

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

6e 18/0918 Reg'd: 27.09.18 Expires: 27.11.18 Ward: C  
 Nei. 19.10.18 BVPI 13 Number >8 wks On No  
 Con. Target (Minor of Weeks Target?  
 Exp: dwellings) on Cttee' Day:

**LOCATION:** Premier House, 15 - 19 Church Street West, Woking, GU21 6DJ

**PROPOSAL:** Construction of two storey extension across building to form x9 dwellings (x2 one bedroom and x7 two bedroom) and roof terrace, with associated bicycle storage and refuse/recycling storage.

**TYPE:** Full Application

**APPLICANT:** Magna Asset Management **OFFICER:** Benjamin Bailey

### REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The proposal is of a development type which falls outside the Management Arrangements and Scheme of Delegations.

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This is a full planning application for the construction of a two storey extension across building to form x9 dwellings (x2 one bedroom and x7 two bedroom) and roof terrace, with associated bicycle storage and refuse/recycling storage.

Site Area: 0.1066 ha (1066 sq.m)  
 Existing units: 0  
 Proposed units: 9 (32 including prior approval)  
 Existing density: 0 dph (dwellings per hectare)  
 Proposed density: 84 dph  
 Proposed density: 300 dph (including prior approval)

Scenario A - Current proposal implemented in conjunction with retention of ground, first and second floor levels (inclusive) within office use:

Floor level	Prior Approval/ Planning Application	Studio / 1 bed units	2 bed units	3 bed units	Total units
Ground - Second (Inclusive)	Office use (921 sq.m GFA)				
Third	Planning Application	1	4	0	5
Fourth	Planning Application	1	3	0	4
		2 (23%)	7 (77%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Scenario B - Current proposal implemented in conjunction with prior approval:

Floor level	Prior Approval / Planning Application	Studio / 1 bed units	2 bed units	3 bed units	Total units
Ground	Prior Approval	6	1	0	7
First	Prior Approval	8	0	0	8
Second	Prior Approval	8	0	0	8
Third	Planning Application	1	4	0	5
Fourth	Planning Application	1	3	0	4
		<b>24</b> <b>(75%)</b>	<b>8</b> <b>(25%)</b>	<b>0</b> <b>(0%)</b>	<b>32</b> <b>(100%)</b>

### PLANNING STATUS

- Urban Area
- Woking Town Centre
- Surface Water Flood Risk (1 in 100 year / 1 in 1000 year - partial)
- Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) Zone B (400m-5km)

### RECOMMENDATION

**Grant** planning permission subject to recommended conditions and SAMM (TBH SPA) contribution secured by S106 Legal Agreement.

### SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site contains a three storey office block constructed during the 1980s. Areas laid to hardstanding, and demarcated for car parking, are situated to the north-west of the building. Vehicular access is gained from Church Street West to the east. Immediately to the north-east and south-west are further commercial buildings with residential properties to the north-west.

### RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

PLAN/2017/1415 - Construction of two storey extension across building to form x14 dwellings (x14 one bedroom) and roof terrace.

Refused (04.04.2018) for the following reasons:

01. *By reason of its form, massing, appearance and external finishes the proposed extension would represent an overdominant and discordant development which would detract from the character and appearance of the host building, fail to respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and wider area and fail to represent development designed and developed to the highest possible quality on a key approach into Woking Town Centre from the west. The development would visually dominate the host building and would be readily visible in short and mid distance views from the public realm along Goldsworth Road and Church Street West. Furthermore provision for the storage of waste and recyclable materials has not been demonstrated to serve the proposed x14 flats. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies CS2, CS21 and CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy*

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

*DM16 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016), Supplementary Planning Document 'Design (2015)' and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).*

02. *In the absence of a daylight and sunlight assessment it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not result in a significantly harmful loss of daylight and sunlight detrimental to the residential amenities of Nos.28-33 Vale Farm Road (inclusive). In addition, and in the absence of this information, it has not been further demonstrated that the proposal would not result in a significantly harmful overbearing effect due to bulk and proximity to Nos.28-33 Vale Farm Road (inclusive). The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)' and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).*
03. *In the absence of a daylight assessment it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not result in a significantly harmful loss of daylight detrimental to the residential amenities of Birchwood Court, Nos.45-49 Goldsworth Road. In addition, and in the absence of this information, it has not been further demonstrated that the proposal would not result in a significantly harmful overbearing effect due to bulk and proximity to Birchwood Court, Nos.45-49 Goldsworth Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)' and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).*
04. *In the absence of a daylight assessment it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not result in a significantly harmful loss of daylight detrimental to the residential amenities of No.21 - 25 Church Street West in the event that the extant grant of office-to-residential prior approval (Ref: PLAN/2018/0176) was implemented. In addition, and in the absence of this information, it has not been further demonstrated that the proposal would not result in a significantly harmful overbearing effect due to bulk and proximity to No.21 - 25 Church Street West in the event that the extant grant of office-to-residential prior approval (Ref: PLAN/2018/0176) was implemented. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)' and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).*
05. *It has not been demonstrated that the resultant level of car parking available within the application site, in the event the current proposal was implemented in combination with the grant of office-to-residential prior approval (Ref: PLAN/2017/0165), would not give rise to undue pressure upon the availability of off-site and on-street parking within the locality and would not have a subsequent materially adverse impact upon the free flow of traffic and highway safety, particularly given that it has not been demonstrated that the secure and covered storage of x14 bicycles could be accommodated within the application site without removing any of the existing x16 car parking spaces, proposed to be retained. The proposal is therefore contrary to Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012), Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and SPD 'Parking Standards (2006)'.*
06. *In the absence of 30% of the dwellings to be affordable, or financial appraisal information demonstrating that the provision of affordable housing is not economically viable, the proposed development is contrary to Policy CS12 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and Supplementary Planning Document 'Affordable Housing Delivery (2014)'.*

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

07. *In the absence of a Legal Agreement or other appropriate mechanism to secure contributions towards mitigation measures, the Local Planning Authority is unable to determine that the additional dwellings would not have a significant impact upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, contrary to Policy CS8 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), the Thames Basin Heaths Avoidance Strategy, saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan (2009) and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (SI No.1012 - the "Habitats Regulations").*
08. *No incorporation of appropriate sustainable drainage systems for the management of water run-off are proposed and it has not been demonstrated, nor any evidence provided illustrating, why the incorporation of appropriate sustainable drainage systems would be inappropriate. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS9 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS161) - Sustainable drainage systems and Section 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).*

PLAN/2017/0165 - Prior approval for a proposed change of use from Office (Class B1(a)) to dwellinghouse (Class C3) to provide 29no. 1 bedroom dwellings.  
Prior Approval Approved (30.03.2017)

83/1206 - Variation of condition 5 (requiring occupation by Berkeley Homes) of Consent 82/0297 to permit occupation of the whole building by Hogan Systems.  
Permitted (11.01.1984)

83/0341 - Variation of conditions 3, 7 and 10 on Consent 82/0297 to allow development of building sited at 15a - 19 Church Street West in isolation of the second building at 21 - 23 Church Street West.  
Permitted subject to conditions (02.11.1983)

82/0297 - The demolition of existing houses, the execution of site works, the erection of three storey office buildings in two blocks and provision of 29 car parking spaces at 15a - 23 Church Street West, Woking.  
Permitted subject to conditions (01.06.1982)

### Adjacent Church Gate, 9 - 11 Church Street West:

PLAN/2018/0741 - Construction of two storey extension across building to form x9 dwellings (x3 one bedroom, x4 two bedroom and x2 three bedroom) and roof terrace, with associated cycle storage and refuse/recycling storage (amended plans).  
Elsewhere on this agenda

PLAN/2016/0438 - Prior notification for a proposed change of use - conversion of office building (Class B1a) to create 32 dwellings (Class C3.)  
Prior Approval Approved (13.06.2016)

## **CONSULTATIONS**

**County Highway Authority (CHA) (SCC):** No objection subject to recommended condition 04.

**Natural England:** Natural England has no comments to make on this application, as long as the relevant avoidance and mitigation measures specified in the Appropriate Assessment are secured.

**Thames Water Development Planning:** No comments received.

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Thameswey:** No comments received.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

None received

### **COMMENTARY**

During consideration of the application the applicant has submitted amended drawings making the following key changes to the proposal as initially submitted:

- Reduction in width of bin store
- Re-orientation of cycle store by 90°
- Church Gate bin collection point added adjacent to bin store
- Alteration to external finish of the element providing access to the roof terrace from brick to zinc cladding to reflect mansard style roof

Due to the consideration that the changes made by amended drawings result in reduced neighbour impact, in comparison to the drawings initially submitted, and on which public consultation was undertaken, it was not considered necessary to undertake further public consultation on amended drawings.

