



PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 MARCH 2021

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.

Kevin Gibbs
Executive Director: Delivery

Page No

Planning Applications

(Head of Planning)

**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

Agenda Annex

BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
18th March 2021
SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the agenda.

Item No: 05

20/00812/FUL

4 Bedfordshire Down Warfield Bracknell Berkshire RG42 3UA

ADDITION TO OFFICER REPORT

Paragraph 6.2 on page 23 of the agenda:

It is noted that the conifer in the neighbouring garden of 48 Westmorland Drive which an objector originally highlighted was not listed on the application form as being near to the application site has since been removed by the occupiers of that dwellinghouse which the applicant has provided photographic evidence of.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Following a reconsultation following the receipt of amended plans further comments were made objecting to the application from 6 properties, however it is noted that none of these are new objectors.

Some of these have re-iterated previous objections, maintaining them.

The following additional objections that are planning considerations were made:

- Parking SPD states garage use has declined (*Officer Comment - the Committee report has already addressed the acceptability of the proposed parking layout inclusive of the garage*)
- Error in drawing stating proposed first floor rear window will be 1800mm x 1200mm whilst drawings show it to be considerably smaller with a sill height of 170mm above first floor level (*Officer comment - the window will have a sill level of 1.7m above ff level and has been conditioned under Condition 6 to have a sill level of 1.7m above first floor level. Permitted development rights for any additional windows on this elevation have also been removed under condition 7*)
- Measurements and to scale plans have not been provided to confirm to new parking layout is acceptable to house a large SUV car and bicycles (*Officer Comment - This is incorrect, the amended plans are available to be publicly viewed and are to scale with a scale bar and scale ratio on them. It is re-iterated that the Highway Authority deem the parking plan acceptable. Parking space size requirements is based on the Parking Standards SPD (2016) not the type of car occupiers of a dwellinghouse have. It is also noted that as the amended plans propose 4 bedrooms, and whilst the dressing room 'could' be converted back to a bedroom, 5 instead of 6 cycle storage spaces are required*)
- The Common Access Area has been disregarded which is essential for turning and reversing - (*Officer comment - the Common Access Area has not been disregarded, it has still been considered in terms of turning and reversing but the plans have been amended so as not to include the Common Access Area to demonstrate that there are sufficient parking spaces outside of the Common Access Area*).
- Without measurements it is difficult to tell how much soft landscaping will be removed and how this will affect drainage at the front and street drainage - (*Officer Comment - again to scale plans have been provided showing the existing and proposed areas for soft landscaping. It is re-iterated that the application site (and surrounding area) is in Flood Zone 1 which carries the lowest risk level of flooding and does not require a consultation to the Local Lead Flood Authority or for drainage plans to be provided*)

