

Development Management Ref No	No weeks on day of committee	Parish	Ward	Listed by:
F/2015/0055	13 weeks	Woodley	Coronation	Cllr Haines

Applicant	Mr R Chand		
Location	29 Copse Mead, Woodley	Postcode	RG5 4RP
Proposal	Proposed erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension; single storey side extension on west elevation; change of roof form from twin rear gable to crown roof design; raising of roof to create habitable accommodation in roof space and two storey front gable extension. Demolition of existing detached garage, removal of existing chimneys and changes to existing fenestration.		
Type	Householder		
PS Category	21		
Officer	James McCabe		

FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Planning Committee on 1 st April 2015
REPORT PREPARED BY	Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services

SUMMARY

<p>The proposal is a resubmission of a proposal refused at committee and dismissed at appeal based on the development being harmfully un-neighbourly in terms of its oppressive and overbearing impacts on the living conditions of the residents of 27 Copse Mead. The proposed development has been reduced in scale by the two storey side extension being reduced to single storey, and the two storey rear element of the proposal being shortened from 4m to 3m. It is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in principle and would overcome the previous reasons for refusal and is therefore recommended for approval.</p>

PLANNING STATUS

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major development location • Groundwater Protection Zone 3 |
|---|

RECOMMENDATION

<p>That the committee authorise the GRANT of PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission 2. This permission is in respect of the submitted application plans and drawings numbered 199613 received by the local planning authority on 12.01.2015 and revised plan numbered 220514/A received by the local planning authority on 12.03.2015. 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall be of a similar appearance to those used in the existing building unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
--

4. The two en-suite windows in the side elevations of the development facing No 27 hereby permitted shall be fitted with obscured glass and shall be permanently so-retained. The windows shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the finished floor level of the room in which the window is installed and shall be permanently so-retained.
5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows or similar openings shall be constructed in the first floor level or above in either side elevations of the extensions hereby permitted except for any which may be shown on the approved drawings.
6. The following mitigation and contingency measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plan, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - a) All contractors involved in internal or external alterations to the roof space are to be briefed on the ecology of bats and their legal status before commencing work.
 - b) All tiles to be removed shall be lifted off by hand and a watching brief be kept for evidence of bats.
 - c) Type 1F bitumen felt underlay is to be used as a lining to all extensions to the current roof void.

Reasons:

1. In pursuance of s.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by s.51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
2. For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the application form and associated details hereby approved.
3. To ensure the external appearance of the building is satisfactory.
Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3
4. To safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.
Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3
5. To safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.
Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3
6. To ensure that bats, a European Protected Species, are not adversely impacted upon as a result of the development.

PLANNING HISTORY

- 11687 – Single storey extension and garage – C/A
- 34665 – Pitched roof on double garage – C/A
- F/2014/0034 – Proposed erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension and two storey side extension on west elevation and part first floor side

extension on east elevation, (including change in roof form from twin rear gable to crown roof design). In addition, proposed front gable extension and intergral double garage, demolition of existing detached garage, removal of existing chimney stack and changes to existing fenestration – Refused

- F/2014/0713 – Proposed erection of a part two storey, part single storey rear extension and two storey side extension on west elevation (including change in roof form from twin rear gable to crown roof design). In addition, proposed front gable extension, demolition of existing detached garage, removal of existing chimney stack and changes to existing fenestration (resubmission of F/2014/0034) – Refused at committee and dismissed at appeal.

SUMMARY INFORMATION

For Residential

Site Area	0.11 hectares
Existing bedrooms	4
Proposed bedrooms	5 (plus 'hobby room' in loft space)
Existing parking spaces	5
Proposed parking spaces	5

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Local Member	<p>Listing request: “If you are so minded to approve this application or to reject it on minor matters, I would request that you list this to go before the full Planning Committee for resolution in the fullness of time.</p> <p>My reason is loss of amenity in the garden of number 27 Copse Mead which includes overlooking and violation of privacy”.</p>
Woodley Town Council:	<p>Following concerns: The meeting the committee discussed the proposal and felt that insufficient change had been made from the previous application and therefore recommended that the application be refused on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overdevelopment of the plot - Overbearing - Massing effect on neighbouring properties - Loss of light to adjacent properties - Loss of privacy to adjacent properties <p>If planning permission is granted, the Committee would like there to be a condition stating that the house cannot be used as a house of multiple occupation.</p>
Biodiversity	No objections subject to conditions
Landscape & Trees	No objections subject to conditions
Network Rail	No further observations to make

REPRESENTATIONS

Objections received from four residents (including the two adjacent neighbours) raising the following issues (see brackets for where this has been addressed in the report) :

