

Unrestricted Report

ITEM NO: 6

Application No.
12/00036/FUL

Site Address:

Ward: **Crowthorne**
Date Registered: **10 January 2012**
Target Decision Date: **6 March 2012**
54 Napier Road Crowthorne Berkshire RG45 7EL

Proposal:

Erection of single storey side/rear extension

Applicant:

Name removed at the request of the applicant (7 November 2012)

Agent:

Welldesign

Case Officer:

Michael Ruddock, 01344 352000

environment@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Site Location Plan (for identification purposes only, not to scale)



1 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (If Any)

56/2976 Validation Date:
Application for proposed 3 pairs of type 'c' houses.
Approved

2976 Validation Date: 20.08.1955
3 pairs dwelling houses - type 'c', 2 pairs in Cambridge Road.
Approved

2 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Key to abbreviations

<i>BFBCS</i>	<i>Core Strategy Development Plan Document</i>
<i>BFBLP</i>	<i>Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan</i>
<i>RMLP</i>	<i>Replacement Minerals Local Plan</i>
<i>WLP</i>	<i>Waste Local Plan for Berkshire</i>
<i>SPG</i>	<i>Supplementary Planning Guidance</i>
<i>SPD</i>	<i>Supplementary Planning Document</i>
<i>PPG (No.)</i>	<i>Planning Policy Guidance (Published by DCLG)</i>
<i>PPS (No.)</i>	<i>Planning Policy Statement (Published by DCLG)</i>
<i>MPG</i>	<i>Minerals Planning Guidance</i>
<i>DCLG</i>	<i>Department for Communities and Local Government</i>
<i>SEP</i>	<i>South East Plan</i>

<u>Plan</u>	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Description</u> (May be abbreviated)
BFBLP	EN20	Design Considerations In New Development
BFBLP	M9	Vehicle And Cycle Parking
BFBCS	CS7	Design
BFBCS	CS23	Transport
SEP	CC6	Sustainable Communities and Character of Environment
SEP	T6	Parking

3 CONSULTATIONS

(Comments may be abbreviated)

Transportation Officer

No objection.

Crowthorne Parish Council

Approval is recommended, however Crowthorne Parish Council expressed concern regarding access to complete maintenance on adjacent property.

4 REPRESENTATIONS

Two letters of objection have been received, from the residents of No.52 and No.56 Napier Road. The reasons for objection can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of light to the rear facing windows at No.52.

- The communal soil pipe running to No.52 via No.54 should be protected and have unrestricted access.

[OFFICER COMMENT: *This would be covered under Building Regulations approval (Part H), and is not a material planning consideration.*]

- The extension is too close to No.52 and would not allow access for maintenance and ventilation.

[OFFICER COMMENT: *Maintenance issues are not a material planning consideration, and the plans show that the extension would not encroach over the boundary with the neighbouring property.*]

- The proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of light to a side facing window at No.56.

- The extension would make No.54 and No.56 appear link-detached, reducing the aesthetic appeal, desirability and thus saleability of No.56.

[OFFICER COMMENT: *Affecting the value or saleability of a property is not a material planning consideration.*]

- The proposed development would compromise the function and appeal of No.56 as its proximity to the boundary would result in an inability to effect repairs to that property.

[OFFICER COMMENT: *Maintenance issues are not a material planning consideration.*]

5 OFFICER REPORT

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Finnie, Councillor Wade and Councillor Dudley due to concerns that the proposed development would result in a detrimental effect on the amenities of the residents of the neighbouring properties.

i) PROPOSAL AND BACKGROUND

The proposed development is for the erection of a single storey extension to the side and rear of the property. The extension would project 2.75m to the side of the dwelling over an existing driveway with an overall depth of 7.8m. It would project 3.9m beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwelling with a width of 8.5m and a maximum height of 3.7m. The extension would be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling by 3.3m and would form a new garage at the side of the dwelling and a new kitchen to the rear. An existing garage to the rear of the site would be demolished as a result of the proposals. Although the extension would be situated close to both boundaries at the side of the property, it would be situated on land within the ownership of No.54, as confirmed from an email from the applicants agent dated 2nd April 2012.

ii) SITE

No.54 Napier Road is a semi detached dwelling with parking located at the front and side of the property and a private garden to the rear. The site is bordered by the adjoining dwelling of No.52 to the west and No.56 to the east. The site is at a higher level than the highway at the front of the property, however it is on the same level as the neighbouring properties. No.54 is separated from No.56 by a driveway between the two properties which is under the ownership of No.54. The neighbouring dwelling at No.52 has previously been extended to the rear.

iii) PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

1) Principle of the Development

The site is located in a residential area that is defined as settlement on the Bracknell Forest Borough Proposals Map, and as such the proposed development is considered acceptable in principle, subject to no adverse impact on the street scene, amenity of neighbouring occupiers, highway safety, trees etc.

