



harding rose architects

## Planning Statement

**16 Omega Road, Woking, GU21 5DZ**



No 16 Omega Road is a semi-detached dwelling with an attached garage and wide driveway measuring 5.5m in width. The property is one of 4 similar dwellings, all of which have been extended in the past. No 18 Omega Road is also owned by the applicant, and has had significant 2 storey extensions to the rear. No 22 Omegas Road at the opposite end of the row has been extended and converted split into 2no two-bedroom houses.

To the south of no 16 are the rear gardens of properties on Courtenay Road, the rear elevation of which are 26m away from the side elevation of the existing house.

The submission is made following Pre Application submission PREAPO/2020/0022 dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2020, and the refusal of planning application PLAN/2020/1117

This statement accompanies the submitted drawings which illustrate how the existing property can be extended to the rear and side to create a new 2 bedroom dwelling in addition to the retention of the existing extended dwelling.

## THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is to construct a part 2 storey part single storey extension to the side of the property to create a new 2 bedroom dwelling.

The new dwelling will have a total gross internal floor area of 89.2sqm. The existing house will be extended but remain as 3 bedroom house with an overall gross internal area of 113 sqm. Both properties are in excess of the minimum space standards.

The extension has been left 1m from the side boundary, the side elevation at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level, has been set at 10.4m in depth which is less than the 12m deep 2 storey elevation that was deemed acceptable at no 22 Omega Road.

The proposals also include rear extensions to no 16, these will be part single storey and part 2 storey. The first-floor extension has been brought out to match the extension already constructed on the rear on no 18. The ground floor extension extends to match the ground floor extension of the new dwelling.

At the front of the site, 3 parking spaces will be provided in total with a screened refuse enclosure. To the rear of the site the existing garden will be subdivided to provide a private rear garden for the existing house and a shared amenity area for the two flats. Each garden will accommodate cycle parking within a dedicated store.

## RESPONSE TO REASONS FOR REFUSAL OF APPLICATION

### PLAN/2020/1117

The above referenced application was for a similar extension which provided for 2 new flats, set over 3 floors, plus extension to the retained dwelling. The reasons for refusal have been considered and the proposals now submitted respond to these comments as follows.

#### Principle of Development

The site falls within the Urban Area where the principle of new dwellings is acceptable. The previous application for 2 flats was considered to be *'out of keeping with the character of the area by reason of the proposed type of residential accommodation and would set a precedent in similar types of development coming forwards in an area otherwise characterised by predominantly family housing'*

The change from flats to a single new dwelling overcomes this reason for refusal.

#### Housing Mix

The previous application would provide *'accommodation that would be quite different to existing accommodation in the area which comprises semi-detached family sized housing. The proposal fails to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types to address the nature of local needs evidenced in the latest SHMA, and also fails to reflect the established character and density of the neighbourhood'*

Again, the change from flats to a single new dwelling overcomes this reason for refusal.

## **Design & Character of the Area**

The description in the officer's report acknowledged that many properties in the area have been 'significantly extended', generally with side extensions set back and ridge heights set lower than the host dwellings. The roof form on the reused application was considered *'complex, partly hipped, jarring significantly with no 18 when viewed from the street scene creating a disjointed roof form to the detriment of the host dwelling and no 18 when viewed from the street scene'*

The proposed new dwelling has now been setback from the main front elevation of the host dwelling and a much-simplified roof form is now proposed with a lower ridge height than the host dwelling.

The officers report stated that Omega Road generally consists of plots approximately 10m in width and 30m in depth.

Plot widths are in fact as follows

No 16 Omega Road	11.4m wide
No 18 Omega Road	9.0m wide
No 20 Omega Road	9.4m wide
No 22 Omega Road	5.1m wide
No 22a Omega Road	4.5m wide
No 1a Delta Road	6.2m wide
No 1 Delta Road	5.1m Wide
No 3 Delta Road	9.0m Wide

Properties along Courtenay Road are typically 7.5m wide

Properties along Boundary Road are typically 4.6m wide

As the above table demonstrates the only plot that actually meets or exceeds 10m in width is the application site itself which is the widest plot in the immediate area.

Further examination indicates that the resultant plot widths are in fact wider than the plot widths accepted at no 22 Omega Road and are also reflective of the plot widths that immediately back onto the site at No 1 Delta Road. The officer's report acknowledges these approvals for subdivision of wide plots but yet states the subdivision of the application site, the widest plot in the area, would *'not respond to the established character of the area'*

It has not been made clear why subdivision of plots is considered acceptable in some cases but not appropriate for this site. As demonstrated above and on planning drawing S10 the proposals are not out of keeping with the general variation in plot widths found in the area.

## **Residential Amenity**

There were no concerns relating to the impact on residential amenity and given the current proposal is for a more modest development this will remain the case.

### Provision of Private Amenity Space

The officer's report states that the minimum garden areas for dwellings with 2 bedrooms and above is 65sqm. Both dwellings now have gardens in excess of this figure. The previous concern related to the shared amenity space for the 2 flats.

The flats are now replaced with a single dwelling which overcomes this concern.

### Standard of Accommodation

There were no concerns with the area of the accommodation being provided previously. The current proposals provide 2 dwelling which exceed the minimum space standards therefore there should be no concerns with the proposed dwellings.

The only concern was the impact of the parking space located in front of the bedroom window to Flat 1 and the uncertainty of whether this space would be assigned to Flat 1 or Flat 2.

The ground floor bedroom is now replaced with a dining room. The parking space in front of the new dwelling would be assigned to this dwelling removing the uncertainty that was previously a concern. It is fair to say the current dwelling, nos 18 and nos 20 & 22 Omega Road all have driveway parking immediately in front of their properties, this is an established pattern of parking and one that was not considered an issue at all when the new dwelling was attached to the side of no 22 Omega Road.

### Impact of Parking

The development would require 2 spaces for the existing 3 bed dwelling and 1 space for the new 2 bed dwelling. The site can accommodate 3 off road parking spaces as indicated on the application drawings. The proposal slightly widens the existing dropped kerb to accommodate 3 cars and SCC Highways raised no objection to this on the previous application.

Adequate parking can therefore be provided.

### Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

This was given as a reason for refusal on the previous application, however the applicant was not invited to complete a S106 agreement. The applicant is willing to enter into such an agreement to secure contributions towards mitigation measures. We look forward to receiving confirmation of the required contributions in order for the agreement template to be completed and submitted.

### Flood Risk

There were no objection on these grounds and the site lies within Flood Zone 1 in any case.

### Conclusion

In summary the proposal now submitted has taken reference from the previously refused submission and been significantly revised to address the main concerns that were raised.

We trust that these changes now produce a layout as submitted which overcomes those concerns and can be supported by officers.