

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

6i	19/0154	Reg'd:	26.02.19	Expires:	23.04.19	Ward:	MH
Nei. Con. Exp:	19.03.19	BVPI Target	21 (Household)	Number of Weeks on Cttee' Day:	>8 wks	On Target?	No

LOCATION: Hilltop, The Ridge, Woking, GU22 7EQ

PROPOSAL: Variation of condition 02 (approved plans) of PLAN/2015/1150 dated 29.01.2016 (Erection of a two-storey side extension, a single-storey rear extension following the demolition of a conservatory and an attached garage, conversion of loft space, alterations to the roof, alteration to fenestration and a porch canopy) to remove tile hanging to walls and render entire building with white render, replace roof tiles with grey plain tiles, additional obscure-glazed windows to side elevations, enlarge rear patio doors and change rear upper windows with Juliet balconies and change to style and colour of windows throughout.

TYPE: Modification of Conditions (Section 73) application

APPLICANT: Mr Khan

OFFICER: Benjamin
Bailey

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The decision on whether to issue an Enforcement Notice falls outside the Scheme of Delegation.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This is a 'Section 73' application for the variation of condition 02 (approved plans) of PLAN/2015/1150 dated 29.01.2016 (Erection of a two-storey side extension, a single-storey rear extension following the demolition of a conservatory and an attached garage, conversion of loft space, alterations to the roof, alteration to fenestration and a porch canopy) to remove tile hanging to walls and render entire building with white render, replace roof tiles with grey plain tiles, additional obscure-glazed windows to side elevations, enlarge rear patio doors and change rear upper windows with Juliet balconies and change to style and colour of windows throughout.

PLANNING STATUS

- Urban Area
- Tree Preservation Order (Ref: TPO/0012/2018)
- Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) Zone B (400m-5km)

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission and authorise formal enforcement proceedings.

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site fronts The Ridge, which is a narrow 'C' shaped private road in an elevated position within the surrounding area. The original dwelling on site was a detached bungalow. The dwelling is set back from the carriageway by a driveway which curves around a planted area which includes protected trees. The rear garden area contains an enclosed swimming pool.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

PLAN/2018/1188 - Erection of a first floor extension, two-storey side extensions and a single-storey side extension (amended drawings).

Refused (25.01.2019) for the following reasons:

01. *The overall scale, mass, bulk and location of the proposed extensions would make the property appear cramped, contrived and overdeveloped within the plot. This would be further evidenced by the two large areas of crown roof which are incongruous to the hipped roof form of the original bungalow as well as diminished separation distances to side boundaries. These factors would be exacerbated by the site's elevated and prominent position within The Ridge as well as the proposed white render external finish. The proposal would appear incongruous with the wider urban grain and street scene which would be to the detriment of the character of the wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) and Woking Design SPD (2015).*
02. *The symmetry of the proposal's overall form together with the amount of white render as well as the grey roof tiles and grey-framed windows would give the dwelling a contemporary appearance which would be incongruous with the predominant Arts and Crafts style of dwellings on The Ridge and detrimental to its overall Arcadian character. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) and Woking Design SPD (2015).*
03. *The overall depth, height, separation distance, location and relationship between the proposal and the neighbouring property Beeches would make it appear unacceptably overbearing towards this neighbour which would be to the detriment of its amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008).*

PLAN/2015/1150 - Erection of a two-storey side extension, a single-storey rear extension following the demolition of a conservatory and an attached garage, conversion of loft space, alterations to the roof, alteration to fenestration and a porch canopy.

Permitted subject to conditions (29.01.2016)

PLAN/2015/0803 - Erection of two storey side and single storey side extension; conversion of loft space, alterations to roof and existing surface materials.

Refused (10.09.2015) for the following reason:

01. *The proposed development by reason of its scale, bulk, massing and design will result in incongruous, cramped, large and dominant building that would diminish the visual separation between the properties and have an unsatisfactory appearance to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development is also considered to have a detrimental impact on the occupiers of the neighbouring*

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

properties by reason of an overbearing impact. No arboricultural information has been provided to demonstrate that the trees to the front of the site would be protected as result of the development. The proposed development is contrary to policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), HSG23 and NE9 of the Woking Borough Local Plan (1999) Supplementary Planning Document 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight' (2008), Supplementary Planning Guidance 'House Extensions' (2001) and section 7 'Requiring good design' of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

PLAN/2014/0292 - Proposed first floor extension above existing and remodelling of existing elevations.