- Problems with parking given that 5 bedrooms could in theory equate to 5 vehicles; one per occupant. Elsewhere cars rarely parked on the road overnight. (Paragraph 22)
- Overbearing from increase in ridge height. (Paragraph 8)
- Loss of light to adjacent properties (Paragraphs 16 & 20)
- Impact on the character of the area, out of keeping non-public street (Paragraph 5)
- Change of roof would overhang number 31 (Paragraph 16)
- Proposal in essence unchanged from previous (Paragraph 12 table)
- Previous objections not addressed (Paragraphs 5, 19, 20, 21)
- Oppressive and overbearing in scale and location (Paragraphs 5, 7, 18, 19, 20, 21)
- Harmfully unneighbourly (Paragraphs 11-21)
- 1m gap creates terracing effect (Paragraph 5)
- Loss of light to surrounding dwellings which were designed in proportion to their plots and so as to benefit from light from all 4 elevations (Paragraph 14)
- Number of bedrooms infers multiple occupation (Paragraph 10)
- Loss of privacy from (Paragraphs 15 and 19)
- Inappropriate increase in scale (Paragraph 7)
- Close proximity limits options of extensions to No 27. (Paragraph 19)
- No supporting statement included with proposal (Officer note – this is not a validation requirement for householder applications)
- Rear extension will causes serious overshadowing and loss of privacy (Paragraphs 15, 19, 21)
- First floor windows will cause loss of privacy (Paragraph 19)

Planning Inspector

- Design of front, side and rear elements acceptable within context of the character of the street.
- Development would be harmfully un-neighbourly in terms of its oppressive and overbearing impacts on the living conditions of the residents of 27 Copse Mead which would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CP3 and the NPPF. (Paragraphs 20 & 21)

APPLICANTS POINTS

- The applicant considers that the Inspector's reasons for refusal (namely overbearing impact to the neighbouring first floor bedroom of no 27 and its rear amenity space) have been addressed by the revisions to the scheme.

PLANNING POLICY

- National Planning Policy Framework
- Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policies: CC01, CC02, CC03, CC04, CC05, CC06, CC07, CC09, CC10 & TB23
- Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework – Core Strategy CP1, CP3, CP6, CP7
- SPD Borough Design Guide.

PLANNING ISSUES

Principal of Development

1. The National Planning Policy Framework has an underlying presumption in

favour of sustainable development which is carried through to the local Development Plan. The Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy CC01 states that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan for Wokingham Borough will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

2. The site is located within a major development location and as such the development should be acceptable providing that it complies with the principles stated in the Core Strategy. Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy states that development must be appropriate in terms of its scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character to the area in which it is located and must be of high quality design without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land uses and occupiers.

Impact on the character of the area

3. Copse Mead is a residential street with a distinct suburban character. The street scene comprises a variety of property types ranging from bungalows, chalet bungalows to large two storey dwellings. A key characteristic of the street is its spaciousness, which is afforded by a deep building line, and the majority of the dwellings also benefit from long gardens space to the rear.
4. The Borough Design Guide (BDG) advises that extensions and alterations should respond positively to the context, maintaining or enhancing the street scene or local character. The Guide also advises that extensions should be subservient to the host dwelling. With regards to side extensions, The BDG advises that they should be set back from the building line by at least one metre, preferably have a lower roof line and should be set at least one metre from the plot boundary.
5. The proposed side extension towards No 27 is to be of single storey height with a mono pitched roof and will be set in 1 metre from the boundary. This is a revision to the previously refused proposal which included a two storey side extension on the south-west elevation. It was concluded by the Inspector that, despite the separation between dwellings being a key contributing factor to the spaciousness of the street scene, the two storey side extension would be proportionate to the main elevation in terms of its massing and would be acceptably detailed with regard to the form of the roof and window openings. This is also considered to be the case for the single storey extension proposed in this application. It was additionally noted that the 1 metre separation distance to the boundary would be sufficient to ensure that a terracing effect would not result. It is noted that the revision to the side extension was not to overcome issues with character but to address impacts on neighbouring amenity (see paragraphs 11-21) and given the reduction in scale and the continued sympathetic roof design of the current proposal, it is considered that the side extension would have an acceptable impact on the character of the area.
6. The front two storey gable extension has similarities with No 33 (a chalet bungalow) and No 28 (two storey dwelling). There is a wide variety in the design of the buildings within Copse Mead and the proposed front extension is not considered to raise any concerns as regards character.
7. There are no changes proposed to the north-east side elevation. The rear

extensions, though involving a large increase in floor space, would not be visible from the public realm and would therefore not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area and would be, along with the extensions on other elevations, proportional to the extensive size of the plot and the existing large dwelling.

