asset and their settings

Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan (2016):

- BE1 – Maintaining the Character of the Village
- BE2 – Parking Provision
- BE3 – Spatial Character

Supplementary Planning Documents:

- Woking Design (2015)
- Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022)
- Parking Standards (2015)

PLANNING ISSUES

1. The principal planning considerations in the determination of this application are summarized below:

Impact on the Character of the Area

2. Section 12 of the NPPF (2021) states '*Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments...will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development...are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping..are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities)*'.
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,*

8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings.'

4. Policy BE1 of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan states '*To maintain the character of the area, all new developments should: a) be designed to a high quality; b) ensure that the specific context of the site and the wider character of the street scene are fully taken into account in relation to scale, appearance and materials*'.
5. Supplementary Planning Document 'Woking Design' (2015) section on side extensions states, '*Two storey extensions which leave little or no space between adjoining dwellings will not be permitted if they create a 'terracing effect'. It is important to retain a minimum 1m gap between all two storey extensions and a side boundary. In lower density developments a much greater distance will be required*'.
6. By way of the positioning of the proposed extension, it would be readily apparent when viewed from the public realm. The proposed extension would be built directly above part of the side element of the dwelling's existing single-storey wrap-around extension, running flush with the north side elevation and the rear elevation of the main dwellinghouse. The extension would be set back from the dwelling's principal elevation by 1.5 metres. The extension would incorporate a gable end with an eaves and pitch which mirror that of the existing dwelling. Additionally, it is noted that the materiality of the proposed extension would mirror that of the existing dwelling. It is considered that the proposed extension would appear sympathetic to the host dwelling in terms of its scale and material palette. Though it is noted that the host dwelling forms one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, it is considered that the proposed extension would not unbalance these by virtue of its set back from the dwelling's principal elevation and the lower ridge height.
7. The extension would maintain the existing gap of 1.3 metres between the dwelling and the northern side boundary, in line with the Design SPD, which requires a minimum gap of 1 metre. In addition to this, it is noted that an overall gap of approximately 4.3 metres would be maintained between the host dwelling and neighbouring property to the north. It is considered that, given this distance, the visual level of spaciousness between the two properties would be maintained when viewed from the public realm, and a terracing effect would not be created as a result of the proposed extension. The resultant dwelling would not appear cramped or result in overdevelopment of the plot as a large amount of amenity space would remain to the rear and an acceptable distance between the extension and the side boundary would be maintained.
8. The character of Pyrford Road varies with many different styles and finishes of dwellings. This is illustrated by Map 3 (The Mix of Housing styles in Greater Pyrford, Pg 22, Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan 2016), which illustrates that the application site and its immediate neighbouring dwellings do not fall within an identified style, as a large majority of the rest of Pyrford does. Given that the extension would appear sympathetic to the host dwelling in terms of scale, style and materiality, it is considered that it would not appear inconsistent within the character of the area or the locality in general.
9. With the above taken into account, it is considered that the proposed extension would comply with Section 12 of the NPPF, relevant local policies CS21 of the Councils Core Strategy, BE1 and BE3 of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan and the Woking Design SPD.

Impact on Locally Listed building

10. Elm Cottage, Pyrford Road, the host dwelling's immediate neighbour to the north side, is a Locally Listed building and therefore is considered a Heritage Asset in line with Appendix 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) which defines a Heritage

8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Asset as ‘*a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).*’

11. Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states ‘*In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*’
12. Policy CS20 of the Council’s Core Strategy states ‘*Locally listed buildings are not statutory listed, but are of local architectural or historic interest. They contribute to the character of the area as often they are local landmarks of historic merit or have architectural features of local significance. Approximately 330 buildings are locally listed in Woking Borough. They form an important part of the heritage of the area and will be preserved and enhanced.*’
13. Policy DM20 of the Development Management Plan DPD (DM DPD) (2015) states ‘*A proposal affecting the character, appearance and/or setting of heritage assets will be required to show that the works or development preserve and/or enhance the heritage asset and/or its setting in terms of quality of design and layout (scale, form, bulk, height, character, street pattern and features), materials (colour and texture) and historic street pattern of the area*’.
14. The application site is the adjacent neighbour to Elm Cottage and thus the proposed works would have no physical impact on the Locally Listed building. Therefore, the primary assessment is whether the works would impact the setting of this asset. Elm Cottage is a nineteenth century, detached, three-bay cottage of red brick and tile-hanging under clay-tiled roof. It appears to have retained many original architectural features including timber sash windows, coigns and bay window on the front elevation.
15. Elm Cottage is positioned centrally within its generous plot, resulting in a distance of approximately 3 metres between the south side elevation and the shared boundary with the application site. Overall, a gap of approximately 4.3 metres would be maintained between the Milestones and Elm Cottage. Furthermore, Elm Cottage has a much shallower depth of frontage than Milestones (i.e. it is closer to the Pyrford Road frontage). As such, the whole depth of its left-hand side return elevation (its southern elevation) is visible in the streetscene. This gives the building a generous setting, particularly when viewed from the south. Given that the proposed extension at Milestones would be constructed immediately above the existing, single-storey, side extension, running flush with the north side and two-storey rear elevations of the existing dwelling but will be set back from the front elevation, this will remain the case and no views of the Locally Listed building would be impinged upon by the proposed extension. The whole depth of the southern elevation of Elm Cottage would remain visible and its setting preserved.
16. The Council’s Heritage Consultant concurs with this assessment, stating, “*the proposed two storey extension would not have a significant effect on the setting of the adjacent LL building, as this building sits in a generous plot. So, I have no objections on heritage asset grounds.*”
17. Therefore, it is considered that the historic value of this heritage asset would be maintained as a result of the proposed works in line with Section 16 of the NPPF, Policy CS20 of the Council’s Core Strategy and Policy DM20 of the DM DPD.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