- Not some but most soft landscaping will be removed including most of the lawn and two trees - *(Officer comment - as set out above, to scale plans show the amount of existing landscaping and proposed remaining landscaping. It is clear that tarmac and paviers already cover part of the area for the proposed parking spaces to the front of the dwellinghouse)*
- Residents of the cul de sac will be impacted by the loss of soft landscaping *(Officer Comment - again, the loss of some soft landscaping does not warrant a refusal)*
- Half hipped roof reduces but doesn't eliminate overshadowing and many other style roof's could have been chosen - *(Officer Comment - It is re-iterated that the proposed development is in accordance with the Building Research Establishment: Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a Guide to Good Practice 2011 (BRE SLPDS) loss of light assessment).*
- Like for like bricks were not used in a nearby property and was too late once built impacting nearby homes *(Officer Comment - the Committee report has already addressed this)*
- Loss of soft landscaping does not just affect the streetscene but also those that live in the cul de sac and Westmorland Drive occupiers *(Officer Comment - again the loss of some soft landscaping is not considered a concern to warrant a refusal)*
- Application does not refer to a change in soft landscaping and no formal response as set out in the condition *(Officer comment - it is clear from the existing and proposed plans that there will be a loss of landscaping and if approved the proposal would be required to be built out as per the approved plans. The 'formal response' from the wording of the condition that the objector is referring to would be in the form of a decision notice for an application such as this application should it be approved)*
- Even given oblique angles and 46 being East-facing houses in Westmorland Drive can lose light around 3pm. A glass conservatory still needs light coming in as they would for a garden *(Officer Comment - as stated in the report no. 46 is east facing, and therefore sunlight is on the garden from morning through to well into the afternoon. With a considerable amount of glass the conservatory allows for light to access the room for longer periods of the day and not through just a single direction facing window)*
- Application should be determined on own merit, just because it is tucked away it is not out of sight out of mind *(Officer Comment - extensions as set out in the design guidance should be subordinate to the existing dwellinghouse. The plans show a set back first floor element which has also been reduced in height as well an amended roof reducing the impact on neighbouring properties. It is again reiterated that the Design document is guidance and does not suggest that every single element of the proposal should be subordinate. It has been clearly set out and demonstrated in the report that impacts of this particular proposal on residential amenity are considered acceptable).*
- Existing garage on the site does not necessarily mean that an application can automatically be considered to have satisfied the requirement of the development plan. Evidence clearly points to the existing garage at No. 4 not being able to accommodate a car of current dimensions since it is far too narrow: the deficiency is more than just marginal. This will result in highway harm - *(Officer comment - As set out in the report the garage is conditioned for parking and therefore cannot be discounted as a parking space. In addition it should be noted that the original dwellinghouse had 4 bedrooms and at that time would have been required to have 2 parking spaces)*
- Comparison between the title deed and proposed parking plan indicate less space between the house and common access area resulting in a risk to cars encroaching onto the cul de sac - *(Officer comment - This comparison is unrealistic as the title deed plan is not to the same scale as the proposed parking plan. It is also noted that the proposed plans show that there is more than sufficient additional space for cars to park closer to the principal elevation of the house further away from the common access area)*
- Proposed rear elevation high level window is contrary to guidance for good design set out in Policies EN20 and CS7 - *(Officer Comment - The successful mitigation of overlooking through the construction of a high level window mitigates its design. It is acknowledged that whilst the window would be visible from the rear elevations and gardens of neighbouring properties it would not be visible from the streetscene. Additionally, this type of window can be constructed under permitted development rights without requiring planning permission).*

AMENDMENT TO OFFICER REPORT

Paragraph 9.38:

5 bicycles instead of 6 are required.

Paragraph 9.37:

5 bicycles instead of 6 are required.

Paragraph 9.35:

The proposal would create a 4 bedroom dwellinghouse not a 5 bedroom dwellinghouse.

The dressing room could be converted internally to form a bedroom again resulting in a 5-bedroom house rather than a 6 bedroom house.

AMENDMENT TO RECOMMENDATION

Condition 5 for the retention of the garage for the use of 6 cycles has now been changed to 5 to reflect the amended plans.

Item No: 06

20/00758/FUL

The Managers Flat Dial House Hotel 62 Dukes Ride Crowthorne Berkshire RG45 6DL

AMENDMENT TO OFFICER REPORT

Paragraph 5.2

The maximum width of the building would be 12.5 metres, rather than the 11.1 metres stated in the report.

Paragraph 9.10

The proposed development would be sited approximately 7.8 metres from the nearest residential property, 7 The Avenue. A loss of light assessment has been undertaken with this separation distance which determines the proposal would not have a significant adverse overshadowing impact on this property. It is considered that at this separation distance the proposed development would not appear unduly overbearing.

AMENDMENT TO RECOMMENDATION

An additional condition is recommended as follows:

Condition 6:

The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for covered and secure cycle parking facilities for 1 bicycle. The facilities shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: In the interests of accessibility of the development to cyclists.

[Relevant Policies: BFBLP M9, Core Strategy DPD CS23]

Informative 2:

No details are required to be submitted in relation to the following conditions; however they are required to be complied with:

1. Time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Windows restriction
4. Parking and turning
5. Ancillary use

The applicant is advised that the following condition must be discharged prior to the occupation of the approved development:

5. Cycle parking

Item No: 07
20/01034/3
Church Road Owlsmoor Sandhurst Berkshire

ADDITION TO OFFICER REPORT

Paragraph 6.3

An additional letter of objection has been received raising the following concerns:

The formalisation of the parking bays would reduce the amount of cars that could fit on the site.

Item No: 08
20/01052/3
Rosedale Gardens Bracknell Berkshire

AMENDMENT TO OFFICER REPORT

Paragraph 1.1

This application has been amended to remove one parking space, and the description of development has been amended to:

"Conversion of grassed amenity land into 9 no. residents parking spaces in various locations."

AMENDMENT TO RECOMMENDATION

Condition 2 amended to read:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the following approved plans and other submitted details:

Layout - Received 17.03.2021

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Item No: 10
20/01054/3
Oakengates Bracknell Berkshire

This application has been deferred.