Surrey Heath Borough Council
Surrey Heath House
Knoll Road
Camberley
Surrey GU15 3HD
01276 707100
DX: 32722 Camberley
www.surreyheath.gov.uk

Service **Regulatory**
Our Ref: **PRE/20/0011**
Your Ref:
Direct Tel: 01276 707100
Email: **patricia.terceiro@surreyheath.gov.uk**

Mark Doodes
Email: md@markdoodesplanning.co.uk

6 January 2020

Dear Mr Doodes

PRE-APPLICATION RESPONSE

Site Address: 13 Lime Avenue, Camberley, Surrey GU15 2BS
Proposal: Erection of a 1.5 storey detached dwelling with no 13 retained in a reduced curtilage.

I refer to your submission which I received on 9 November 2019.

Policies and guidance

The following table provides a summary of the main policies relevant to your proposal:

Relevant adopted Local Plan policies	Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP6, CP12, CP14, DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP).
Supplementary Guidance	Guiding Principles WH1, WH2, WH3 and WH6 of the Western Urban Area Character (WUAC) SPD 2012, as the site is located within the Wooded Hills Character Area. The site is adjacent to the Post War Open Estate Character Area, so Guiding Principles P01 and P02 are also relevant. Principles 6.6, 6.7, 7.3, 7.4, 7.6, 7.8, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 9.2 and 9.3 of the Residential Design Guide (RDG) SPD 2017.

Site history

There is no relevant site history.

List of site constraints

The site is adjacent to an area Tree Preservation Order (TPO 4/73, A1) immediately to the south.

The site lies within 5km buffer of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area. The proposal would provide a net increase of one dwelling and therefore would be liable for a SANG

contribution, which would be collected as a part of CIL. The applicant is advised that currently there is limited SANG capacity within the Borough. Further details can be found under the following link: https://www.surreyheath.gov.uk/residents/planning/planning-policy/thames-basin-heaths-special-protection-area/suitable-alternative.

The development would also be liable for a contribution towards SAMM (Strategic Access Monitoring and Maintenance) of the SANG, which is a payment separate from CIL and would depend on the sizes of the unit proposed. Further details can be found under the link: https://www.surreyheath.gov.uk/residents/planning/development-planning-advice/community-infrastructure-levy-cil-guidance

Principle of development and presumption in favour of sustainable development

The Council's Spatial Strategy directs development to the west of the Borough. The Council cannot currently demonstrate 5-year supply of housing (4.85 years) and so the following comments have regard to the titled balance set out in paragraph 11 (d) of the NPPF.

Therefore, the main issues include the character and appearance of the area; residential amenities; highways and ecology. I will consider each in turn below:

Character and appearance

Comments	There is no unifying character in terms of either size or shape of the surrounding plots. Although the proposal would create two plots slightly smaller than those surrounding, these would be considered to respond well to their informal plot context. The Guiding Principles for both the Wooded Hills and Post War Open Estates character areas seek to protect their spaciousness, for example by retaining side gardens and gaps between buildings. The existing bungalow at no 13 is sited well within the plot and surrounded by garden area. Part of its garden would be lost, however a side garden towards the eastern boundary would be retained. The proposed dwelling would also be provided with a side garden. Although the proposal would be placed near the site's northern boundary, the separation distance to the dwellings at the adjacent plots (including no 13) would avoid a cramped appearance. The building footprint of the proposed dwelling would reflect the surrounding development. Parking would be provided to the side of the dwelling and this arrangement would be considered acceptable. In the absence of elevations, it is not possible to fully comment on the proposal's design merits. It is however noted that the proposal would have a pitched roof with a gabled end to the rear and this would be in keeping with the surrounding roofscape. The Tree Constraints Plan shows that the application site contains a number of trees on its boundaries. This plan however shows the existing buildings on site, and it appears that there would be some encroachment on the Root Protection Areas of these trees. The applicant is advised that this plan should be updated to show the proposed development, in the event of submitting an application. In any event, the Tree Officer would be consulted should a planning application be forthcoming. As such, the applicant is advised that a full Tree Survey Report prepared in accordance with BS5837:2012 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations should accompany any submission of an application.