### **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

#### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2018)

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development

Section 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Section 7 - Ensuring the vitality of town centres

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport

Section 11 - Making effective use of land

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

#### Woking Core Strategy (2012)

CS1 - A spatial strategy for Woking Borough

CS2 - Woking Town Centre

CS7 - Biodiversity and nature conservation

CS8 - Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas

CS9 - Flooding and water management

CS10 - Housing provision and distribution

CS11 - Housing mix

CS12 - Affordable housing

CS18 - Transport and accessibility

CS21 - Design

CS22 - Sustainable construction

CS24 - Woking's landscape and townscape

CS25 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

#### Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DMP DPD) (2016)

DM7 - Noise and light pollution

#### Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Design (2015)  
Parking Standards (2018)  
Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)  
Climate Change (2013)  
Affordable Housing Delivery (2014)

### Other Material Considerations

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)  
South East Plan (2009) (Saved policy) NRM6 - Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area  
Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy  
Woking Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2015)  
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2015)  
Waste and recycling provisions for new residential developments  
Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015)

### **PLANNING ISSUES**

01. The main planning issues to consider in determining this application are:
- Principle of development
  - Compatibility of uses
  - Housing mix
  - Design and impact upon the character of the area, including storage of waste and recyclable materials
  - Impact upon neighbouring amenity
  - Amenities of future occupiers
  - Parking, highways implications and alternative modes of travel
  - Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA)
  - Affordable housing
  - Energy and water consumption
  - Flooding and water management
- having regard to the relevant policies of the Development Plan, other relevant material planning considerations and national planning policy and guidance.

### Background

02. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 24 July 2018 and is a material consideration in the determination of this application. However, the starting point for decision making remains the Development Plan, and the revised NPPF (2018) is clear at Paragraph 213 that existing Development Plan policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to 24 July 2018. The degree to which relevant Development Plan policies are consistent with the revised NPPF (2018) has been considered in this instance, and it is concluded that they should be afforded significant weight, with the exception of Policy CS12, the reasons for which are set out within the affordable housing section.

### Principle of development

03. The application site falls within the Urban Area within Woking Town Centre. The NPPF (2018) and Policy CS25 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) promote a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Policy CS10 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) identifies that the Council will make provision for an additional 4,964 net additional dwellings in the Borough between 2010 and 2027, with an indicative number of net additional dwellings within Woking Town Centre of 1,980.

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

04. Policy CS10 sets out an indicative density range of in excess of 200 dph within Woking Town Centre, although states that the density ranges set out are indicative and will depend on the nature of the site and that higher densities than the guidelines will be permitted in principle where they can be justified in terms of the sustainability of the location and where the character of the area would not be compromised. The existing site density is 0 dph (dwellings per hectare); in isolation the current proposal (on the basis of x9 dwellings) would increase this density to 84 dph, although, if implemented in conjunction with the prior approval at ground, first and second floor levels (the stated intention of the applicant), the resulting density would be 300 dph (on the basis of x32 dwellings). This resulting density exceeds 200 dph, as set out by Policy CS10, and is considered to be justified in this instance through the sustainability of the location within Woking Town Centre, albeit subject to an assessment of character impacts, and other material planning considerations.
05. The reasoned justification text to Policy CS10 sets out that Woking Town Centre is one of the broad locations for long-term residential development in accordance with the overall spatial approach of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), helping to minimise the impact on important biodiversity and landscape features and offers the greatest scope to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle because of the proximity to existing services, jobs and public transport. Furthermore, the use of Woking Town Centre sites will help minimise the amount of land that will be needed to be released from the Green Belt to meet housing need.
06. Policy CS2 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that the Council will support the development of Woking Town Centre as the primary centre for economic development in the Borough and as a primary economic centre in the South East and that Woking Town Centre is the preferred location for town centre uses and high density residential development, that new development proposals should deliver high quality, well designed public spaces and buildings, which make efficient use of land, contribute to the functionality of the centre and add to its attractiveness and competitiveness.
07. Policy CS2 sets out that proposals within Woking Town Centre will be achieved through, inter alia:
  - mixed-use high density redevelopment of existing sites
  - refurbishment of outmoded sites
  - intensification of existing sites
08. The proposal takes the form of a two storey extension to an existing office building within Woking Town Centre, albeit benefitting from prior approval for conversion to residential, in line with Policy CS2. In providing x9 net dwellings the proposal would contribute to housing supply within both Woking Town Centre and the wider Borough and towards meeting the indicative net additional dwelling thresholds set out by Policies CS2 and CS10 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).
09. Paragraph 188 of the NPPF (2018) states that *“planning...decisions should:...support opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes. In particular, they should allow upward extensions where the development would be consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, is well-designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards), and can maintain safe access and egress for occupiers”*. Furthermore paragraph 68 of the NPPF (2018) states that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly, and that to promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should, inter alia, support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions - giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes.

10. Prior approval has previously been approved for the conversion of the existing office building to provide x29 dwellings under reference PLAN/2017/0165. It is noted from the officer's site visit that implementation of the prior approval scheme does not appear to have commenced. The Class B1(a) (office) use continues to operate from the subject building. Whilst the prior approval will form a highly material consideration in the assessment of this application, given that the prior approval has not been fully implemented, and the residential use has therefore not been established, the proposal will be assessed as a residential extension to the Class B1(a) (office) use of the building.
11. Both the current planning application and the existing prior approval are each standalone and could be implemented in isolation or in combination. In assessing the current application, this report also considers the cumulative impacts of both schemes being implemented.

### Compatibility of uses:

12. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF (2018) promotes mixed use development whilst paragraph 127 seeks to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Access to the proposed additional storeys could be achieved by utilising the front entrance that would be shared by any employees of the Class B1(a) (office) use on the lower floors. Whilst the main entrance to the building would be shared, security could be maintained by way of internal secure doors to separate the residential and office uses. The buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site are residential and office (Class B1(a)); as such there is no objection in respect of the compatibility of the proposed residential use with surrounding uses.
13. If prior approval reference PLAN/2017/0165 is implemented, the use of the additional floors (third and fourth) for residential would be compatible with the residential uses on the lower floors (ground, first and second). It is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of the compatibility of the use in this location. The principle of development, subject to the other planning considerations addressed within this report, is considered to be acceptable.

### Housing mix

14. Policy CS11 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that all residential proposals will be expected to provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address the nature of local needs, as evidenced in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), to create sustainable and balanced communities. Policy CS11 does however state that the appropriate percentage of different housing types and sizes for each site will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. In this case the current proposal would result in 23% (x2) of 1 bedroom units and 77% (x7) of 2 bedroom units.
15. The latest West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (September 2015) recommends that the following mix of market housing be sought:

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

- 1-bed: 10%
  - 2-bed: 30%
  - 3-bed: 40%
  - 4-bed: 20%
16. Whilst it is noted that the proposed mix provides a higher number of 1 and 2 bedroom units than as stated within the latest SHMA (September 2015), it is acknowledged that not every development site will deliver the complete mix of unit sizes. It is also noted that Policy CS11 operates, and is monitored, Borough wide. In addition the reasoned justification to Policy CS11 notes that lower proportions of family accommodation (2+ bedroom units which may be houses or flats) will be acceptable in locations in the Borough such as the town and district centres that are suitable for higher density developments. The application site lies within Woking Town Centre and is considered to provide a good split between 1 and 2 bedroom units and, taking into account the location of the application site and the considerations of design and access, the flatted nature of the units proposed is considered to be acceptable. Overall the mix of dwelling types and sizes is considered to be acceptable and to accord with Policy CS11 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).
17. It should be noted that the housing mix of the prior approval is outside of the remit of this planning application as housing mix is not a matter which the Local Planning Authority can consider under the provisions of the prior approval procedure.

### Design and impact upon the character of the area

18. The NPPF (2018) sets out that one of the fundamental functions of the planning and development process is to achieve the creation of high quality buildings and places and that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that development should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land.
19. SPD Design (2015) sets out that Woking Town Centre has undergone significant redevelopment since the 1960s and that it is important to ensure that new developments are designed and developed to the highest possible quality.
20. The existing building is three storeys in height and terminated by a mansard style roof, which appears as a visually lighter element than the predominantly brick-faced elevations and furthermore pitches away from the elevations, thereby reducing its bulk, mass and prominence within surrounding street scenes. The front (Church Street West) elevation of the building consists of four vertical bays and is articulated by protruding brick pier elements which flank the four bays. The facing brick is fair-faced with the material below the windows reflective of the existing mansard style roof in colour. The existing building is largely screened in views from the north-east by the form and scale of adjacent Nos.21-25 Church Street West and Goldvale House. In views from the south-west the existing building is largely screened by adjacent Church Gate.
21. The proposal would remove the existing mansard style roof and increase the height (discounting the central lift/stair enclosure leading to the proposed roof terrace) across the entire building by approximately 4.5m above the predominant height of the existing mansard style roof, and by approximately 6.0m above the height of the existing facing brick elevations. Whilst this increase in height would remain very similar to refused

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

PLAN/2017/1415 it was the combination of the form, massing, appearance and external finishes, as opposed to the inherent scale or increase in height, of that refused proposal which was considered to result in an overdominant and discordant development which would have detracted from the character and appearance of the host building, failed to respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and wider area and failed to represent development designed and developed to the highest possible quality.