18. The site's immediate neighbouring dwellings are; Elm Cottage to the north, the rear boundary of the site adjoins the side boundary of No. 14 Floyds Lane and the attached neighbouring dwelling, Fermain, to the south side.
19. By virtue of the positioning of the proposed extension in relation to the south side and the rear of the site, it would not breach the 45- or 25-degree angles when measured from the centre points of the nearest habitable windows at these properties.
20. The proposed extension would be adjacent to the north side boundary of the site which is shared with Elm Cottage. The extension would run flush with the side elevation of the dwelling's existing single-storey side extension and thus would maintain a distance of 1.3 metres to this shared boundary. It is noted that the neighbouring dwelling is positioned approximately 3 metres from this boundary and thus, a distance of approximately 4.3 metres would remain between the extension and the neighbouring dwelling.
21. The proposed extension would mirror the depth of the main dwelling, running flush with the first-floor rear elevation. Consequently, the rear elevation of the extension would not project further than that of Elm Cottage and thus, the extension would not breach the 45-degree angle when measured from the centre point of the nearest habitable windows within the rear elevation of this neighbour.
22. The proposed extension would breach the 25-degree angle when measured from the centre point of the neighbouring dwelling's south side window which serves a small sitting room. This angle is already breached by the existing roof and the mature hedgerow on the shared boundary between the two properties. It is also noted that due to the orientation of the site, the Milestones is located directly to the south of this neighbouring window. Therefore, the light this window currently receives from the south is already limited, with the large majority of light being received from the east and west, which are either side of the host dwelling. Though this is a habitable room, it is not the sole living room in the dwelling and it is noted that whilst this window is the only external window serving this room, there are glazed double doors to the side of the room which lead to the dwelling's glazed conservatory, which also provide a source of natural light to the room.
23. With the above taken into account, whilst it is noted that the breach of the 25 degree angle by the host dwelling would occur sooner as a result of the proposed extension, given the existing breaches by both the host dwelling and the shared boundary treatment, the impact this would have on the light this room receives would be limited. The window would still receive the majority of its light from the east and west as it currently does. It is also noted that the double doors to the side of the room also provide a source of natural light and given the positioning of the extension in relation to the neighbouring rear conservatory, these would not be adversely affected by the proposal.
24. Additional regard must also be had for the outlook of this window, however it is considered that its outlook is already limited by the boundary wall and hedgerow between the host dwelling and this neighbouring property, and thus the proposed extension would not detrimentally impact this.
25. The proposed extension would encompass new windows to the front and rear elevations at first floor level. It is considered that these windows would not provide views dissimilar to the existing windows within the front and rear elevations of the existing dwelling and thus would not result in overlooking or a loss of privacy to the nearest neighbouring dwellings. The extension would not encompass any side facing windows at first floor level.

8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

26. Overall, there would be no significant impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Impact on Highways and Parking

27. Policy BE2 of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan states '*Development proposals must demonstrate that they will not result in on-road parking to the detriment of highway safety or adverse impact on the character of the area.*'
28. The proposed extension would not increase the number of bedrooms at the dwelling. Nor would it decrease the existing parking provision at the site. Therefore, the works would not require any additional off street parking provision and would not be contrary to the Parking Strategy SPD (2018). Similarly, as the proposed works would not result in an increase in number of bedrooms at the dwelling, there would not be an increased need for bin storage at the site as a result of the works proposed.

Conclusion & Planning Balance:

Overall, the proposal is considered to be appropriate in scale and character to the host building and surrounding area and is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenities of neighbours. The proposal therefore accords with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Supplementary Planning Documents 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight' (2022) and 'Woking Design' (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework and is recommended for approval.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Site Photographs dated 21 October 2022.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

01. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced not later than three years from 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).

02. The external finishes of the extension hereby permitted shall be implemented and thereafter retained in accordance with the specified details in the application unless any different materials are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

03. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 1 and Classes A, B and C of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any orders amending or re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

8 NOVEMBER 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE

The flat roof area of the single storey rear extension hereby approved shall not be used as balcony, roof terrace, sitting out area or similar amenity area nor shall any railings or other means of enclosure be erected on top of or attached to the side of the extension without the grant of further specific planning permission by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect adjoining properties from overlooking and noise.

04. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below:

- Proposed Floor Plans – Dwg No. P302 Rev A – dated January 2022 and received by the Local Planning Authority 26.04.2022
- Proposed Elevations and Existing and Proposed Roof Plans – Dwg No P304 Rev A – dated January 2022 and received by the Local Planning Authority 26.04.2022

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

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 2021.
2. The applicant is 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.
3. The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, works which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours: 8.00 a.m. - 6.00 p.m. Monday to Friday; 8.00 a.m. - 1.00 p.m. Saturday; and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.