

Date Published: 17 June 2014



## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**19 JUNE 2014**

### **SUPPLEMENTARY PAPERS**

**TO: ALL MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The following papers have been added to the agenda for the above meeting.

These were not available for publication with the rest of the agenda.

Alison Sanders  
Director of Corporate Services

**Page No**

### **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

(Head of Development Management)

**The conditions for public speaking have been met in the applications marked 'PS'.  
For further information or to register for public speaking, please contact Customer  
Services 01344 352000.**

This page is intentionally left blank

**BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
19th June 2014  
SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**

---

**Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the agenda.**

---

**Item No: 6**

**14/00227/FUL**

**90 College Road College Town Sandhurst Berkshire GU47 0QZ**

ISSUE DATE: 17 JUNE 2014

**Amendment to Officer Report**

Penultimate paragraph of Residential Amenity section on page 24 of the agenda should read:

One south-facing first floor side window is proposed to be installed which would face the rear of 88 College Road. It is recommended in the event of granting planning permission that a condition requiring obscure-glazing, to prevent overlooking of 88 College Road. It is also recommended that a condition be imposed to restrict the formation of any additional windows on this elevation for the above reasons.

**Amendment to Recommendation**

Conditions 4 and 5 should read:

04. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows at first floor level shall be installed on either the southern or northern side elevations of the development hereby permitted, except for any which may be shown on the approved plans.

REASON: In the interests of the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties of 88 and 92 College Road, College Town, Sandhurst.

[Relevant Policy: BFBLP 'Saved' Policy EN20].

05. The southern and northern facing side windows at first floor level hereby permitted to bedroom 3, the studio room, and the en-suite bathroom, as identified on the approved plans, shall not be glazed at any time other than with a minimum of Pilkington Level 3 obscure glass (or equivalent). They shall at all times be fixed with the exception of a top hung openable fanlight. Any replacement window shall be glazed and fixed to this standard, and retained as such.

REASON: In the interests of the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties of 88 and 92 College Road, College Town, Sandhurst.

[Relevant Policy: BFBLP 'Saved' Policy EN20].

ISSUE DATE: 19 JUNE 2014

**Amendment to Recommendation**

Conditions 4 should read:

04. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows at first floor level or above shall be installed on either the southern

or northern side elevations of the development hereby permitted, except for any which may be shown on the approved plans.

REASON: In the interests of the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties of 88 and 92 College Road, College Town, Sandhurst.

[Relevant Policy: BFBLP 'Saved' Policy EN20].

---

**Item No: 7**

**14/00251/FUL**

**129 Dukes Ride Crowthorne Berkshire RG45 6DP**

ISSUE DATE: 17 JUNE 2014

**Additional highway matters**

Planning application 3955 for the erection of 12 bungalows and garages was approved in 1957. This application relates to this site. The original plans show the garage was intended to be used for parking.

The existing garage on site has a garage door on and although it is labelled as a "lobby" on the existing floor plans submitted with the application, it is used as a garage. There is also a small entrance lobby in the existing garage which provides access into the dwelling. This application proposes to enlarge the size of the garage and to remove the entrance lobby so although it would remain substandard in size in accordance with the Council's Parking Standards SPD, it would be larger than the existing garage on site following the removal of the entrance lobby and would therefore count as a useable parking space.

**Amendment to condition**

Condition 7 to be amended to the following:

Prior to the occupation of the first floor accommodation, the existing entrance lobby within the garage shall be removed and works to the garage undertaken in accordance with details as shown on drawing no. 13/12/02 received 7 March 2014 by the Local Planning Authority. The garage accommodation shall thereafter be retained for the use of the parking of vehicles at all times.

REASON: To ensure that the Local Planning Authority's vehicle parking standards are met.

[Relevant Policy: BFBLP M9]

---

**Item No: 8**

**14/00506/FUL**

**81 New Road Ascot Berkshire SL5 8PZ**

ISSUE DATE: 17 JUNE 2014

**Additional representations**

Since the publishing of the report, 4no. additional letters of support have been received to the application.

These can be summarised as follows:

- dropping kerb essential measure for any property where childcare is undertaken
- parking difficulties on New Road exacerbated since introduction of parking restrictions on the road causing vehicles to park opposite Londis
- parents not guaranteed parking spaces close to property and there is no pavement so this application would make the situation safer
- no reports of accidents on New Road over last 5 years
- BFC have granted similar accesses elsewhere in New Road
- safer for residents to have off road parking to facilitate safer family living

- chaotic parking in area, particularly when builders or shop workers leave their cars on the road all day

1 of the letters of support is from 85 New Road where an application for a new access onto New Road was refused (LPA ref: 14/00267/FUL) on highway safety grounds. An appeal is to be lodged following the refusal of that application. 14/00267/FUL was similar to no. 81 in that there is an existing parking area serving the dwelling at no. 85 from Kennel Ride which is not formalised but could be formalised with the provision of a dropped kerb. At the time of determination of that application, the site was under one ownership. The letter of support from no. 85 raises the following:

- BFBC categorise New Road as a distributor road suggesting frontage access onto this type of road should be resisted. However, recent traffic counts has confirmed that New Road is relatively lightly trafficked (c2,700 movements per day) and recent research undertaken for MfS has confirmed that frontage access onto roads carrying up to 10,000 movements per day do not create road safety problems.
- A speed survey was undertaken two weeks ago along New Road confirming vehicle speeds were 30mph eastbound and 30.3mph westbound.
- Invite the members to observe the significant number of properties with direct frontage access onto New Road that have no option but to reverse out onto New Road. There are some 30 dwellings on New Road which have direct frontage access onto the street and all of these, do not have the facility to turn within their property, resulting in no alternative but to reverse out onto New Road. The proposal at 81 provides on-site provision to turn within the site and for vehicles to exit in forward gear.
- On the basis New Road carries less than 3,000 vehicles per day, nowhere near the now advised 10,000 movements, the formation of new frontage access points onto New Road should not create a road safety problem.
- RBWM Council has given planning consent (Ref: 11/01432) to Banner Homes for 14 dwellings on land to the south of New Road. BFBC raised no highway objection to 6 of the properties having direct frontage access onto New Road and granted permission under 11/383/FUL for the dropped kerbs. These Banner Home properties are currently under construction and each driveway will result in vehicles having to reverse out of their private drives onto New Road.
- Furthermore in 2012 our highway consultants provided highway support, for a proposal for 14 dwellings on land at 152 New Road (opposite and immediately west of the Londis store). Prior to planning consent being granted, they liaised directly with BFBC Highways with regard to access and it was the Council that actively encouraged promotion of three new private access drives onto New Road to serve 5 of the 14 new dwellings.
- These recent planning approvals appear to conflict with the BFC highway comments received for No 81 and our site at No 85.
- Wokingham Borough Council road safety department has advised, that for the most recently available records for the five year period, there have been no reported incidents to the Police on New Road. It is therefore clear that there does not appear to be a road safety problem in the vicinity of No 81 or indeed No 85.

In summary, a total of 9 letters of support have been received to the application and 1 letter of objection received.

ISSUE DATE: 19 JUNE 2014

The Highways Department of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) were consulted on the proposal and commented as follows:

RBWM Highway Authority, along with Bracknell Forest BC, has a general presumption against the formation of accesses onto classified roads. The Highway Authority objects to this additional point of access onto a classified highway where there is an existing point of access onto a non-classified highway to the rear (at Kennel Ride).

## **Additional representations**

2no. further letters of support have been received to the application.

These can be summarised as follows:

- The parking in New Road is extremely difficult especially in proximity to the local Londis shop and post office. The building of several new houses close by will only exacerbate this. The more vehicles we can park off road the better.
- The traffic in this area of New Road is chaotic due to the Londis supermarket. As a result dropping off young children in the main road is extremely dangerous and by providing an off road place to do this is completely sensible and safe.

1no. further letter of objection has been received to the application.

This can be summarised as follows:

- Having read that one parent had a child sprawled on the road, yet would they still use the front of the property rather than the safety of the back.
- Have witnessed Mr Doel asking people not to park outside the property on the public highway. As far as getting a push chair out onto the road there is a problem in that there is no pavement sited on the outside of the properties.
- The rear of the property is safer and may be inconvenience but if the front is dangerous why use it.

In summary, a total of 11 letters of support have been received to the application and 2 letters of objection received.

---