22. The extension refused under PLAN/2017/1415 would have lied flat and flush with all vertical elevations of the building, demonstrated no articulation and no variation in facing materials (being wholly rendered) with the proposed windows utilising differing proportions and design to the existing windows, which are arranged vertically. Unlike the existing mansard style roof the form of the extension refused under PLAN/2017/1415 would have failed to achieve a lightweight or 'capping' element to the top of the building, would which have significantly increased the visual dominance of the building and the elevations of the resulting upper facade would have clearly lacked any depth and richness in detailing.
23. To address this previous reason for refusal the current proposal would match the elevational appearance and treatment of the existing building at third floor level and 'cap' the building with a re-provided zinc-clad mansard style roof at fourth floor level. The effective re-provision of a mansard style roof at fourth floor level would reduce the resulting bulk and visual dominance of the building and achieve a more visually lightweight element at the top of the building, the zinc-clad appearance of which would integrate into other zinc-like elements on the existing building. Furthermore, unlike refused PLAN/2017/1415, the additional windows have been arranged to line-through, and maintain the verticality of the existing window arrangements within the building, and would reflect the proportions and design of existing windows. The use of matching materials at third floor level, and a zinc-clad mansard style roof at fourth floor level, as opposed to the wholly rendered finish proposed under refused PLAN/2017/1415, would integrate into the appearance of the existing building and maintain visual interest. Overall it is considered that the elevational form and composition would complement the existing building and result in a clear ordered hierarchy with depth and definition.
24. Whilst it is acknowledged that the resulting building would reach 5 storeys in height (with the fifth storey contained within the mansard-style roof) SPD Design (2015) states that "*prevailing building heights are typically around 3-5 storeys...buildings above 6 storeys in height would therefore be regarded as tall buildings in Woking Town Centre*". Whilst it is also acknowledged that the resulting building would be 2 storeys higher than neighbouring Church Gate, this adjacent building is the subject of a similar planning application (Ref: PLAN/2018/0741), elsewhere on this agenda, which would result in a height identical to that proposed at Premier House, in the event that both proposals were granted planning permission and subsequently implemented. It is also a significant material consideration that Premier House is directly opposite Birchwood Court which varies in height between 5 - 7 storeys. Having regard to these combined factors the resulting building is not considered to be 'tall' for the purposes of applying SPD Design (2015).

### Storage of waste and recyclable materials

25. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that "*proposals for new development should...incorporate provision for the storage of waste and recyclable*

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

*materials*". The Council has also produced a document titled 'Waste and recycling provisions for new residential developments', although this document provides guidance and does not form part of the Development Plan. Refused PLAN/2017/1415 made no provision for the storage of waste and recyclable materials and this formed part of the reasons for refusal.

26. The current application includes provision of a bin store with sufficient capacity to store x10 1,100 litre residual waste and recycling bins (x5 of each) and x3 240 litre kitchen waste bins. This capacity has been based on the intention of the applicant to implement both the current proposal in conjunction with the prior approval (at ground floor, first floor and second floor). In the event the prior approval was not implemented any continued office use would likely to be able to utilise this bin store. Joint Waste Solutions consider this residual waste and recycling bin storage capacity to be sufficient having regard to the likely level of occupation of the current proposal, in conjunction with the prior approval.
27. The applicant has submitted a swept path analysis to demonstrate that it would be possible for the RCV to reverse (less than the 40m stated by the guidance document) from Church Street West into the Premier House car park (and subsequently leave the site in a forward gear) in order to service the Premier House bin store (if granted planning permission and subsequently implemented). This provision is considered to be acceptable and can be secured via recommended condition 06.
28. Overall the proposal is considered to respect and make a positive contribution to the character of Woking Town Centre, paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land in accordance with Policies CS2 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Design (2015) and the provisions of the NPPF (2018).

### Impact upon neighbouring amenity

29. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) advises that proposals for new development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties, avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of loss of privacy, loss of daylight or sunlight, or an overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook. Detailed guidance on assessing neighbouring amenity impacts is provided within SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008).
30. The impact of the development upon nearby properties within commercial uses does not need to be considered, although the impact on any development potential of adjoining sites may need to be considered. In this respect the additional floors at third floor and mansard level would not demonstrate any side-facing windows or other openings and the proposal is therefore not considered to unduly prejudice any development potential of adjoining sites. The key neighbouring amenity considerations are those of Nos.34-37 Vale Farm Road, Nos.28-33 Vale Farm Road, Nos.5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 Oaks Road (inclusive), Birchwood Court, Nos.45-49 Goldsworth Road, and Greenwood House (above Woking Fire Station). The impact upon the prior approval at adjacent Nos.21-25 Church Street West will also be considered.

### Daylight impacts

31. The impact of the proposed development upon nearby residential properties has been assessed by the applicant within a daylight, sunlight and overshadowing study by Delva Patman Redler LLP (dated August 2018) carried out in compliance with the

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

methodology outlined within the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Guide 'Site Layout Planning for Sunlight and Daylight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)', a recognised industry tool for assessing these effects (hereafter referred to as the BRE Guide). The BRE guide is however a guide and compliance is not mandatory, since the actual effect can be influenced by other factors. The BRE Guide is referred to within SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008).

32. Where the BRE guidelines are exceeded then daylighting and/or sunlighting may be adversely affected. The BRE Guide provides numerical guidelines although emphasizes that advice given is not mandatory and the BRE Guide should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy; the (numerical guidelines) are to be interpreted flexibly since natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout and design. The BRE Guide also sets out that in special circumstances the developer or Local Planning Authority may wish to use different target values. For example, in a historic city centre, or in an area with modern high rise buildings, a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings.
33. It is also a material consideration that Paragraph 123(c) of the NPPF (2018) states that "*local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in this Framework. In this context, when considering applications for housing, authorities should take a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site (as long as the resulting scheme would provide acceptable living standards)*".
34. Rooms in adjoining or nearby housing where daylight is required include living rooms, kitchens and bedrooms. Windows to bathrooms, toilets, storerooms, circulation areas and garages need not be analysed as daylight is not required to these rooms. Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and Daylight Distribution (DD) are the primary tests used to assess the impact of new development upon the daylighting of existing buildings.

### Vertical Sky Component (VSC)

35. Vertical Sky Component (VSC) quantifies the amount of skylight falling on a vertical wall or window, measured on the outer pane of the window. According to the BRE Guide if the VSC is greater than 27% then enough skylight should still be reaching the window of the existing building. If the VSC, with the new development in place, is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times (ie. a greater than 20% reduction) of its former value (pre-development), occupants of the existing building will notice the reduction in the amount of skylight. The maximum VSC value obtainable at a flat window in a vertical wall is effectively 40%. Clearly 'noticeable' is a different test than that set out within Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), which refers to 'significant' harm rather than a 'noticeable' effect.

### Daylight Distribution (DD)

36. Where room layouts are known, the impact on the daylighting distribution in existing buildings can be found by plotting the 'no sky line' in each of the main rooms. For housing this would include living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens; the BRE Guide states that bedrooms should also be analysed although they are less important. The no sky line divides points on the working plane (in housing assumed to be horizontal and 0.85m high) which can and cannot see the sky. The BRE Guides states that if, following construction of a new development, the no sky line moves so that the area of the existing room, which does not receive direct daylight, is reduced to less than 0.8

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

times its former value (ie. a greater than 20% reduction) this will be noticeable to the occupants, and more of the room will appear poorly lit. However the BRE Guide also states that the guidelines need to be applied sensibly and flexibly; if an existing building contains rooms lit from one side only and greater than 5.0m deep, then a greater movement of the no sky line may be unavoidable.

### Sunlight impacts

#### Sunlight impact to windows

37. Unlike daylight, which is non-directional and assumes that light from the sky is uniform, the availability of sunlight is dependent on the orientation of the window, or area of ground, being assessed relative to the position of due south. The BRE guide recommends that all main living rooms facing within 90° of due south (ie. facing from 90° to 270°) should be checked for potential loss of sunlight. Kitchens and bedrooms are less important.
38. The BRE Guide states that sunlight availability may be adversely affected if the centre of the window receives less than 25% of annual probable sunlight hours (APSH), or less than 5% of APSH between 21 September and 21 March (for ease of reference this period is referred to as 'winter months') and receives less than 0.8 times its former sunlight hours during either period and has a reduction in sunlight received over the whole year greater than 4% of APSH. In this context 'Probable sunlight hours' means the total number of hours in the year that the sun is expected to shine on unobstructed ground, allowing for average levels of cloudiness for the location in question.

#### Overshadowing to gardens and open spaces

39. The BRE Guide sets out that the availability of sunlight should be checked for all open spaces where sunlight is required, including gardens and sitting out areas (such as those between non-domestic buildings and in public squares) and recommends that at least 50% of the area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21st March, stating that, if, as a result of a new development, an existing garden or amenity area does not meet the 50% criteria, and the area which can receive two hours of sunlight on 21st March is less than 0.8 times its former value (ie. a greater than 20% reduction), then the loss of sunlight is likely to be noticeable.