2) Highways Considerations

The proposed development would not result in any additional bedrooms however the side element would project over an area that is available for parking as existing and an existing garage to the rear would be demolished. However the Highways Officer is satisfied that parking provided at the site would still comply with the Bracknell Forest Borough Parking Standards. It is therefore not considered that the proposed development would result in an adverse impact on highway safety.

3) Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

The extension would project to the side of the property and would therefore be visible in the streetscene. As it would be single storey and set back from the front elevation of the dwelling by 3.3m it is considered that the extension would be subordinate to the host dwelling. It is therefore not considered that it would be a disproportionate addition to the property that would appear incongruous in the streetscene.

The extension would project close to the boundary with No.56, leaving a gap of 0.2m between the two dwellings. However as the extension would be at single storey level only it is not considered that it would result in an undesirable terracing effect. Furthermore Napier Road has a varied streetscene and it is not considered that such a development would be out of keeping with the existing streetscene or adversely affect the character of the area.

4) Effect on the Amenities of the Residents of the Neighbouring Properties

The extension would project beyond the rear elevation of No.52 Napier Road and would therefore be visible from the rear facing windows of that property. No.52 has previously been extended to the rear with a 2.4m depth conservatory close to the boundary with No.54. The proposed extension would have a depth of 3.9m and would therefore project 1.5m beyond the nearest rear facing window at No.52. A 45 degree line drawn on the horizontal plane from the nearest rear facing window at No.52 would not intersect the extension, and it is therefore not considered that the extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light to the rear facing windows of No.52.

Although the extension would be close to the boundary with No.52, as it would only project 1.5m beyond the rear elevation of the conservatory at No.52 and would be single storey with a maximum height of 3.7m (2.9m at the rear of the conservatory) it is not considered that it would appear unduly overbearing when viewed from the neighbouring property.

The proposed extension would be sited in close proximity to the side elevation of No.56, and would be visible from a side facing ground floor window at that property. This window serves a ground floor W.C. which is not considered to be a habitable room, and it is therefore not considered that any loss of light to this room would be unacceptable. As the extension would not project beyond the rear elevation of No.56 it

is not considered that it would result in any unacceptable loss of light to or unduly overbearing effect on the rear of No.56.

It is therefore not considered that the proposed development would result in a detrimental effect on the amenities of the residents of the neighbouring properties which would warrant refusal.

CONCLUSIONS

It is not considered that the proposed extension would result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area or a detrimental effect on the amenities of the residents of the neighbouring properties. It is therefore not considered that the development would be contrary to BFBLP Policy EN20, CSDPD Policy CS7 or SEP Policy CC6 and the application is recommended for approval.

6 RECOMMENDATION

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:-

01. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
REASON: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the following approved plans received by the Local Planning Authority on 10th January 2012 and 24th January 2012:

54NR - 1
54NR - 2
54NR - 3
54NR - 4
54NR - 5
54NR - 5A

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

03. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.
REASON: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.
[Relevant Policies: SEP CC6, BFBLP EN20, Core Strategy DPD CS7]

Summary Of Reason(s) For Decision:

The following development plan policies have been taken into account in determining this planning application:

Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan: Policy EN20 as it would be acceptable in terms of its impact upon the character of the area, and amenity of surrounding properties and adjoining area.

Policy M9 which seeks satisfactory parking provision for vehicles and cycles.

Core Strategy Development Plan Document: Policy CS7 which seeks to ensure that developments are of high quality design.

Policy CS23 which seeks to ensure the Council will use its powers to reduce the need to travel, and promote alternative modes, increase safety of travel and maintain and improve the local road network.

South East Plan: Policy CC6 which seeks development that will respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of settlements and landscapes, and use innovative design to create a high quality built environment which promotes a sense of place.

Policy T4 which seeks an appropriate level of parking.

Guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework has been taken into account.

The following material considerations have been taken into account:

The proposal is considered to comply with BFBLP Policies EN20, and M9, CSDPD Policies CS7 and CS23 and SEP Policies CC6 and T4. The proposal will not adversely affect the character of the building, neighbouring property or area or significantly affect the amenities of neighbouring property. The planning application is therefore approved.

Informative(s):

01. The Applicant is advised that this permission does not convey any authorisation to enter onto land or to carry out works on land not within the Applicant's ownership.

Doc. Ref: Uniform 7/DC/Agenda

The application file to which this report relates can be viewed at the Council's Time Square office during office hours or online at www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk