PLANNING STATEMENT
(INCLUDING DESIGN & ACCESS)

FOR:

HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION FOR PROPOSED FRONT PORCH AND ROOF ENLARGEMENT AND CONVERSION OF LOFT TO LIVING AND CHANGES TO FENESTRATION. (AMENDED SCHEME FOLLOWING REFUSED 24/P/00416)

AT:

OAK TREE CORNER
SILKMORE LANE
WEST HORSLEY
LEATHERHEAD
KT24 6JB

APPLICATION SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF:
MR D PATHAK

June 2024

+44 (0) 1483 415 753

applications@planitconsulting.co.uk
www.planitconsulting.co.uk

3 Innovation Place, Douglas Drive
Godalming, Surrey GU7 1JX

INTRODUCTION

1.1 This statement is submitted on behalf of our client Mr D Pathak to Guildford Borough Council in support of a householder planning application for a front porch, roof enlargement and conversion of loft space into an additional living space at the site of Oak Tree Corner, Silkmore Lane, West Horsley, Surrey KT24 6JB.

1.2 This statement will address issues raised by the refused scheme 23/P/01105, address the concerns raised by the officer in appeal APP/Y3615/D/22/3329202 and the following revised application 24/P/00416 which is currently under appeal.

1.3 The proposed scheme would remove the previous ground floor elements as well as altering elements of the roof which were cited as overly bulky and dominant within the street scene. Whilst the aim is to reduce the “cramped” appearance cited in the officer’s report it should be noted that until the appeal decision has been made the previous reason for refusal is still contested. As such whilst this statement provides a compromise for the council it is not agreed that the previous refusal reason was correct.

1.4 Within this statement it will be explained why the works proposed would comply with Guildford planning policy as outlined in the Guildford Borough Council Local Plan Strategy and Site 2019 and the Development Management policies part 2 as well as the recently updated NPPF.

1.5 This application will outline the changes made based to the reasons for refusal of application 24/P/00416. As such a portion of the policy assessment will focus on the changes and why the reasons for refusal are no longer valid considering these changes.

1.1 The remainder of this statement is set out as follows:

2) The Application Property
3) The Application Proposal
4) Policy Assessment

5) Summary

1.2 The application is accompanied by the following documents

- Site Location Plan
- Site Plan
- Existing Plans
- Proposed Plans
- Sustainability and Climate Change Questionnaire.

2. APPLICATION SITE AND CONTEXT

2.1 The application site, Oak Tree Corner is a bungalow on Silkmore Lane on the northern side of West Horsley. The dwelling as well as the rest of Silkmore Lane sits just north of but ultimately outside of the West Horsley Conservation Area, the Conservation Area Boundary ends roughly 80 metres south of the dwelling. The land is triangular in shape and is extremely well screened. The site is not within the Green Belt

2.2 The mapping extract below illustrates the position of the house and its relationship to the public highway and neighbouring properties and the conservation area (marked by the orange border). As with the rest of West Horsley the site is inset from the Green Belt nor within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty nor Area of Great Landscape Value

Map view of the site taken from Guildford Online Planning Map

2.3 The dwelling has a small attached garage on its south side which due to its modest scale and capacity is no longer used for storing vehicles. The dwelling is however

served by a driveway in front of this garage which could provide parking for multiple vehicles.

2.4 The property was constructed in 1962 under planning application GU/R 9887. The other dwellings across Silkmore Lane appear to have been built at a relatively similar time however the majority are far larger than that of the application dwelling, many are two storeys tall.

2.5 The plot sizes on Silkmore Lane are varied however Oak Tree Corner's plot by way of it's position on the corner of Silkmore Lane is on the larger size for the area. For example, Little Orchard, a property two doors down from the application property has a plot size of approximately 684sqm whereas that of Oak Tree Corner is 895sqm despite serving a much smaller dwelling.