Permitted subject to conditions (19.12.2014)

PLAN/2012/0896 - Erection of ground and first floor side extension, ground floor front extension and insertion of 2 no rear dormers and 1 no side dormer window.

Permitted subject to conditions (31.01.2013)

PLAN/2011/0055 - Single storey side extension.

Permitted subject to conditions (31.03.2011)

PLAN/2010/0843 - Certificate of Proposed Lawful Development for the erection of a rear dormer roof extension.

Refused (07.10.2010)

PLAN/2010/0723 - Application for a Certificate of Proposed Lawful Development for a single storey side extension.

Refused (14.09.2010)

PLAN/2009/1148 - Application for a Certificate of Existing Lawful development for the pool house and shed in the rear garden.

Certificate Issued (19.02.2010)

PLAN/2009/0947 - Certificate of Existing lawful Development for the erection of a single storey side extension, erection of a pool house and 2 x sheds located in rear garden area.

Refused (15.12.2009)

PLAN/2001/0745 - Erection of a single storey side extension and formation of 3 dormers in roof.

Refused (30.08.2001)

PLAN/2001/0293 - Construction of loft extension including the provision of 3 dormer windows.

Permitted subject to conditions (07.06.2001)

PLAN/2000/0085 - Demolition of existing bungalow and replacement by a two storey family home with its own garaging and off road parking.

Refused (28.03.2000)

81/0852 - The execution of site works and the carrying out of internal alterations to existing dwelling and the formation of a bedroom in existing roof space.

Permitted subject to conditions (06.10.1981)

78/1219 - The demolition of existing garage, the execution of site works and the erection of additions to existing bungalow.

Permitted subject to conditions (07.11.1978)

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

7179 - The execution of site works and the erection of a detached bungalow and garage on land at The Ridge, Maybury Hill.

Permitted subject to conditions (30.04.1954)

3611 - The erection of a detached bungalow on a plot of land in The Ridge, Maybury.

Permitted subject to conditions (04.07.1949)

CONSULTATIONS

Senior Arboricultural Officer: As long as the tree protection remains as agreed there will be no arboricultural objections to the proposed.

REPRESENTATIONS

x6 letters of objection have been received raising the following main points:

- Contemporary appearance would be out of character
- Grey roofing tiles have already been installed
- Proposed finishes would make the building more domineering
- Now a large property extending past the rear of Westbourne
- Render finish may deteriorate more quickly than approved tiles
- Exacerbated by sites prominent and elevated position
- Loss of privacy to amenity area of adjacent Westbourne
- Applicant has a disregard for the previous planning approval and conditions
- Request that a Stop Order is put on all external finishes
- Roof space could easily be converted into living accommodation
- The nature of The Ridge and Lytton Road is gradually changing, and not always for the better
- Loss of privacy to adjacent Beeches

COMMENTARY

The present application was registered as valid on 26.02.2019. The case officer undertook a site visit on 13.03.2019 at which point the roof covering was in-situ but no windows had been installed and no render finish had been applied. The agent was made aware on 15.04.2019 that there were concerns regarding the proposed use of grey window frames, but that black window frames (ie. RAL 9017 (Traffic black), RAL 9011 (Graphite black) or RAL 9005 (Jet black)) may provide an acceptable alternative. Further observations from the carriageway of The Ridge were subsequently undertaken on 17.04.2019 (being prior to the target determination date of the present application on 23.04.2019), at which point at least several windows with anthracite grey frames (RAL 7016) had clearly been installed. The applicant has not agreed to change the window frames, likely because the anthracite grey window frames have already been installed, albeit entirely at the applicants' risk. Therefore Officers are left with no alternative but to put the matter before the Planning Committee.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (February 2019)

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development

Section 4 - Decision-making

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Woking Core Strategy (2012)

CS18 - Transport and accessibility

CS21 - Design

CS25 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

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

DM2 - Trees and landscaping

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)

Design (2015)

Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)

Parking Standards (2018)

Other Material Considerations

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2015)

Woking Character Study (2010)

SECTION 73 APPLICATION

This is an application made under section 73 of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the variation of condition 02 (approved plans) of PLAN/2015/1150 dated 29.01.2016 (Erection of a two-storey side extension, a single-storey rear extension following the demolition of a conservatory and an attached garage, conversion of loft space, alterations to the roof, alteration to fenestration and a porch canopy) to remove tile hanging to walls and render entire building with white render, replace roof tiles with grey plain tiles, additional obscure-glazed windows to side elevations, enlarge rear patio doors and change rear upper windows with Juliet balconies and change to style and colour of windows throughout.

Annex A of the PPG sets out that applications under section 73 should be considered against the Development Plan and material considerations, under section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, and conditions attached to the existing permission and that LPAs should, in making their decisions, focus their attention on national and development plan policies, and other material considerations which may have changed significantly since the original grant of permission.

PLANNING ISSUES

01. The main planning issues to consider in determining this application, in so far as the changes proposed under the present Section 73 application, are:
 - Design and impact upon the character of the area
 - Impact upon neighbouring amenity
 - Impact upon parking provisionhaving regard to the relevant policies of the Development Plan, other relevant material planning considerations and national planning policy and guidance.

Design and impact upon the character of the area

02. Section 12 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve 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

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

scale, height, proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land. The reasoned justification text to Policy CS21 states that different parts of the Borough present different contexts for development, that a Character Study has been carried out to provide evidence of the distinctiveness of the various parts of the Borough and that all forms of development should have regard to the Character Study.

03. The site in this instance falls within Character Area 17 (Hockering) of the Character Study. This Character Area is a large Arcadian residential area to the south of the railway, with small areas of post war and modern housing infill. The majority of properties are two to two and a half storey detached houses built on large plots. They are generally constructed of buff and red brick, with sections of the facade rendered and some limited examples clad in wood.
04. Under reference PLAN/2015/1150 planning permission was granted for the erection of a two-storey side extension, a single-storey rear extension following the demolition of a conservatory and an attached garage, conversion of loft space, alterations to the roof, alteration to fenestration and a porch canopy. The present 'Section 73' application seeks to vary condition 02 (approved plans) of that planning permission to:
 - Remove the tile hanging to the walls and render entire building with white render
 - Replace the roof tiles with grey plain tiles
 - Add additional obscure-glazed windows to side elevations
 - Enlarge rear patio doors
 - Change rear upper windows with Juliet balconies
 - Change to style and colour of windows throughout
05. The overall form and scale of the present proposal remains as per that previously approved under PLAN/2015/1150. However the approved proposed elevations for the development permitted under PLAN/2015/1150 showed tiled hanging at first floor level to all four elevations, with facing brick at ground floor level, and a tiled roof. The application form submitted under PLAN/2015/1150 set out that the proposed walls were to consist of "*brick and tile hanging to match existing*", the roof was to consist of "*concrete tiles to match existing*", windows (ie. the frames) were to be "*white upvc*" and the doors were to be "*white upvc and stained timber*". These external materials and finishes were traditional and considered to remain consistent with the built character of properties within The Ridge and the wider Character Area.
06. In contrast the present application, although not altering the form and scale of the host dwelling as previously permitted, proposes a much more contemporary palette of external materials and finishes, with the resulting elevations to consist entirely of light-coloured render. A more contemporary (slate-effect) roof covering is also proposed, consisting of grey plain tiles. The windows are also proposed to be changed from white upvc frames with leaded detail to plain glazed windows within an anthracite grey frame.
07. Whilst limited details of the proposed external finishes were submitted at the outset of the present application, at the request of the case officer the agent (on 30.04.2019) provided further details, setting out that "*the render is from K-rend and is Porcelain...the roof tiles are Marley Interlock Smooth Grey...[and] the windows are Anthracite (RAL 7016)*" [Anthracite grey].
08. One of the reasons for refusal of PLAN/2018/1188 was that "*the symmetry of the proposal's overall form together with the amount of white render as well as the grey*

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

roof tiles and grey-framed windows would give the dwelling a contemporary appearance which would be incongruous with the predominant Arts and Crafts style of dwellings on The Ridge and detrimental to its overall Arcadian character. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) and Woking Design SPD (2015)".