#### Nos.34-37 Vale Farm Road:

40. Nos.34-37 Vale Farm Road forms a two storey block of x4 maisonettes to the north-west. The proposal would result in a maximum building height (discounting the central lift/stair enclosure leading to the proposed roof terrace) measuring approximately 15.8m. Approximately 29.0m separation would be retained to the rear boundary of Nos.34-37 (which occurs to the rear of adjacent Church Gate), and approximately 41.0m to the rear elevation of Nos.34-37. Given these factors, together with the offset, and hence obliquely angled, relationship between the subject building and Nos.34-37, it is not considered that a significantly harmful overbearing effect by reason of bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, would occur to Nos.34-37. Whilst the balustrade to the proposed roof terrace, and the central lift/stair enclosure leading to the roof terrace, would project above this approximate 15.8m height these elements would be set back from the northern (rear) elevation by approximately 3.0m and 4.8m respectively, such that the impacts of these elements would be greatly reduced.
41. The proposal would result in additional windows at third and fourth floor levels albeit these would be offset, and therefore demonstrate a heavily oblique relationship with,

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

the rear boundary of Nos.34-37 (which occurs to the rear of adjacent Church Gate). SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008) sets out recommended minimum separation distances for achieving privacy, of 30.0m for 3+ storey rear-to-rear elevation relationships, and of 15.0m for 3+ storey rear elevation-to-boundary relationships, stating that standards of amenity may be relaxed for housing in the Town Centre. The proposal would comply with these recommended separation distances and therefore no significantly harmful loss of privacy is considered to occur to Nos.34-37. Taking into account the retained separation distances and height (1.7m) and set-back (approximately 3.0m) of the northern balustrade to the proposed roof terrace it is not considered that any significantly harmful loss of privacy would occur to Nos.34-37 due to the proposed roof terrace.

42. The submitted Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study (hereafter referred to as the Study) demonstrates that all relevant windows within Nos.34-37 Vale Farm Road would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain VSC reductions of less than 20%), such that occupants are unlikely to notice the reduction in the amount of skylight. The Study also demonstrates that all relevant rooms would experience no 'no sky line' (NSL) reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain NSL reductions of less than 20%), such that occupants are unlikely to notice a reduction in daylighting distribution within relevant rooms. The Study demonstrates that no adverse loss of sunlight (as defined within the BRE Guide) would be sustained to any relevant windows, or to the rear amenity area, at Nos.34-37 Vale Farm Road.

### Nos.28-33 Vale Farm Road:

43. Nos.28-33 Vale Farm Road form a two storey terraced block of x6 dwellings to the north-west with private rear garden areas abutting the application site boundary. There is a slight fall in ground level from Premier House towards Nos.28-33 Vale Farm Road. The existing building is located approximately 18.0m from the common boundary, which marks the terminus of the approximately 10.0m deep rear gardens of these dwellings, and approximately 28.0m from the rear elevations of Nos.28-33. The existing level of separation would be retained although the height of the subject building would increase to approximately 15.8m.
44. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed extension would be readily apparent from the rear elevations, and rear garden areas, of Nos.28-33 having regard to the fact that the resulting height of the building (approx. 15.8m) would remain less than the retained 18.0m separation distance to the common boundary, and that approximately 28.0m would be retained to the rear elevations of Nos.28-33, it is not considered that a significantly harmful overbearing effect by reason of bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, would occur to Nos.28-33 contrary to Policy CS21, particularly taking into account that Nos.28-33 immediately abut the Woking Town Centre boundary, where more 'urban' relationships are to be expected. Whilst the balustrade to the proposed roof terrace, and the central lift/stair enclosure leading to the roof terrace, would project above this approximate 15.8m height these elements would be set back from the northern (rear) elevation by approximately 3.0m and 4.8m respectively, such that the impacts of these elements would be greatly reduced.
45. The proposal would result in additional windows at third and fourth floor levels facing towards Nos.28-33. SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008) sets out recommended minimum separation distances for achieving privacy, of 30.0m for 3+ storey rear-to-rear elevation relationships, and of 15.0m for 3+ storey rear elevation-to-boundary relationships, stating that standards of amenity may be relaxed for housing in the Town Centre.

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

46. The proposal would comply with the recommended separation distance for 3+ storey rear elevation-to-boundary relationships although, at 28.0m, would fall approximately 2.0m short of the 30.0m recommended separation distance for 3+ storey rear elevation-to-rear elevation relationships. Whilst this is the case the existing building contains rear-facing windows at 3 storeys high (ie. second floor) and therefore contravenes the SPD guidance as existing. The SPD also sets out that standards of amenity may be relaxed for housing in the Town Centre. The subject building falls within Woking Town Centre and whilst Nos.28-33 do not (although are situated within a High Density Residential Area) these dwellings do immediately abut the Woking Town Centre boundary and are therefore situated within a location in which more 'urban' relationships are to be expected. Furthermore any overlooking arising from the additional windows would be largely restricted to that occurring at a somewhat acute angle (ie. from an individual standing/sitting within close proximity to a window) as outlook from further back within the rooms served by these additional windows would primarily be directed across the rooftops of Nos.28-33. For these combined reasons, and on balance, no significantly harmful loss of privacy is considered to occur to Nos.28-33 Vale Farm Road.
47. Taking into account the retained separation distances and height (1.7m) and set-back (approximately 3.0m) of the northern balustrade to the proposed roof terrace it is not considered that any significantly harmful loss of privacy would occur to Nos.28-33 due to the proposed roof terrace.
48. The submitted Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study demonstrates that all relevant windows within Nos.28-33 Vale Farm Road would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain VSC reductions of less than 20%), such that occupants are unlikely to notice the reduction in the amount of skylight.
49. With the exception of two rooms addressed below the Study demonstrates that all relevant rooms within Nos.28-33 Vale Farm Road would experience no 'no sky line' (NSL) reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain NSL reductions of less than 20%). Therefore occupants are unlikely to notice a reduction in daylighting distribution within relevant rooms with the exception of the following two relevant rooms:

Floor	Window ID	Room Type	DD Reduction
First	W3	Bedroom	20.04%
First	W5	Bedroom	22.01%

50. In terms of daylighting distribution the BRE Guide states that bedrooms should be analysed although they are less important than living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens. Although the daylight distribution reductions to these two bedrooms would exceed the BRE Guide criteria the transgressions in these instances are considered to be minor, representing 0.04% and 2.01% beyond the 20% BRE Guide criteria respectively. The minor extent of these transgressions is such that, whilst a reduction in daylighting distribution is likely to be noticeable within these two bedrooms, such reductions would not be significantly harmful contrary to Policy CS21, particularly taking into account that Nos.28-33 Vale Farm Road abut the boundary of Woking Town Centre.
51. The Study demonstrates that no adverse loss of sunlight (as defined within the BRE Guide) would be sustained to any relevant windows, or to the individual rear garden

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

areas, at Nos.28-33 Vale Farm Road.

52. The proposed bin store would occur within close proximity of the common boundaries with Nos.28-29 Vale Farm Road, and the proposed cycle store within close proximity of the common boundaries with Nos.30-31 Vale Farm Road. The common boundaries represent the terminus of the approximately 10.0m deep rear gardens of these dwellings.
53. The proposed bin store would reach a maximum height measuring approximately 2.4m although would pitch slightly to an approximate 2.2m height closest to the common boundaries with Nos.28-29. The proposed cycle store would reach approximately 2.9m at its highest point although would be orientated at a 90° angle in relation to the common boundaries such that the building profile presented to these common boundaries would be, at approximately 2.5m, relatively narrow. Whilst these two structures would be apparent above the intervening common boundary treatment they would not project significantly above, nor be so substantial in scale and height, such that any significantly harmful loss of daylight or sunlight, or overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, is considered to occur to Nos.28-29 and Nos.30-31 Vale Farm Road. The proposed bin store would be fully enclosed to both the rear elevation and roof such that no significantly harmful impact by reason of potential odour is considered to occur to Nos.28-29 Vale Farm Road.

Nos.5, 7, 9 11, 13 and 15 Oaks Road (inclusive):

54. Nos.5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 Oaks Road (inclusive) are two storey buildings located to the west, beyond the intervening Welcome Church car park and adjacent Church Gate, and are currently occupied in association with Welcome Church. It is a material consideration that PLAN/2018/0410, dated 07.09.2018, granted planning permission for, inter alia, the demolition of Nos.5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 Oaks Road (inclusive) and it is understood these demolition works are due to commence on 26.11.2018.
55. The existing subject building is located approximately 46.0m, at an oblique angle, from the very south-eastern corner of the closest of these buildings (No.11 Oaks Road) and approximately 58.0m from the rear elevation of No.5 Oaks Road at its closest point. The existing level of separation would be retained although the height of the subject building would increase to approximately 15.8m and additional openings would be formed at third and fourth floor levels. Whilst this is the case, taking account of the retained level of separation in comparison to the uplift in height, combined with the heavily obliquely angled relationship between the subject building and the closest of these buildings, and the location within Woking Town Centre, it is not considered that a significantly harmful overbearing effect by reason of bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, or significantly harmful loss of privacy, would occur to Nos.5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 Oaks Road (inclusive).
56. The submitted Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study demonstrates that all relevant windows within Nos.5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 Oaks Road (inclusive) would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain VSC reductions of less than 20%), such that occupants are unlikely to notice the reduction in the amount of skylight. The Study also demonstrates that all relevant rooms within Nos.5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 Oaks Road (inclusive) would experience no 'no sky line' (NSL) reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain NSL reductions of less than 20%), such that occupants are unlikely to notice a reduction in daylighting distribution within relevant rooms. The Study demonstrates that no adverse loss of sunlight (as defined within the BRE Guide)

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

would be sustained to any relevant windows, or to the rear garden areas, at Nos.5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 Oaks Road (inclusive).

