

ITEM NO:

Application No.
15/01163/FUL
Site Address:

Ward:
Wildridings And Central

Date Registered:
7 December 2015

Target Decision Date:
1 February 2016

10 The Ridgeway Bracknell Berkshire RG12 9QU

Proposal: **Erection of a part first floor, part two storey side extension and single storey rear extension**

Applicant: Mr Peter Jarrett

Agent: Mr Mark Jarrett

Case Officer: Michael Ruddock, 01344 352000

development.control@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

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



OFFICER REPORT

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The proposal is for the erection of a part first floor, part two storey extension to the side of the property and the erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the property.

1.2 It is not considered that the development would result in an adverse impact on the streetscene or the character of the area. The relationship with adjoining properties is acceptable. There are no highway safety implications.

RECOMMENDATION
Planning permission be granted subject to the conditions in Section 11 of this report

2. REASON FOR REPORTING APPLICATION TO COMMITTEE

2.1 The application has been reported to the Planning Committee following the receipt of more than 3 objections.

3. PLANNING STATUS AND SITE DESCRIPTION

PLANNING STATUS
Within Defined Settlement
Area C of the Character Area Assessment SPD for Sandhurst.

3.1 No.10 The Ridgeway is a detached dwelling with driveway parking to the front of the property and a private garden to the rear. The property is part of a small estate east of Bagshot Road and north of Broad Lane that includes properties on The Ridgeway and Woodridge Close.

3.2 A characteristic of the site and the neighbouring properties is that they are all served by double driveways at the front of the plot, which are broken up by areas of soft landscaping.

3.3 The site is bordered on either side by No.8 The Ridgeway to the west and No.12 The Ridgeway to the east. It is noted that both these properties have previously been extended. There is a slight levels difference between the properties, No.10 being at a slightly higher level than No.8 and a slightly lower level than No.12.

3.4 The site is located within Area C (The Ridgeway) of the Character Area Assessment SPD for Sandhurst.

4. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

4.1 There is no planning history for No.10 The Ridgeway.

5. THE PROPOSAL

5.1 The proposed development is for the erection of a part first floor, part two storey extension to the side of the property and a single storey extension to the rear.

5.2 The side element would project over an existing garage to the side with a width of 2.7m. It would have the same depth as the existing main two storey element of the dwelling of 7.6m and height of 8.0m. The existing garage does not project as far to the rear as the main

dwelling, therefore a 3.1m depth two storey element would be constructed to the rear of the garage.

5.3 The rear element would project 4.0m beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwelling, and 2.0m beyond the rear of the side extension. It would match the width of the extended dwelling of 11.8m and would have a maximum height of 3.6m.

5.4 The development would provide a new study, dining area and lounge at ground floor level, with an en suite shower room, en suite bathroom and new wardrobes to serve two existing bedrooms at first floor level.

6. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Bracknell Town Council:

6.1 Recommend refusal for the reason that the development would be overbearing and unneighbourly. The neighbours concerns need to be addressed.

Other representations:

6.2 A total of three objections were received from neighbouring residents. The reasons for objection are summarised as follows:

- The extensions would be of an inappropriate size for a confined space. The properties of No.8 and No.10 The Ridgeway both narrow towards each other at the rear as the two properties are built at an angle to one another.
- The levels difference between No.8 and No.10 and the close proximity of the extension would result in an unduly overbearing effect and the overshadowing of the patio, barbeque and entertaining area to the rear of No.8.
- New windows would result in a loss of privacy to No.8.
- Proposal would be for a more substantial development than what has previously taken place in the area.
- Scale and mass of the single storey rear extension is large and out of character with the properties on either side.
- Waste and drainage from the new bathrooms appear to be directed towards the front garden of No.8.

[OFFICER NOTE: In respect of waste and drainage, whilst these comments are noted this is not a material planning consideration. Connecting to services would be covered when the applicant applies for Building Regulations.]

7. SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways Officer

7.1 No objection.

8. MAIN POLICIES AND OTHER DOCUMENTS RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

8.1 The key policies and associated guidance applying to the site are:

	Development Plan	NPPF
General policies	CP1 of SALP, CS1 & CS2 of CSDPD	consistent
Design	CS7 of CSDPD, Saved policy EN20 of BFBLP	consistent
Residential	Saved policy EN20 of BFBLP	consistent

Amenity		
Transportation	Saved policy M9 of BFBLP	consistent
Other publications		
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). Character Area Assessment SPD.		

9. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

9.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- I Principle of the Development
- ii Impact on character and appearance of the area
- iii Impact on residential amenity
- iv Transport implications
- v Community Infrastructure Levy

i. Principle of the development

9.2 The site is located within a defined settlement as designated by the Bracknell Forest Borough Policies Map. Due to its location and nature, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle and in accordance with CSDPD CS1 (Sustainable Development), CS2 (Locational Principles) and the NPPF subject to no adverse impacts upon character and appearance of surrounding area, residential amenities of neighbouring properties, highway safety etc. These matters are assessed below.

ii. Impact on Character and Appearance of the Area

9.3 The first floor element would project to the side of the existing dwelling and as such would be visible in the streetscene. It is noted that the extension would mirror the height and front projection of the existing dwelling and as such it would not appear subordinate in respect of its design. However as it would not increase the height, width or front projection of the dwelling it is not considered that it would result in a disproportionate addition to the property that would appear incongruous in the streetscene.

9.4 It is noted that both properties on either side of No.10 The Ridgeway have previously been extended to the side at first floor or two storey level. The neighbouring property to the east at No.12 has been extended over the garage to the side with an extension of the same height and front projection as the original dwelling. The proposed side extension would be very similar in appearance to the extension at No.12.

9.5 The neighbouring dwelling to the east at No.8 has also been extended over the original garage to the side. Although lower in height than the main dwelling, this extension projects forward of the front elevation of the original dwelling. It is considered that this extension forms a more prominent feature in the streetscene than that proposed. It is therefore considered that the proposed side element would be in keeping with the existing streetscene which contains similar extensions to that proposed.

9.6 The site lies within Area C (The Ridgeway) of the Character Area Assessment SPD for Bracknell. This refers to the area as a 'Distinct development pocket of 1960s suburban housing' and recommends that development should follow the existing architectural language, using similar materials and roof forms. Given that the extension would be in keeping with the streetscene, and would use similar materials to the existing dwelling, it is not considered that the development would be contrary to the recommendations of the Character Area Assessment SPD.

9.7 It is noted that applications for a two storey side extension at the nearby property of No.11 Woodridge Close have previously been refused and dismissed at appeal for the reason that the extension would appear prominent and assertive in the street scene to the detriment of the visual amenities of the surrounding area. However it is not considered that the two sites are comparable. The side elevation of No.11 Woodridge Close faces towards the highway, and the extension would have brought that dwelling closer to the highway. The front elevation of No.10 The Ridgeway faces towards the highway and the extension would not increase the front projection of the property. It is not considered that the proposed side extension would appear any more prominent in the streetscene than the existing dwelling.

9.8 With regard to the proposed single storey rear extension, concerns have been raised in respect of the size and scale of the proposed development. Due to its location to the rear of the property, this extension would not be a prominent feature in the streetscene that would result in a significant impact on the character and appearance of the area. Although it would result in a visible impact on the properties to the side, it is not considered that the impact of a 4m depth extension at single storey level with a maximum height of 3.6m would be so unacceptable that refusal of the application would be warranted.

9.9 It should also be noted that the applicant could, using 'Permitted Development' rights, erect a single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling with a depth of 4.0m and a maximum height of 4.0m. The main element of the single storey extension is within these parameters and could therefore be constructed under 'Permitted Development' by itself.

9.10 It is therefore not considered that the development would result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore not be contrary to CSDPD Policy CS7, BFBLP 'Saved' Policy EN20, the NPPF of the Character Area Assessment SPD.

iii. Impact on Residential Amenity

9.11 The development would be visible from both No.8 and No.12 The Ridgeway. With regard to No.8, the two storey element would not project beyond the rear facing windows of that property. The single storey element would be visible from the nearest rear facing window at that property, which serves a dining room, however a 45 degree line drawn on the horizontal plane from the midpoint of the window towards the extension would not intersect any part of the extension. It is therefore not considered that the development would result in an unacceptable loss of light to the rear facing windows of No.8.