09. Whilst the form and scale of the resultant dwelling would remain as per approved PLAN/2015/1150, and therefore the previous concerns in terms of the symmetry of the overall form, which arose under refused application reference PLAN/2018/1188, do not arise in relation to the present proposal the extent of light-coloured render, combined with the grey (slate-effect) roof tiles and anthracite-grey framed windows would give the resulting dwelling a contemporary appearance, which would appear incongruous with the predominant Arts and Crafts style of dwellings on The Ridge and detrimental to its overall Arcadian character.
10. It is a significant material consideration in the determination of the present application that the use of K-Rend Limestone White / Weber Monocouche Chalk render (which have a similar appearance to the K-Rend Porcelain render) and Wienerberger Cassius clay roof tile (which has a similar appearance to the Marley Interlock Smooth Grey tile) was approved at nearby White Gables, The Ridge, under application reference COND/2018/0117, which was subsequently 'carried through' to the approval under application reference PLAN/2018/1286. However the applicant at White Gables initially wished to use anthracite-grey window frames. Following concerns raised by Officers, and subsequent discussion, the applicant at White Gables agreed to instead use RAL 9011 (Graphite black) window frames, which was reflected in the details discharged under application reference COND/2018/0117, which were subsequently 'carried through' to the approval under application reference PLAN/2018/1286.
11. The reason black window frames were considered to be acceptable at nearby White Gables was that there are examples of black window frames (albeit likely timber frames) at other properties within The Ridge, such as Maybury Copse and Tiverton. There are also examples of black window frames combined with white render at Deerhaddnn, The Ridge, which achieves a far less contemporary appearance than is proposed at Hilltop. Clearly the installation of anthracite-grey window frames at Hilltop, in combination with the use of a light-coloured render finish and slate-effect roof tiles, would undermine the external materials and finishes recently achieved at nearby White Gables.
12. Following concerns raised by the case officer the agent (on 03.06.2019) has submitted several photographs of dwellings within the surrounding area in support of the use of anthracite-grey window frames. Whilst these submitted photographs are not labelled none show the use of anthracite-grey window frames in combination with a light-coloured render and slate-effect roof tiles, as is proposed at the application property, with the exception of a photograph of Silverglade Lodge, Lytton Road.
13. Extensions and alterations to Silverglade Lodge, Lytton Road were permitted on 18.09.2012 under application reference PLAN/2012/0689. The proposed materials and finishes section of the submitted application form set out that the walls were to be "*Brick*", the roof "*Concrete tile*" and the windows "*White PVCu*" and the approved proposed elevations drawing annotated that "*all external facing materials and finishes e.g. brickwork incl. bonding, roof/hanging tiles, rendering etc to match existing unless noted otherwise*". Condition 02 attached to PLAN/2012/0689 stated that "*the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby*

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

approved shall match those used in the existing building". For these reasons it appears that the external materials and finishes at Silverglade Lodge are unauthorised and should therefore be afforded only very limited weight. Furthermore Silverglade Lodge appears within a differing street scene to the application property and is not set at the same level as the application property, which is set at something of a high point within the immediate area, thus increasing its visual and physical prominence.