### Birchwood Court, Nos.45-49 Goldsworth Road:

57. Birchwood Court, Nos.45-49 Goldsworth Road is an apartment block on the corner of Church Street West and Goldsworth Road. Existing apartments are located at first floor level and above. Planning permission (Ref: PLAN/2014/0340) was granted on 30.03.2015 for the conversion of part of the ground floor to x4 further apartments however development to implement this planning permission does not appear to have commenced and the planning permission therefore appears to have lapsed on 30.03.2018.
58. The proposal would result in a maximum building height (discounting the central lift/stair enclosure leading to the proposed roof terrace) measuring approximately 15.8m. Approximately 16.0m separation would be retained to the north-western elevation of Birchwood Court at its closest point. Given these factors, combined with the 'across the street' relationship and the Woking Town Centre location, it is not considered that a significantly harmful overbearing effect by reason of bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, would occur to Birchwood Court. Whilst the balustrade to the proposed roof terrace, and the central lift/stair enclosure leading to the roof terrace, would project above this approximate 15.8m height these elements would be set back from the south-eastern (front) elevation by approximately 3.0m and 9.0m respectively, such that the impacts of these elements would be greatly reduced.
59. The proposal would result in additional windows at third and fourth floor levels facing towards Birchwood Court. SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008) sets out a recommended minimum separation distance for achieving privacy, of 15.0m for 3+ storey front-to-front elevation relationships, stating that standards of amenity may be relaxed for housing in the Town Centre. The proposal would comply with this recommended distance and therefore no significantly harmful loss of privacy is considered to occur to Birchwood Court. Taking into account the retained separation distance and height (1.1m) and set-back (approximately 3.0m) of the south-eastern balustrade to the proposed roof terrace it is not considered that any significantly harmful loss of privacy would occur to Birchwood Court due to the proposed roof terrace.
60. The submitted Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study demonstrates that all relevant windows within Birchwood Court would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction), such that occupants are unlikely to notice the reduction in the amount of skylight, with the exception of the following three windows:

Floor	Window ID	Room Ref	Room Type	VSC Reduction
Ground	W1 & W2	R1	LKD	32.60%
Ground	W3	R2	Bedroom	29.83%
Ground	W4	R3	Bedroom	25.52%

61. It should be noted that these three windows would all be located at ground floor level as a result of planning permission (Ref: PLAN/2014/0340), granted on 30.03.2015, for the conversion of part of the ground floor of Birchwood Court to x4 further flats.

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Development to implement this planning permission does not appear to have commenced and PLAN/2014/0340 therefore appears to have lapsed on 30.03.2018.

62. The Study treats Birchwood Court in the 'worst case' scenario, which is that these x4 ground floor flats were implemented, either through development works having commenced under PLAN/2014/0340 (which does not appear to be the case) or through a further grant of planning permission (which would be assessed on its merits). It should also be noted that a major factor for the VSC infringement to these three windows can be attributed to the recessed nature of these windows, and the presence of the overhang of the main building elevation directly above, which inhibits the access of light to these windows. The BRE Guide recognises, in paragraph 2.2.11 that the presence of balconies above windows will limit the access of direct light, and permits a secondary assessment without the effects of the balconies being taken into account. It is clear from the VSC results for the remainder of Birchwood Court that the primary factor for these VSC infringements is due to the recessed nature of these three windows, and the presence of the overhang of the main building elevation directly above, rather than a result of the proposed development at Premier House in isolation.
63. With the exception of six rooms addressed below the Study demonstrates that all relevant rooms within Birchwood Court would experience no 'no sky line' (NSL) reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain NSL reductions of less than 20%), such that occupants are unlikely to notice a reduction in daylighting distribution within relevant rooms with the exception of the following six rooms:

Floor	Window ID	Room Ref	Room Type	DD Reduction
Ground	W1 & W2	R1	LKD	22.22%
Ground	W3	R2	Bedroom	21.97%
Ground	W4	R3	Bedroom	32.20%
First	W3	R2	Bedroom	21.64%
First	W4 & W5	R3	LKD	31.23%
Second	W4 & W5	R3	LKD	28.65%

64. Again it should be noted that, in terms of daylighting distribution, the BRE Guide states that bedrooms should be analysed although they are less important than living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens. Also, in terms of the three ground floor rooms (R1, R2 and R3) the preceding comments, in terms of VSC, are also applicable to the daylighting distribution (DD) results; that is the primary factor for these DD infringements is due to the recessed nature of the windows serving these rooms, and the presence of the overhang of the main building elevation directly above, rather than a result of the proposed development at Premier House in isolation.
65. Furthermore, although the daylight distribution reductions to two ground floor rooms (R1 and R2), and one first floor room (R2), would exceed the BRE Guide target criteria the transgressions in these instances are considered to be minor, representing 2.22%, 1.97% and 1.64% beyond the 20% BRE Guide criteria respectively. The minor extent of these transgressions is such that, whilst a reduction in daylighting distribution is likely to be noticeable within these three rooms, such reductions would not be significantly harmful contrary to Policy CS21, particularly taking into account the Woking Town Centre location, and high density nature, of Birchwood Court.
66. Whilst the daylighting distribution reductions to room 3, at both first and second floor levels, would be more significantly adverse (31.23% and 28.65% respectively) the BRE Guide states that the guidelines need to be applied sensibly and flexibly; if an

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

existing building contains rooms lit from one side only and greater than 5.0m deep, then a greater movement of the no sky line (ie. above 20%) may be unavoidable. It is apparent from the approved plans for the construction of Birchwood Court (Ref: PLAN/2006/0979) that these two rooms are lit from one side only and greater than 5.0m deep such that a greater movement of the no sky line (ie. above 20%) is unavoidable.

67. It is also a contributing factor that windows W5, at both first and second floor levels, and which serve these rooms in combination with windows W4, are slightly recessed and that the presence of balconies above windows W5 will limit the access of direct light. Furthermore the Study demonstrates that the area of these rooms which will receive direct daylight, with the proposed development in place, would be 57.94% (first floor) and 70.85% (second floor) respectively. Taking into account the Woking Town Centre location, and high density nature, of Birchwood Court, combined with the factors previously discussed, these retained levels of daylight distribution are not considered to give rise to significantly harmful impact contrary to Policy CS21.
68. The Study demonstrates that no adverse loss of sunlight (as defined within the BRE Guide) would be sustained to any relevant windows within Birchwood Court.

### Greenwood House (above Woking Fire Station):

69. There is residential accommodation at first floor level and above within Woking Fire Station (which is known as Greenwood House). Approximately 52.0m separation would be retained between the closest points of the subject building and the residential accommodation at first floor levels and above. Furthermore, there would be a heavily oblique and offset relationship between the front elevation of the extended subject building and that of Greenwood House, and existing Birchwood Court intervenes between these two buildings. These factors are considered sufficient to avoid any potential undue overbearing effect, or sense of enclosure, resulting from bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, and also to avoid any potentially harmful overlooking, to Greenwood House.
70. The submitted Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study (hereafter referred to as the Study) demonstrates that all relevant windows within Greenwood House would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain VSC reductions of less than 20%), such that occupants are unlikely to notice the reduction in the amount of skylight. The Study also demonstrates that all relevant rooms within Greenwood House would experience no 'no sky line' (NSL) reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain NSL reductions of less than 20%), such that occupants are unlikely to notice a reduction in daylighting distribution within relevant rooms. Sunlight impacts are not relevant to Greenwood House due to its location in relation to the subject building.

### Nos.21-25 Church Street West:

71. Nos.21 - 25 Church Street West is an existing four storey office building (with the fourth floor contained within the mansard roof) to the north-east, located beyond the shared access drive onto Church Street West. This building demonstrates existing glazed openings within its side (south-west) elevation facing towards the blank side elevation of Premier House and benefits from an extant grant of prior approval (Ref: PLAN/2018/0176, dated 3 April 2018) for office-to-residential conversion. Whilst it is acknowledged that the prior approval has not yet been implemented at Nos.21 - 25

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Church Street West it nonetheless remains extant and capable of implementation and is therefore a material consideration in determination of this planning application.