2.6 It was stated in the previous appeal statement and repeated within the officer's report that Silkmore Lane see's a gradual reduction across its eastern side as the dwellings approach the centre of West Horsley. However this is incorrect. Below are images of dwellings in order starting from 7 houses down Silkmore Lane ending with the neighbouring dwelling to the application dwelling. All the properties are on the eastern side. The first dwelling shown is Millwood

2.7 As the image above shows the first 2 dwellings are bungalows (it is noted that a general mix of bungalows and two storey dwellings can be found further north

however 7 dwellings should be sufficient to nullify the original argument. The next two dwellings are shown below.

2.8 These 2 dwellings on from the bungalows are two fairly large two storey dwellings, one appears of a fairly standard shape and size with a two storey rear extension. This is following by a two storey dwelling with two garages. This is an obvious increase in scale not reduction from the previous two dwellings. Below shows the following two dwellings

2.9 These dwellings appear as one single dwelling however are in fact two (the garage was converted to a separate dwelling). The converted garage is modest in scale and the main dwelling is a large two storey dwelling, equal or larger than the previous dwellings shown. Below are the next two dwellings on.

2.10 This is yet again another pair of semi detached dwellings. When looking at the character of the street scene these together make up another large single building.

2.11 The above dwelling is the neighbour to the application property and once again has a high roof appearing two storey with dormer windows. Whilst it is a chalet bungalow it's height would match that of a two storey dwelling.

2.12 Finally the application dwelling is at the end of Silkmore Lane. It's obvious from the ascending list of dwellings that the scales are inconsistent and do not follow a

pattern. If anything the sizes are even “ascending” with Oak Tree Corner appearing the odd one out following 5 much larger buildings.

2.13 As such we disagree that the dwellings are “descending” as previously stated in the dismissed appeal and reaffirmed in the officer’s description of the site.

2.14 As stated to the south of the area is West Horsley’s Village centre and Conservation Area, to the East and West of the site are more dwellings backing onto the open countryside area designated as Green Belt. To the north of the site are more residential dwellings and the continuation of West Horsley Village.

2.15 It is noted that whilst the site is fairly centrally placed in West Horsley, Silkmore Lane is a branch off from “The Street” which runs centrally across West Horsley and slopes north east after the fork towards East Horsley and other villages in the area. As such Silkmore Lane is primarily residential and not on the throughfare for people passing through West Horsley.

2.16 Silkmore Lane has a verdant character which derives from a lack of footways along the highway. Boundary treatments are characterised by hedge planting and the presence of grass verges interspersed with mature trees. The appearance of the area and nature of the land surrounding the dwellings can be seen in the photos at the end of the appeal site section of this statement.

Planning History

2.17 The planning history for the site is shown in the table below:

Planning Reference	Proposal	Decision
24/P/00416	Proposed front porch, single storey side and rear extensions, and changes to the roof of the dwelling including raising it and the addition of 5 dormers and 7 rooflights at the site of Oak Tree Corner	Refused 07/05/2024 (Under Appeal)
23/P/01105	Proposed front porch, single storey side and rear extensions, an addition of a first floor and changes to fenestration	Refused 22/08/2023 Appeal Dismissed 18/01/2024

23/P/00167	Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the proposed development to the rear, side extensions to dwelling house and erection of a porch is lawful	Part Approve Part Refused 22/03/2023
GU/R 9887	Erection of a dwellinghouse with private garage	Full Permission 24/11/1962

Table of planning history

2.18 It is noted that no works have been done to the dwelling since it's erection in 1962. The 2023 PD application found that the porch was lawful however none of the other works were. This permission was not implemented or part implemented.

2.19 It should be noted that after studying the certificate application the rear extension would have been permitted if set slightly away from the existing rear element. As such technically only the side extension would have been completely outside of permitted development.

2.20 The 2023 application 23/P/01105 was refused on the grounds of

"1. The proposed development, by virtue of its excessive scale, would add significant bulk and mass to the dwelling, overcrowding the plot. It would appear overly dominant and obtrusive within Silkmore Lane and would not respect the site's context. The light-coloured render and simple architectural detailing would exacerbate the prominence of the proposed dwelling, leading to its appearance as one extensive mass. By virtue of its design, the proposed first floor addition would appear contrived and disproportionate in scale with the host dwelling and its plot."