14. Another photograph submitted by the agent is of Langton, The Ridge. Extensions and alterations to Langton were permitted on 02.07.2015 under application reference PLAN/2015/0405. Condition 03 of PLAN/2015/0405 required the submission of external finishes, which were subsequently approved under application reference COND/2016/0019, albeit with "*windows, doors, eaves and trim – white to match existing*". The window frames as installed at Langton are grey, not the approved white, and, it appears, are therefore unauthorised and should be afforded very limited weight. Nonetheless the grey window frames at Langton are at first floor level, within front dormer windows which sit within a roof covered in slate-effect roof tiles. The grey window frames at Langton therefore do not result in the same, wholly contemporary, effect as they would, when combined with a light-coloured render and slate-effect roof tiles, at the application property.
15. It has not been possible to identify one of the dwelling photographs submitted by the agent however this photograph shows brown window frames utilised in combination with facing brick, tile hanging and a clay tile roof. The traditional effect of this combination is in no manner comparable to the wholly contemporary effect of the anthracite-grey window frames, combined with a light-coloured render and slate-effect roof tiles, proposed at the application property.
16. The agent has also submitted a photograph of what appears to be Maybury Copse / Tiverton. This property utilises black (not grey) window frames, which have leaded detail and appear largely beside the tiled roof. Again the effect of this combination is in no manner comparable to the wholly contemporary effect of the grey window frames, combined with a light-coloured render and slate-effect roof tiles, proposed at the application property.
17. Overall, for the preceding reasons, the photographs submitted by the agent are not considered to justify the wholly contemporary combination of material finishes proposed, in particular the combination of the grey window frames with the light-coloured render and slate-effect roof tiles.
18. The other alterations (other than changes to external materials and finishes) proposed over and above permitted PLAN/2015/1150 are:
 - Add additional obscure-glazed windows to side elevations
 - Enlarge rear patio doors
 - Change rear upper windows with Juliet balconies
19. These alterations have very limited implications in terms of design and the character of the area. The enlargement of the rear patio doors, and change of the rear upper windows to Juliet balconies, would not be apparent in public vantage and would appear typical of residential development. The additional obscure-windows take the form of x4 rooflights to serve the utility room, bathroom, bedroom 4, and presumably loft space, at high-level. These additional rooflights would not appear prominently in public vantage, would project a very small extent beyond the plane of the roof slopes, and would appear proportionate in overall extent to the respective roof slopes. For

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

these reasons these changes are not considered harmful in design and character terms.

20. In conclusion, it is therefore considered that one of the reasons for refusal of PLAN/2018/1188 has not been sufficiently overcome and that the wholly contemporary effect of the combination of anthracite grey window frames and light-coloured render and slate-effect roof tiles, would fail to respect and make a positive contribution to the predominant Arts and Crafts style of dwellings on The Ridge and appear detrimental to its overall Arcadian character contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and SPD Design (2015).

Impact upon neighbouring amenity

21. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that proposals for new development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties, avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, or an overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook. More detailed guidance is provided within SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008).
22. The overall form and scale of the present proposal remains as per that previously permitted under PLAN/2015/1150. For this reason no additional impacts, through potential loss of daylight, sunlight or overbearing effect, would therefore occur to neighbouring and nearby properties over and above those deemed acceptable in permitting application reference PLAN/2015/1150.
23. The changes proposed to permitted PLAN/2015/1150, relevant to neighbouring amenity, are:
 - Add additional obscure-glazed windows to side elevations
 - Enlarge rear patio doors
 - Change rear upper windows with Juliet balconies
24. The additional obscure-windows take the form of x4 rooflights to serve the utility room, bathroom, bedroom 4, and presumably loft space, at high-level. The utility room rooflight would serve space at ground floor level, the bathroom and bedroom 4 rooflights would serve space at first floor level and the further rooflight would seemingly serve loft space. It is clear from the location of these rooflights within the respective roof slopes that the sill heights would be a minimum of 1.7m above finished floor level ('FFL'), such that no outlook would be achievable from these rooflights, notwithstanding that they are all annotated on the submitted drawings to be "*obscure*". Had the application otherwise been considered acceptable condition(s) could have secured the sill heights, and obscure-glazing, of these rooflights in order to preserve the privacy of adjacent Westbourne and Beeches.
25. The enlargement of the rear patio doors would extend the width of the glazing. Given the ground floor level of these patio doors, and that they open out into the private garden of the application property, no harmful loss of privacy would occur to adjacent properties as a result of this change.
26. Whilst the first floor level rear windows are now proposed with full-height glazing and Juliet balconies such Juliet balconies generally constitute 'permitted development' and do not facilitate external access. The absence of external access precludes a materially greater 'arc' of visibility than is achievable through 'traditional' windows. It is

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

also noted that these Juliet windows were proposed under application reference PLAN/2018/1188; whilst refused for other reasons no objection was raised to the Juliet balconies under that application.