72. These south-west facing glazed openings are shown (at each of ground, first, second and third floors) within the proposed floor plans of the prior approval to serve as both single and secondary aspect to bedrooms and living areas. The living areas at ground to second floors (inclusive) would also be served by windows within the front and rear elevations of Nos.21-25, which would remain materially unaffected by the proposed development. These front and rear facing windows would retain outlook to the living areas, notwithstanding the south-west facing openings. A single bedroom within the centre of each of these floor plans would be served by a window facing directly towards the site. Whilst the proposal would increase the height of the existing facing brick wall presented to the side (south-west) elevation of Nos.21-25 it is not considered that the outlook afforded to the windows within the side elevation of Nos.21-25 would be significantly harmed over and above the existing situation. As existing (ie. without the proposed development) the side-facing (south-west) windows within Nos.21-25, if utilised for residential purposes, would face directly onto a brick wall approximately 3.6m away. Whilst the height of the brick wall would increase this inherent limited outlook would not alter materially.
73. With the exception of three windows considered further below the submitted Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study demonstrates that all relevant windows within Nos.21-25 Church Street West would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain VSC reductions of less than 20%), such that occupants are unlikely to notice the reduction in the amount of skylight. With the exception of three rooms considered further below the Study also demonstrates that all relevant rooms within Nos.21-25 Church Street West would experience no 'no sky line' (NSL) reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain NSL reductions of less than 20%), such that occupants are unlikely to notice a reduction in daylighting distribution within relevant rooms:

Floor	Window ID	Room Ref	Room Type	VSC Reduction	DD Reduction	Retained ADF
Ground	W26	R2	Bedroom	22.38%	27.43%	1.85%
First	W26	R2	Bedroom	34.84%	52.10%	2.09%
Second	W2	R2	Bedroom	47.01%	64.70%	2.02%

74. Taking into account that Nos.21-25 Church Street West is not currently within residential use, although the extant prior approval remains a material planning consideration in determination of this application, and recognising that reductions in daylighting to the above three rooms (out of the fifteen rooms assessed) within Nos.21-25 Church Street West exceed the BRE Guide criteria the applicant has calculated the ADF of these three rooms, with the proposed development in place, on the basis of the proposed prior approval plans available on the Council's Planning Register. Whilst it is acknowledged that ADF is primarily used for calculating daylight in new rooms given that works to implement the adjacent prior approval have not yet commenced, and that the rooms within Nos.21-25 Church Street West would therefore be 'new' rooms, in residential terms, this approach is considered to be acceptable in this instance in order to supplement the VSC and DD assessments also undertaken.
75. The ADF takes into account the VSC value, i.e. the amount of skylight received on windows, the size and number of windows serving a single room, the diffuse visible transmittance of the glazing used, the maintenance factor and the reflectance of the

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

room surfaces. Therefore ADF is considered as a more detailed and representative measure of the daylight levels within rooms. Where there are multiple windows serving a single room the ADF due to each one can be added together. BS 8206-2 Lighting for buildings – Part 2: Code of practice for daylighting recommends, for housing, minimum values of ADF of 2% for kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms and 1% for bedrooms.

76. As can be seen from the preceding table those three rooms (all bedrooms) which would sustain reductions in VSC and DD beyond the BRE Guide criteria would retain ADF well above the 1% for bedrooms recommended within BS 8206-2 Lighting for buildings – Part 2: Code of practice for daylighting, such that sufficient daylight would be retained. Overall therefore the Study indicates that the proposed development at Premier House would not significantly harm the resulting daylighting of adjacent Nos.21-25 Church Street West in the event that office-to-residential prior approval reference PLAN/2018/0176 was implemented.
77. The Study demonstrates that no adverse loss of sunlight (as defined within the BRE Guide) would be sustained to any relevant habitable room windows at Nos.21-25 Church Street West.

### Communal roof terrace

78. A communal roof terrace is proposed (170 sq.m). It is considered that the issue of potential noise and disturbance arising from use of this roof terrace can be addressed via the submission of a management plan secured by recommended condition 07. Such a management plan would need to include (i) hours of access to the communal roof terrace (ii) means of controlling access to the communal roof terrace and (iii) signage regarding hours of use and any activities which are prohibited (ie. barbeques / late night gatherings etc).

### Amenities of future occupiers

79. Refused PLAN/2017/1415 proposed x14 apartments. The current application proposes x9 apartments, a reduction of x5 apartments in comparison to the refused proposal.
80. All proposed apartments would comply with, or exceed, the relevant minimum gross internal floor areas set out by the Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard (March 2015), although these standards are not locally adopted. The current proposal is therefore considered to provide a good standard of amenity, in terms of the size of accommodation, to future occupiers. Whilst the kitchens would be located towards the centre of the floor plans the layout of all proposed apartments is such that these would be small galley-type kitchens which would be directly linked to the living/dining rooms, which are likely to be well daylit.
81. SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008) states that “*dwelling specifically designed not to be used for family accommodation do not require any specific area to be set aside for each as private amenity space. This would apply to one and two bedroom flats and any other forms of dwelling less than 65sq.m. floorspace together with specified forms of non family tenure...however, all forms of dwelling should seek to incorporate some modest private sunlit area...at higher levels, particularly in the case of flats, a simple terrace or balcony might be incorporated*”.
82. SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008) also states that “*in the most dense urban locations of Woking Town Centre...where multi storey developments*

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

*including flats, duplex apartments and townhouses are intended for family accommodation (for this purpose all flats or duplex apartments with two bedrooms or more and exceeding 65 sq.m. gross floor space) alternative forms of on-site amenity provision may be permitted in lieu of a conventional private garden...use of a communal amenity space or, where it is safe to do so, a suitable area of landscaped roof garden or terrace, may be acceptable for this purpose if it provides an equivalent area of amenity value”.*

83. x3 of the x9 apartments (apartment 1 at third floor and apartments 3 and 4 at fourth floor) proposed would provide two bedrooms or more and exceed 65 sq.m in gross floor space. Whilst this is the case all proposed apartments would have access to a communal roof terrace measuring 170 sq.m. Taking into account that the site is located within Woking Town Centre, and would provide flatted development, the approach to external amenity provision is considered to be acceptable.
84. Good levels of outlook and daylight are considered to be provided to all proposed apartments. Overall the proposed apartments are considered to provide a good standard of residential amenity for future occupiers.

### Parking, highways implications and alternative modes of travel

85. The NPPF (2018) promotes sustainable transport. Paragraph 109 sets out that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) aims to locate most new development within the main urban areas, served by a range of sustainable transport modes, such as public transport, walking and cycling.
86. Existing vehicular access is via the existing access from Church Street West, which would be unaffected by the proposal. Unlike refused PLAN/2017/1415 the current proposal is supported by a Transport Statement. The current application also proposes x5 fewer apartments than the x14 apartments proposed under PLAN/2017/1415.

### Car Parking

87. SPD Parking Standards (2018) sets out the following minimum residential parking standards, in the two potential scenarios:

Scenario A - Current proposal implemented in conjunction with retention of ground, first and second floor levels (inclusive) within office use:

Number of bedrooms	Vehicle parking spaces per flat, apartment or maisonette (i)	Number of flats, apartments or maisonettes in proposal (ii)	Overall vehicle parking standard (ie. i x ii)
1 bedroom	0.5	2	1
2 bedroom	1	7	7

**11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

<b>Total (Residential) spaces (min.)</b>		<b>8</b>
<b>Gross floor area (GFA) (sq.m)</b>	<b>Maximum per sq.m GFA</b>	<b>Overall maximum parking standard</b>
921 sq.m	1 car space per 100 sq.m	10
<b>Total (Office) spaces (max.)</b>		<b>10</b>
<b>Total combined spaces</b>		<b>18</b>

88. It should be noted that SPD Parking Standards (2018) states that on site parking provision below minimum standards will be considered for residential developments within Woking Town Centre, as in this instance. The preceding table sets out the minimum parking standard for the residential development proposed under the current application for reference purposes. In the event the current proposal was implemented the minimum parking standard for the residential element would be 8 spaces. If the remainder of the subject building (ground, first and second floor levels (inclusive)) remained within office use the maximum parking standard for this element would be 10 spaces. This results in a combined total of 18 parking spaces.

Scenario B - Current proposal implemented in conjunction with prior approval:

<b>Number of bedrooms</b>	<b>Vehicle parking spaces per flat, apartment or maisonette (i)</b>	<b>Number of flats, apartments or maisonettes in proposal (ii)</b>	<b>Overall vehicle parking standard (ie. i x ii)</b>
1 bedroom	0.5	24	12
2 bedroom	1	8	8
<b>Total</b>			<b>20</b>

89. In the event the current proposal was implemented in conjunction with the prior approval the preceding table sets out the resulting minimum residential parking standards, although the site is within Woking Town Centre where SPD Parking Standards (2018) states that on site parking provision below minimum standards will be considered for residential developments.
90. The resulting car parking provision, taking account of the proposed bin and cycle store, would be x15 spaces, which would represent 83% provision in scenario A (18 spaces) and 75% in Scenario B (20 spaces).
91. SPD Parking Standards (2018) sets out that flats have a lower average level of car ownership in comparison to a house/bungalow with a corresponding number of bedrooms. The submitted Transport Statement states that further analysis has been undertaken of the 2011 Census Car Ownership statistics specifically within the Woking Town Centre Output Area to understand local car ownership levels and the results indicate that 59% of households within Woking Town Centre do not own a car. Based on these statistics, and assuming that 41% of units within the current proposal, taken cumulatively with the prior approval, were to own a car, this would equate to a demand of x13 parking spaces. The proposal would provide x15 parking spaces, in line with this likely level of demand.
92. In proposing x15 parking spaces the proposal falls below the threshold, with regard to flats and housing with communal facilities, of 20 or more parking spaces in which SPD Climate Change (2013) requires the provision of electric vehicle (EV) charging points.