2. The proposed development would be located within the setting of the West Horsley Conservation Area. The proposed development would be highly visible to vehicles and pedestrians travelling North along The Street from Ripley and by virtue of its scale and materiality, the proposed development would appear overly dominant and obtrusive and as such, would impede views of the mature oak tree, which is a focal point within the setting of the conservation area.

3. The proposed development would increase the number of bedrooms from three to four which would reduce the housing mix within the defined settlement boundary of West Horsley. As outlined within the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan, proposals to extend an existing two or three bedroom home will be resisted."

2.21 An appeal was submitted and the appeal inspector did not agree that the second reason for refusal was correct and as such dismissed the appeal on reasons for refusal 1 and 3 only.

2.22 A resubmission was then submitted in March 2024 which addressed the 2 concerns. The case officer was happy that the bedroom number reason for refusal had been addressed however found that the first reason for refusal was still a significant concern stating.

"*The proposed development, by virtue of its width, height, design, and materiality, would add significant bulk and mass to the dwelling, overcrowd the plot and appear overly dominant and obtrusive within Silkmore Lane. The proposed development would not, therefore, respect the existing context, scale, design and character of the existing dwelling and would have an unacceptable adverse impact upon the character of the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would conflict with policies D1 of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019, policy D4 and H4 of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2023, policy WH2 of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan 2016, the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2018 and the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023."*

2.23 This application seeks to address these concerns.

<u>Photos of the site</u>

2.24 Below are a collection of photos taken of the site for context

View of the side garden and hedging at end of garden

View of the south side of the house

View of dwellings opposite application dwelling

Another view of large scale of neighbour on other side of street

View of the rear of the site from "The Street"

View of site and large oak tree from the edge of the Conservation Area

3. APPLICATION OVERVIEW

3.1 The proposed design has address the concerns raised at appeal and following the decision of the resubmission with a design that would be of an appropriate bulk and massing for the scale of the plot.

Layout and Footprint

3.2 The proposed would consist of very few changes to the footprint as no longer includes the side or rear extensions. The only footprint change would be from the PD front porch which cannot be considered in this application as has already been approved through a certificate.

The ground floor does include fenestration changes although these would be modest, in keeping with the are and also PD.

Existing Ground Floor Plans

Proposed Ground Floor Plans

Proposed First Floor Plan

Appearance and Scale

3.3 The dwelling as existing is constructed from pale orange concrete bricks with a simple concrete pitched roof with gabled ends to the north and south sides. The doors and windows are painted timber and steel. The rear of the dwelling includes a gable ended rear element and a flat roofed side south side element.

3.4 The proposed dwelling would have a roof consisting of plain clay tiling. The windows would be made from UPVC and painted aluminum. The roof of the proposed dwelling would be hipped as opposed to the existing dwelling pitched roof with gable ends.

3.5 Below are the existing and proposed roof plans

Existing Roof Plan

Proposed Roof Plan

3.6 The roof height would be raised by approximate 2.3 metres from 4.9 metres to 7.2. This change would not however be to produce an obvious first floor extension but instead merely increase the roof scale to allow for the loft to be used for accommodation.

3.7 This roof alteration would be facilitated by the addition of three dormer windows and two rear dormer windows. The roof of the enlargement would alter the roof from a pitched roof with north and south gable ends to a hipped roof thus reducing the massing of the dwelling. The dormer windows have been positioned to sit above the eaves whilst low enough down to be subservient in appearance.

3.8 The change would allow for the new bedrooms however would appear far less obtrusive and visually prominent than the previous enlargement. Furthermore the conversion of the roof space would be more in keeping with the neighbouring dwellings which have adopted a chalet bungalow style.