9.12 The single storey element would project beyond the rear elevation of No.8, however the element that would be closest to the boundary would only project approximately 2m beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring property. Although it is noted that there is a levels difference between the properties, it is not considered that a single storey extension with such a depth would appear so unduly overbearing when viewed from the neighbouring property that refusal of the application would be warranted. The main element of the rear extension would project further to the rear at 4.0m, however as this would be set approximately 3.5m off the boundary with the neighbouring property it is not considered that it would result in an unduly overbearing effect on that property. Again it is noted that a 4.0m extension with a height of 4.0m could be constructed to the rear of the original dwelling under 'Permitted Development.'

9.13 The side extension element of the development would be visible from a side facing kitchen door window at No.8 The Ridgeway, however this room is also served by a front facing window which is the primary source of light to the room. It is not considered that a loss of light to the side facing window would be unacceptable. A side facing window at first floor

level would face towards No.8, and would have the potential to overlook the neighbouring property resulting in a loss of privacy. As such a condition will be imposed requiring this window to be glazed with obscure glass and fixed shut. A further condition will restrict any additional first floor windows in this elevation.

9.14 The rear extension would project 4.0m beyond the rear elevation of No.12 The Ridgeway and would be visible from the rear facing windows of that property. A 45 degree line drawn from the midpoint of the nearest rear facing window at No.12, which serves a dining room, would not intersect any part of the extension and it is therefore not considered that the development would result in an unacceptable loss of light to the rear facing windows of that property.

9.15 The rear extension would be set 1.4m off the boundary with No.12, and it is not considered that a single storey element with such a set off, a depth of 4.0m and a height of 3.6m would appear so unduly overbearing when viewed from the rear of the neighbouring property that refusal of the application would be warranted. Again it is noted that a 4.0m extension with a height of 4.0m could be constructed to the rear of the original dwelling under 'Permitted Development.'

9.16 It is therefore not considered that the development would result in a detrimental effect on the amenities of the residents of the neighbouring properties. The development would therefore not be contrary to BFBLP 'Saved' Policy EN20 or the NPPF.

iv. Transport Implications

9.17 The proposed development would not result in any additional bedrooms and would not affect the existing parking layout. It is therefore not considered that the development would be contrary to BFBLP 'Saved' Policy M9 or the NPPF.

v. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.18 Bracknell Forest Council introduced charging for its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on 6th April 2015. CIL 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.

9.19 CIL applies to any new build (except outline applications and some reserved matters applications that leave some reserved matters still to be submitted), including new build that involves the creation of additional dwellings. Extending the existing dwelling at this site is not development that is CIL liable.

10. CONCLUSIONS

10.1 It is not considered that the development would result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, the amenities of the residents of the neighbouring properties or highway safety.

10.2 It is therefore considered that the proposed development complies with Development Plan Policies SALP Policy CP1, CSDPD Policy CS7, BFBLP 'Saved' Policies EN20 and M9 and the NPPF.

11. 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 7 December 2015:
MJ/RW/01
Block Plan
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 be of similar appearance to those of the existing dwelling.
REASON: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.
[Relevant Policies: BFBLP EN20, Core Strategy DPD CS7]
04. The first floor window in west facing side elevation of the side extension hereby permitted shall not be glazed at any time other than with a minimum of Pilkington Level 3 obscure glass (or equivalent). It shall at all times be fixed shut up to a height of 1.7m from the floor level.
REASON: To prevent the overlooking of neighbouring properties.
[Relevant Policies: BFBLP EN20]
05. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no additional windows, similar openings or enlargement thereof shall be constructed at first floor level or above in the west facing side elevation of the side extension hereby permitted except for any which may be shown on the approved drawing(s).
REASON: To prevent the overlooking of neighbouring property.
[Relevant Policies: BFBLP EN20]

Informative(s):

01. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission subject to conditions, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
02. No details are required to be submitted in relation to the following conditions; however they are required to be complied with:
 1. Commencement
 2. Approved Plan
 3. Materials
 4. Obscure Glazing
 5. Restrictions on side facing windows