Compliance with policy	Complies with Principles 6.6, 6.7, 7.4 of the RDG. Complies with Principles WH1, WH2, P01 and P02 of the WUAC SPD. Complies with Policies CP2 and DM9 of the CSDMP.
Suggested amendments	The applicant is advised that the hardstanding to the front should cover only the minimum space necessary. Given that no 13 is a bungalow, the applicant's attention is drawn to the height of the proposed dwelling, in order to avoid an abrupt change in height between both properties, which would likely give rise to an unsatisfactory visual relationship between both buildings. The applicant is advised that the proposed design should be create a rational, coherent whole with a visually pleasing balance of proportions. Guiding Principle WH6 of the WUAC SPD welcomes high quality contemporary designs, where they respect the surroundings. Bin storage should be provided in a manner that functions well and does not compromise the visual amenities of the building.

Residential amenities

Comments	In the absence of full plans and elevations, it is not possible to fully comment on this matter. The following points are however noted: - The proposal would retain a separation distance of about 12m to its rear boundary. Section 8 of the RDG talks about separation distances of 20m between the rear elevations of two storey buildings in order to respect privacy. Given the proposed 1.5 storey height and that the separation distance to the nearest buildings would be well in excess of 20m, the proposal would likely be acceptable in terms of overlooking; - Owing to the relationship and separation distance to the nearest dwellings (including no 13), and on the basis the development would be 1.5 storey, it is considered unlikely that the proposal would give rise to overbearing and overshadowing impacts; - The proposed garden would be generous and in excess of the minimum outdoor amenity space standard for houses required by the RDG.
Compliance with policy	Complies with Principle 8.4 of the RDG. Likely to comply with Principles 8.1 and 8.3 of the RDG and Policy DM9 of the CSDMP.
Suggested amendments	The applicant's attention is drawn to following: - any flank windows above ground floor facing no 13 should serve non-habitable rooms or be secondary sources of light, so to avoid loss of privacy; - the proposal's internal space should meet the national standards; - all habitable rooms should be provided with adequate outlook and sunlight. The dwelling would be placed fairly close to the site's northern elevation, so any windows in the front elevation close to the boundary should serve non-habitable rooms or be secondary sources of light.

Highway considerations

Comments	The proposed dwelling would be provided with 2 no parking spaces. In the absence of floor plans detailing the number of bedrooms, it is not possible to comment on whether or not this provision would be acceptable. The applicant is therefore advised that, in line with the current 'Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (2018)', dwellings up to 2-bed in suburban locations should be provided with 1 parking space, whereas 3+bed dwellings should be provided with 2 no parking spaces. Cycle storage should also be provided. In any event, the applicant is advised to consult with the County Highways Authority which provides its own fee paid pre-application service.

Ecology

Comments	The applicant has submitted a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report which advises that the proposed development would not impact upon any designated sites or protected habitats. The building on site has low suitability for roosting bats. For all other protected and notable species, the site had negligible/low value and no significant impacts are likely if the mitigation measures provided in this report are implemented. Though the report does not appear to raise any concerns in respect of ecology, the applicant is recommended to liaise with the Surrey Wildlife Trust, where advice regarding the requirement of a Biodiversity Survey can be provided on development proposals prior to their submission to the Local Planning Authority as a planning application.

Other matters

CIL applies to any new build that involves the creation of one additional dwelling, and is applied as a charge on each square metre of new development. The amount payable varies depending on the location of the development within the borough and the type of development. The charging schedule states how much CIL will be charged based on the development type and its location within the borough.

The application site lies within the 'Western Charging Zone'. Further details can be found under the link: http://www.surreyheath.gov.uk/residents/planning/planning-policy/other-planning-documents/community-infrastructure-levy-cil

Summary and Conclusion

For the reasons given above the proposal if amended to include my suggested amendments is likely to receive a favourable officer recommendation.

The advice given represents an officer's informal opinion based on the information you have supplied and is not intended to bind the Local Planning Authority's decision-making powers on any formally submitted application. All submitted applications will be the subject of publicity and consultation in accordance with statutory requirements and the Council's adopted procedures. These, and any other matters which may subsequently come to light, may result in additional issues being raised that are pertinent to the determination of the application. It should also be noted that subsequent alterations to local and national planning policies may affect the advice given.

Please refer to the Council's validation document on the Council's website for national and local requirements which need to accompany any planning application.

Yours sincerely

Patricia Terceiro