3.9 Below are elevations for the existing and proposed dwelling

Existing Front (West Elevation)

Proposed Front (West Elevation)

Existing Rear (East Elevation)

Proposed Rear (East Elevation)

Existing Side (South) Elevation

Proposed Side (South) Elevation

Existing Side (North) Elevation

Proposed Side (North) Elevation

Layout

3.10 The existing dwelling is screened on the east and south by large hedging. Roughly 3 –4 metres at the rear and at least 3 metres at the side. There is also a large side

garden going south from the property with a depth of 19.7 metres which gives a total distance of 23 metres between the dwelling and side boundary.

3.11 See below proposed street scene plan of the site

Proposed Street Scene Plan

3.12 The north screening is more modest with thinner hedging and a garden fence however no issues were raised regarding any impact on the neighbour to this side. Overall the screening across the east and south of the site is considerable. It should be noted that the Oak Tree is extremely high with thick leaves and branches which screen the southern elevation.

4. POLICY CONTEXT

4.1 The following section provides a review of the relevant national and local planning policies applicable to the appeal.

4.2 The NPPF is a material consideration in the determination of this case and the following are considered relevant:

- Chapter 2: Achieving sustainable development
- Chapter 3: Decision Making
- Chapter 12: Achieving well designed places
- Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Guildford Borough Council's Local Plan Part 1: strategy and sites

Policy S1: - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Policy S1: - Spatial Strategy
Policy D1: - Place Shaping
Policy D2: - Climate Change, sustainable design, construction, and energy

Guildford Local Plan Development Management Policies

Policy H4: - General Standard of Development
Policy P6: - Protecting Important Habitats and Species
Policy D4: - Design and Layout
Policy D5: - Protection of Amenity and Provision of Amenity Space
Policy D11: - Noise Impacts
Policy D15: - Climate Change Adaptation
Policy ID10: - Parking Standards for New Development

4.3 West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan 2018

- WH1 West Horsley Conservation Area
- WH2 Design Management within Village Settlement
- WH4 Housing Mix

4.4 Supplementary Planning Documents

- Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2018
- Parking Standards for New Developments SPD 2023

5. POLICY ASSESSMENT

5.1 The principal considerations are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Any impact on neighbouring dwellings
- Impact on highways and parking
- Impact on trees and ecology
- Sustainable design and construction

The principle of development

5.2 The proposed house is located within the West Horsley Village area which is inset from the Green Belt as well as outside of the AONB and AGLV and as such is not constrained by any additional planning requirements.

5.3 The application site is situated outside of the West Horsley Conservation Area. Whilst the site is adjacent to the oak tree which is significant to the view of the Conservation Area the planning inspector concluded that in appeal APP/Y3615/D/22/3329202 that the dwelling was too far from the tree to be considered to impact the Conservation Area.

5.4 The proposal of this application would not decrease this gap and would actually enlarge it by way of the removal of the side extension. Considering the inspectors conclusion it is not considered that the proposal would impact the heritage asset nor the heritage aims of policies D3 of the LPSS, Policy D20 of the LPDMP and Policy WH1 of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan. As such the impact on the Conservation Area will not be addressed below.

5.5 In regards to the housing mix concerns raised in a previous refusal and seconded by the planning inspector (WH4). It is noted that the proposed would have a similar layout to the refused application however with 1 fewer upstairs bedroom. Whilst there are downstairs rooms of varying uses these were not previously considered likely bedrooms as per the inspector's determination. It should be noted that the previous

application 24/P/00416 had the same layout as that proposed and the planning officer found no issue regarding bedroom number.

5.6 Please note that the proposed dwelling would have only three bedrooms as per existing. As such the proposed would be in compliance with policy WH4.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

5.7 Policy D1 **Place Shaping** requires that developments achieve high quality design that responds to distinctive local character of the area in which it is set. Policy D1 reflects the aspirations set out within the NPPF.

5.8 This scheme no longer includes various elements from the previous schemes. The notable changes being the removal of the ground floor side and rear elements to reduced the buildings perceived bulk and “cramped” appearance which has been a repeated concern from the planning officer.