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Furthermore the proposal would re-utilise existing parking spaces serving Church Gate. No conditions are therefore recommended in relation to the provision of EV charging points as there is no policy basis to recommend such conditions.

### Cycle Parking

93. SPD Parking Standards (2018) requires x2 cycle parking spaces per dwelling, regardless of bedroom provision. The submitted plans make provision for the provision of x18 cycle parking spaces within a cycle store proposed to the rear; this equates to x2 spaces to serve each of the apartments proposed under the current proposal in line with the requirements of SPD Parking Standards (2018). This provision can be secured via recommended condition 04.

### Trip Generation

94. The submitted Transport Statement utilises TRICS to forecast that the current proposal is likely to generate between 2 and 4 two-way vehicle trips during the respective AM and PM peak hours and, in the event that the current proposal is implemented in conjunction with the prior approval, 7 and 10 two-way vehicle trips are likely to be generated during the AM and PM peak hours respectively; this level of additional traffic is not considered to result in a material impact on the operation, or safety, of the local highway network, particularly having regard to the vehicle trips generated during the AM and PM peak hours by the lawful office use of the building.

### Alternative modes of travel

#### Walking and cycling

95. Walking and cycling provide important alternatives to the private car and should also be encouraged to form part of longer journeys via public transport. The local highway network is subject to a network of good quality footways and pedestrian crossing facilities, which connect to the centre of Woking and public transport connections.
96. There are a range of cycle routes within the vicinity of the site, including the Surrey Cycleway, which is accessible from the centre of Woking and continues through Ripley and Clandon to the south and Horsell and Egham to the north. National Cycle Road 221 is accessible via Victoria Way and operates along the Basingstoke Canal as a traffic-free route between Brookwood and West Byfleet. A range of additional interconnecting local cycle routes are available within Woking, namely the 'Planet Trails'. In particular, the 'Pluto' cycle trail operates along Goldsworth Road close to the application site as a formal cycle route between the centre of Woking and Knaphill / Wych Hill and incorporates a range of on-carriageway and off-carriageway sections.

#### Rail

97. Woking railway station is located a walking distance of approximately 520 metres (High Street entrance) east of the site (a circa 5 - 7 minute walk) and is accessible from the site via the existing network of footways and pedestrian crossings. This distance is well within the 800 metre 'acceptable' walking distance as recommended by the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation (CIHT). Woking railway station provides access to a wide range of high-frequency South Western Railway services to various local and regional destinations, which includes fast, direct services to Clapham Junction and London Waterloo and services to Guildford, Surbiton, Weybridge, Alton and Portsmouth Harbour.

#### Bus

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

98. The nearest bus stop to the site is on Woking High Street, approximately 260 metres to the south-east of the site and well within the CIHT's recommended 400 metres walking distance to a bus stop. The 'High Street Link Road' bus stop was recently implemented and provides high quality waiting and accessibility infrastructure, including a shelter, seating, raised kerbing and real time bus information. It is directly accessible from the site via the existing footways and crossing provision. This bus stop serves many local bus routes.
99. Overall it is evident that there are a wide range of alternative modes of travel to the private car available within the local area, including public transport services, which would reduce the demand for car parking within the development.
100. Overall it is considered that the level of car parking proposed has been justified in this instance, in the case of both potential Scenarios A and B, and having regard to the Woking Town Centre location of the site. It is considered that it has been sufficiently demonstrated that the resultant level of car parking provision would not give rise to undue pressure upon the availability of off site and on-street parking within the locality and would not have a subsequent materially adverse impact upon the free flow of traffic and highway safety.

### Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA)

101. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) has been identified as an internationally important site of nature conservation and has been given the highest degree of protection. Policy CS8 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that any proposal with potential significant impacts (alone or in combination with other relevant developments) on the TBH SPA will be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment to determine the need for Appropriate Assessment. Following recent European Court of Justice rulings, a full and precise analysis of the measures capable of avoiding or reducing any significant effects on European sites must be carried out at an 'Appropriate Assessment' stage rather than taken into consideration at screening stage, for the purposes the Habitats Directive (as interpreted into English law by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the "Habitat Regulations 2017")). An Appropriate Assessment has therefore been undertaken for the site as it falls within 5 kilometres of the TBH SPA boundary.
102. Policy CS8 of Woking Core Strategy (2012) requires new residential development beyond a 400m threshold, but within 5 kilometres of the TBH SPA boundary to make an appropriate contribution towards the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM), to avoid impacts of such development on the SPA. The SANG and Landowner Payment elements of the SPA tariff are encompassed within the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), however the SAMM element of the SPA tariff is required to be addressed outside of CIL. The applicant has agreed to make a SAMM contribution of £5,780 in line with the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance Strategy tariff (April 2018 update). This would need to be secured through a S106 Legal Agreement. For the avoidance of doubt, sufficient SANG at Brookwood Country Park has been identified to mitigate the impacts of the development proposal.

<b>Size of dwelling (bedrooms)</b>	<b>SAMM contribution per dwelling (i)</b>	<b>Number of dwellings in proposal (ii)</b>	<b>Overall SAMM contribution (ie. i x ii)</b>
1 bedroom	£503	2	£1,006

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

2 bedroom	£682	7	£4,774
<b>Total SAMM contribution</b>			<b>£5,780</b>

103. Subject to securing the provision of the SAMM tariff (through a S106 Legal Agreement) and an appropriate CIL contribution, and in line with the conclusions of the Appropriate Assessment (as supported by Natural England), the Local Planning Authority is able to determine that the development will not affect the integrity of the TBH SPA either alone or in combination with other plans and projects in relation to urbanisation and recreational pressure effects. The development therefore accords with Policy CS8 of Woking Core Strategy (2012), the measures set out in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance Strategy, and the requirements of the Habitat Regulations 2017.
104. It should be noted that the prior approval apartments, if implemented, would also be liable to make a SAMM contribution although the SAMM contribution for these apartments would be secured through a separate process under the requirements of the Habitat Regulations 2017.

### Affordable housing

105. Policy CS12 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that all new residential development will be expected to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing and that, on sites providing fewer than five new dwellings, the Council will require a financial contribution equivalent to the cost to the developer of providing 10% of the number of dwellings to be affordable on site.
106. However, Paragraph 63 of the NPPF (2018) sets out that the provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer).
107. Whilst it is considered that weight should still be afforded to Policy CS12 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) it is considered that more significant weight should be afforded to the policies within the NPPF (2018). The proposal is not major development and therefore no affordable housing contribution is sought.
108. It should be noted that PLAN/2017/1415, which was refused on affordable housing grounds, proposed x14 apartments, and was therefore major development. The revised NPPF (2018) has also been published since the refusal of PLAN/2017/1415.

### Energy and water consumption

109. Policy CS22 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), relating to energy and water consumption, does not explicitly state that it relates to extensions to existing buildings. Therefore it is not considered reasonable or necessary to recommend any planning conditions relating to energy and water consumption.

### Flooding and water management

110. The site is located within Flood Zone 1, as identified on the Flood map for planning, and therefore no fluvial flood issues are raised. It should be noted that refused PLAN/2017/1415 proposed x14 apartments, and was therefore major development.

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

The current proposal is for x9 apartments and is therefore not major development, such that SuDS matters do not automatically apply.

111. The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2015) identifies only a small area towards the front of the site as being partially at 1 in 100 year, and partially at 1 in 1000 year, risk of surface water flooding. Whilst this is the case this identified area would not be subject to any alteration as a result of the current proposal and would remain, as existing.
112. Furthermore the additional two storeys would not increase the existing area receiving rainwater because they would occur on the existing roof, with no alterations to the current building footprint. The proposed bin and cycle stores would both be located on existing areas laid to hardstanding for car parking provision and would not increase the existing impermeable area as a consequence. Given these factors it is not considered necessary to recommend conditions in relation to surface water, which would be addressed outside of planning control.

### **LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

113. The development would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to the sum of **£32,686** (on the basis of 353 sq.m net floorspace) (including the April 2018 Indexation).

### **CONCLUSION**

114. Overall the principle of development is considered to be acceptable and the housing mix is considered to be appropriate given the Woking Town Centre location of the site. Furthermore, subject to recommended conditions and S106 legal agreement, the development is considered to result in acceptable impacts with regard to design and the character of the area, neighbouring amenity, amenities of future occupiers, parking, highways implications and alternative modes of travel, Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA), affordable housing, energy and water consumption and flooding and water management.
115. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Sections 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2018), Policies CS1, CS2, CS7, CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS18, CS21, CS22, CS24 and CS25 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DMP DPD) (2016), Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) Design (2015), Parking Standards (2018), Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008), Climate Change (2013) and Affordable Housing Delivery (2014), the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), South East Plan (2009) (Saved policy) NRM6 - Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy and Woking Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2015).