27. Overall it is considered that, subject to conditions which would have been recommended had the application otherwise been considered to be acceptable, the present application would achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties, avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of potential loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, or overbearing due to bulk, proximity or outlook.

Impact upon parking provision

28. It is noted that PLAN/2015/1150, which the present application seeks to vary, was permitted on 29.01.2016, prior to the adoption of SPD Parking Standards (2018) on 05.04.2018. Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that minimum car parking standards will be set for residential development (outside of Woking Town Centre). Accordingly SPD Parking Standards (2018) sets out minimum residential parking standards, stating that, in the case of 5+ bedroom houses, as would result in this instance, 3 parking spaces should be provided.
29. It is considered that parking for 2 cars can be accommodated on the existing driveway of the application property. In addition the present proposal includes an integral garage, which exceeds the 6m x 3m minimum size such that it could accommodate a further parking space as per SPD Parking Standards (2018). It is therefore considered that parking can be accommodated on the application site in accordance with the requirements of Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and SPD Parking Standards (2018). The impact upon parking provision is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Expediency of Enforcement Action

30. It appears to the Local Planning Authority that the changes proposed under the present application, over and above those permitted by PLAN/2015/1150, including the changes to external materials and finishes, constitute a breach of planning control. It is considered expedient to issue an Enforcement Notice, having regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, and to any other material considerations, because the wholly contemporary effect of the combination of anthracite grey window frames and light-coloured render and slate-effect roof tiles, would fail to respect and make a positive contribution to the predominant Arts and Crafts style of dwellings on The Ridge and appear detrimental to its overall Arcadian character contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and SPD Design (2015).

LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS

31. Regulation 9(6) of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) sets out that where the effect of a planning permission granted under section 73 of TCPA 1990 is to change a condition subject to which a previous planning permission was granted so that the amount of CIL payable would not change, the chargeable development is the development for which planning permission was granted by the previous permission. This is the case under the present application.

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

CONCLUSION

32. In conclusion, the wholly contemporary effect of the combination of anthracite grey window frames and light-coloured render and slate-effect roof tiles, would fail to respect and make a positive contribution to the predominant Arts and Crafts style of dwellings on The Ridge and appear detrimental to its overall Arcadian character contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and SPD Design (2015).
33. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused and formal enforcement proceedings are authorised.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Site visit photographs
2. Consultation response from Senior Arboricultural Officer
3. x6 Letters of representation

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission for the following reason:

01. The wholly contemporary effect of the combination of anthracite grey window frames and light-coloured render and slate-effect roof tiles, would fail to respect and make a positive contribution to the predominant Arts and Crafts style of dwellings on The Ridge and appear detrimental to its overall Arcadian character contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and SPD Design (2015).

It is further recommended:

That the Head of Legal Services be instructed to issue an Enforcement Notice under Section 172 of The Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in respect of the above land requiring the remedy of the breach of planning control to be achieved through the following:

- (a) Replace or re-colour the installed Anthracite grey (RAL 7016) window frames with an alternative colour to be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The applicant is advised that the following window frame colours may provide an acceptable alternative: RAL 9017 (Traffic black), RAL 9011 (Graphite black) or RAL 9005 (Jet black).

Within six months of the date the Enforcement Notice takes effect.

Informatives

01. The plans and particulars relating to the application hereby refused are numbered/titled:

S1358 - 001 A (Location Plan), undated and received by the Local Planning Authority on 25.02.2019.

S1358 - P100 C (Block Plan), undated and received by the Local Planning Authority on 18.02.2019.

23 JULY 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

S1358 - P101 C (Proposed Ground Floor), undated and received by the Local Planning Authority on 18.02.2019.

S1358 - P102 C (Proposed First Floor), undated and received by the Local Planning Authority on 18.02.2019.

S1358 - P103 C (Proposed Roof), undated and received by the Local Planning Authority on 18.02.2019.

S1358 - P111 B (Proposed Front and Rear Elevations), undated and received by the Local Planning Authority on 18.02.2019.

S1358 - P112 C (Proposed Left and Right Side Elevations), undated and received by the Local Planning Authority on 18.02.2019.

02. The Council confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of the NPPF. The application is part retrospective in nature, seeking to remedy a breach of planning control.