5.9 The dormer windows however have also been moved to sit much higher up than the existing eaves line. It should be noted that the dormer windows do not contravene with any of the parameters outlined in the Guildford Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

5.10 It should be noted that the proposed porch falls under the criteria of permitted development and as such is acceptable.

5.11 The roof proposed is sympathetic to the size of the dwelling’s plot. Whilst many of the dwellings across Silkmore Lane are two storey the main concern raised at appeal is that the change to a two storey dwelling would appear overly bulky and out of keeping for the size of the plot the dwelling sits within. The distance of the plot from the main road was also a concern.

5.12 The officer following the 24/P/00416 refusal still raised concerns regarding bulk. The removal of the single storey elements along with the previous roof changes result in dwelling of a scale vastly reduced from the previous refusals. These changes would open the plot far more reducing the dwellings perceived scale within the more awkwardly shaped plot it sits.

5.13 Whilst the height of the dwelling would still be increased by approximately 2 metres from existing, the proposal would have a hipped roof immediately drawing back away from the main road and thus the increased scale would immediately be set back from the main road as opposed to that of the previous first floor enlargement.

5.14 Overall the change from a two storey dwelling to a chalet style bungalow with no ground floor enlargements should remove the concerns regarding bulk in a modest sized plot. Whilst dormer windows would be implemented and the change of height from refused to proposed is not considered significant; the hipped roof styling sloping away from the main road and modest nature of the dormer windows should sufficiently remove the council's previous concerns.

5.15 The proposal would therefore be in full accordance with Policy D1 and aims of the NPPF.

Impact on residential amenity

5.16 Policy G1(3) of the 2003 Local Plan seeks to protect the amenities enjoyed by occupants of buildings from unneighbourly development in terms of privacy, access to sunlight and daylight, noise, vibration, pollution, dust and smell.

5.17 The only neighbouring property close enough to be impacted is that of "Cope Cottage".

5.18 The proposed dwelling would have a "cat slide" style roof on the side of Cope Cottage with an eaves height of 2.2 metres which would only reach it's maximum ridge height a full 5.9 metres back from the eaves.

5.19 Regardless the properties sit a total of 7.25 metres from one another with only the garage being set close to the boundary with Oak Tree Corner. As such neither property would be of any impact on one another in regards to overbearing or overshadowing.

5.20 Furthermore the pitched north elevation of the dwelling would have no upper storey windows. There would be one ground floor window however this would only face the neighbours garage and as such is not considered a concern.

5.21 There are no south side neighbours to be impacted by the development.

5.22 It should be noted that neither the planning officer nor the inspector found any neighbouring amenity grounds for refusal with the previous development. The proposed would be of a more modest scale with the second storey removed and as such there should be no amenity concerns.

5.23 Therefore, the proposed changes would be in full accordance with Policy D5 of the DM Policies.

Sustainable Design and Construction

5.24 Policy D2 (Climate Change, sustainable design, construction and energy) requires applications to include information setting out how sustainable design and construction practice will be incorporated (where applicable). Information should be proportionate to the size of the development.

5.25 Accompanying this application is a Climate Change, Energy and Sustainable Development Questionnaire. This has been prepared by the scheme Architects and we refer the Council to this document.

5.26 The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the requirements set out within Policy D2 of the Local Plan.

6. SUMMARY

6.1 This statement has set out the details of the proposal and demonstrated that the scheme is acceptable for the following reasons:

- The proposed changes will not affect the character of the building or area
- The proposed changes will not have any negative affect on neighboring amenity.
- The proposed design changes have been made to sufficiently address the concerns of the LPA and planning inspectorate in order to create a dwelling which is sympathetic to the scale of it's plot and in accordance with neighbourhood planning.

6.2 Accordingly, we trust the Council will agree with the appropriateness of the application scheme and we look forward to confirmation that the scheme is approved by the Council.