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Site visit photographs

Consultation response from County Highway Authority (CHA) (SCC)

### **PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

	Obligation	Reason for Agreeing Obligation
--	------------	--------------------------------

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

1.	£5,780 SMM (TBH SPA) contribution.	To accord with the Habitat Regulations 2017, Policy CS8 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) Avoidance Strategy.
----	------------------------------------	--

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**Grant** planning permission subject to the following conditions and SMM (TBH SPA) contribution secured by way of S106 Legal Agreement:

01. 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).

02. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed in this notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the requirements of the conditions of this planning permission:

PH\_PA2 001 Rev A, dated 24 September 2018 (Location Plan)

PH\_PA2 002 Rev A, dated 19 September 2018 (Existing Drawings - Site Plan)

PH\_PA2 003 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Existing Drawings - Ground Floor Plan)

PH\_PA2 004 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Existing Drawings - First Floor Plan)

PH\_PA2 005 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Existing Drawings - Second Floor Plan)

PH\_PA2 006 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Existing Drawings - Mansard Floor Plan)

PH\_PA2 007 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Existing Drawings - Roof Plan)

PH\_PA2 008 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Existing Drawings - Front Elevation)

PH\_PA2 009 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Existing Drawings - Side Elevation)

PH\_PA2 010 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Existing Drawings - Rear Elevation)

PH\_PA2 011 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Existing Drawings - Section A)

PH\_PA2 012 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Existing Drawings - Section B)

PH\_PA2 100 Rev A, dated 15 October 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Site Plan)

PH\_PA2 101 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Third Floor Plan)

PH\_PA2 102 Rev A, dated 24 September 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Mansard Floor Plan)

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

PH\_PA2 103 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Roof Terrace Plan)

PH\_PA2 104 Rev 0, dated 26 July 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Roof Plan)

PH\_PA2 105 Rev A, dated 24 September 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Front Elevation)

PH\_PA2 106 Rev A, dated 24 September 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Side Elevation)

PH\_PA2 107 Rev A, dated 24 September 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Rear Elevation)

PH\_PA2 108 Rev A, dated 24 September 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Detailed Front Elevation)

PH\_PA2 109 Rev A, dated 24 September 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Section A)

PH\_PA2 110 Rev A, dated 24 September 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Section B)

PH\_PA2 111 Rev A, dated 24 September 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Contextual Elevations)

PH\_PA2 112 Rev A, dated 22 October 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Refuse and Recycling Storage)

PH\_PA2 113 Rev A, dated 22 October 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Bicycle Storage)

Design Statement Report, dated 6th August 2018

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

03. ++ Notwithstanding the external material details annotated on the approved plans/documents listed within condition 02 of this notice, or within the submitted application form, prior to the application/installation of any external facing materials to the development hereby permitted details and a written specification of the materials to be used in the external elevations of the development hereby permitted (including RAL colours for window/door frames) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include the provision of a sample panel measuring at least 1.2m x 1.2m on the application site for the approval of the Local Planning Authority showing the proposed external materials. The development shall be carried out and thereafter permanently retained in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the character, appearance and visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Design (2015) and the provisions of the NPPF (2018).

04. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the cycle store shall be fully implemented and made available for use in accordance with the approved plans numbered/titled PH\_PA2 100 Rev A, dated 15 October 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Site Plan) and PH\_PA2 113 Rev A, dated 22 October 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Bicycle Storage). The cycle storage mechanism shall be Falco Level Premium + unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle store shall thereafter be permanently retained for use by future occupiers at all times.

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory facilities for the secure and covered storage of cycles are provided to encourage sustainable travel by means other than the private car in accordance with the principles set out within Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Parking Standards (2018) and the provisions of the NPPF (2018).

05. The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until space has been laid out in accordance with the approved plan numbered/titled PH\_PA2 100 Rev A, dated 15 October 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Site Plan) for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to manoeuvre. Thereafter the vehicle parking spaces and manoeuvring areas shall be permanently retained and maintained for their designated purpose.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Parking Standards (2018) and the provisions of the NPPF (2018).

06. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the refuse/recycling bin store shall be fully implemented and made available for use in accordance with the approved plans numbered/titled PH\_PA2 100 Rev A, dated 15 October 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Site Plan) and PH\_PA2 112 Rev A, dated 22 October 2018 (Proposed Drawings - Refuse and Recycling Storage). The refuse and recycling bin store shall thereafter be permanently retained for use by future occupiers at all times.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory facilities for the storage and recycling of refuse and to protect the general amenity of the area in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Design (2015) and the provisions of the NPPF (2018).

07. ++ Prior to the first beneficial use of the communal roof terrace hereby permitted a communal roof terrace management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall set out:
- i. hours of access to the communal roof terrace
  - ii. means of controlling access to the communal roof terrace
  - iii. signage regarding hours of use and any activities which are prohibited (ie. barbeques / late night gatherings etc)

The measures approved shall be implemented upon first beneficial use of the communal roof terrace and thereafter be permanently maintained in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the general amenities of the area and the residential amenities of neighbouring and nearby properties from undue noise and disturbance in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2018) and the provisions of the NPPF (2018).

### **Informatives**

01. 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 NPPF (2018). The Council requested amended plans to overcome concerns with the application as initially submitted. Following the submission of amended plans the application was considered to be acceptable.

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

02. The applicants attention is specifically drawn to the planning conditions above marked ++. These condition(s) require the submission of details, information, drawings, etc. to the Local Planning Authority PRIOR TO THE RELEVANT TRIGGER POINT. Failure to observe these requirements will result in a contravention of the terms of the planning permission and the Local Planning Authority may serve Breach of Condition Notices (BCNs) to secure compliance. The applicant is advised that sufficient time needs to be allowed when submitting details in response to planning conditions, to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the details and discharge the condition(s). A period of between five and eight weeks should be allowed for.
03. The applicant is advised that the development hereby permitted is subject to a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liability. The Local Planning Authority will issue a Liability Notice as soon as practical after the granting of this permission.

The applicant is advised that, if he/she is intending to seek relief or exemptions from the levy such as for social/affordable housing, charitable development or self-build developments it is necessary that the relevant claim form is completed and submitted to the Council to claim the relief or exemption. In all cases (except exemptions relating to residential exemptions), it is essential that a Commencement Notice be submitted at least one day prior to the starting of the development. The exemption will be lost if a commencement notice is not served on the Council prior to commencement of the development and there is no discretion for the Council to waive payment. For the avoidance of doubt, commencement of the demolition of any existing structure(s) covering any part of the footprint of the proposed structure(s) would be considered as commencement for the purpose of CIL regulations. A blank commencement notice can be downloaded from:

[http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/1app/forms/form\\_6\\_commencement\\_notice.pdf](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/1app/forms/form_6_commencement_notice.pdf)

Claims for relief must be made on the appropriate forms which are available on the Council's website at:

<https://www.woking.gov.uk/planning/service/contributions>

Other conditions and requirements also apply and failure to comply with these will lead to claims for relief or exemption being rendered void. The Local Planning Authority has no discretion in these instances.

For full information on this please see the guidance and legislation here:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/community-infrastructure-levy>

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/all?title=The%20Community%20Infrastructure%20Levy%20Regulations%20>

Please note this informative provides general advice and is without prejudice to the Local Planning Authority's role as Consenting, Charging and Collecting Authority under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).

04. 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.
05. The applicant is advised that adequate control precautions should be taken in order to control noise emissions from any fixed plant, including generators, on site during demolition / construction activities. This may require the use of quiet plant or ensuring

## 11 DECEMBER 2018 PLANNING COMMITTEE

that the plant is sited appropriately and / or adequately attenuated. Exhaust emissions from such plant should be vented to atmosphere such that fumes do not ingress into any property. Due to the proximity of residential accommodation there should be no burning of waste material on site. During demolition or construction phases, adequate control precautions should be taken in order to control the spread of dust on the site, so as to prevent a nuisance to residents within the locality. This may involve the use of dust screens and/ or utilising water supply to wet areas of the site to inhibit dust.

06. The provisions of the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 may be applicable and relates to work on an existing wall shared with another property; building on the boundary with a neighbouring property; or excavating near a neighbouring building. An explanatory booklet, prepared by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, and setting out your obligations, is available at the following address:  
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/party-wall-etc-act-1996-guidance#explanatory-booklet>
07. The applicant's attention is drawn to Sections 60 and 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and the associated British Standard Code of Practice BS 5228: 1984 "Noise Control on Construction and Open Sites" (with respect to the statutory provision relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites). If work is to be carried out outside normal working hours, (i.e. 8 am to 6 p.m. Monday to Friday, 8 am to 1 p.m. Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays) prior consent should be obtained from the Council's Environmental Health Service prior to commencement of works.
08. This decision notice should be read in conjunction with the related S106 Legal Agreement.
09. The applicant is advised that this decision has been based solely upon the amended plans submitted during consideration of the application as referred to in condition 02.
10. With regard to water supply, the applicant is advised that this area is covered by the Affinity Water Company. For information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.