8. An objection has been raised to the raising of the ridge height by 0.1 metres at a width of 3.3 metres to accommodate an attic room. A similar height increase was proposed with the last application but which would have had a greater width (5.2 metres) given that the roof was to be extended above the two storey extension. Additionally the previously proposed rooflight has been removed and is now replaced with a flat velux window. This is shown on plan no 220514/A which is a revision requested to address the disparity between the floorplan and elevations. Given that the roof section to be raised is situated on a central, narrow section of the dwelling it would have limited impact on the immediate neighbours and appearance of the dwelling.
9. The Council's trees and Landscape Officer has requested that a landscaping scheme to the front of the dwelling be included as a requirement of a condition. It is however considered that this would be onerous given that the proposal is for a residential extension, and therefore a condition to this effect has not been included in the recommendation.
10. Given the above considerations, it is not deemed that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character of the area. It has been noted by residents and the Parish Council that the number of rooms is indicative of the dwelling being used for multiple occupation. There is however no evidence that this is the case.

Residential Amenities:

11. The application is for proposed two storey extensions to the front and rear of the dwelling with single storey side and rear extensions also. A change of roof form is proposed to the rear which currently has a twin gable design and will be altered to a crown roof design. Other minor alterations are also proposed.

12. The key dimensions of the proposed extensions are summarised as follows:

Side extension	1m to side boundary with no 27 (now single rather than 2 storey)
Two storey rear extension	3m in depth (previously 4m), 3m to No 27 boundary (previously 1m) and 2.5m to No 31 boundary
Additional single storey rear extension	4m in depth (previously 3m), 3m to No 27 boundary and 4m to No 31 boundary
Total rear extension depth	7m (same as previous)
Front extension	1.5m in depth, 5.5m to No 27 boundary and 5m to No 31 boundary
Roof height	0.1m increase in the ridgeline.

13. It is advised in the Borough Design Guide that rear extensions should not exceed

a depth of 4m when located close to boundaries. It also recommends that a 1 metre separation distance should be maintained to the side boundary in order to minimise the impact on the amenity of neighbouring land users.

14. **No 31:** The proposal would increase the built development adjacent to the boundary with no 31 but this would be set in a minimum of 2.5 metres for the two storey element and would be stepped in a further 1.5 metres for the deeper single storey extension. From the previous application, the two storey rear extension has been reduced in depth by 1 metre to further lessen the impact, and while not shown on the current plans, it was previously shown that the location of the single storey extension would ensure an uninterrupted 45 degree line is possible from all ground floor windows as per the guidance on page 56 of the BDG.
15. No first floor side windows are proposed and the rear facing windows and ground floor side windows are not considered to result in any direct overlooking. Indeed the rear windows will afford views of a lesser extent of No 31's rear amenity space given the extra projection from the current rear elevation.
16. The inspector concluded that, while No 31's residents would be aware of the rear extension it would not be perceived as visually oppressive and nor would it result in a material loss of sunlight or daylight enjoyed. It has been noted by the resident that the eaves of the side extension would overhang their property. The side extension in question is an existing feature and does not form part of this application so this issue is not material to the current planning application. It is considered therefore that the impact on the amenity of No 31 would be acceptable.
17. **No 27:** The north-east side elevation of No 27, which faces the application property, comprises a secondary kitchen window and a cloakroom window on the ground floor as well as a primary bedroom window at first floor level.
18. The proposals would increase the built development adjacent to the side boundary with No 27 (trading off the removal of the set-back garage with a single storey side extension and two storey rear extension) and would maintain a 1 metre separation to the boundary which is in accordance with the advice contained within the Borough Design Guide.
19. The previously proposed two storey extension at the rear which projected 4 metres has been shortened by 1 metre which, coupled with the change of the side extension from two to a single storey, results in the two storey rear element now being set 3 metres from the side boundary as opposed to the previous 1 metre. The resident at No 27 has submitted plans showing a 45 degree horizontal angle from the habitable rooms on their north-east elevation. It is noted that these plans show the positioning of the previous proposals and not the redesigned scheme. As per page 51 of the BDG a 25 degree vertical test has been carried out which confirms that the ground floor rooms would not be harmfully deprived of daylight/sunlight and these rooms are, in any case, not habitable rooms. It follows that the 25 degree test also confirms that no harmful loss of daylight/sunlight would result to the habitable first floor bedroom. Therefore, as regards the impact on the ground floor windows, it is considered that the reductions outlined above will not lead to harmful impact with regards

loss of light, overbearing or overlooking (due to the obscured first floor windows and boundary treatment screening ground floor windows) as was concluded with previous, larger proposal. The side extension which projects 2 metres from the south-west elevation is not considered to preclude No 27 from similarly extending given that this dwelling's main side elevation is set 4 metres from the shared boundary.

20. In relation to the primary first floor bedroom window, the Inspector concluded that, while there is insufficient evidence to conclude that daylight to the bedroom would be materially affected, it would be the case that "the limited outlook currently available towards the appeal property's side elevation would be considerably and harmfully foreshortened by the mass of the proposed side extension brought to within 5m or so. It would appear oppressive from this habitable room." The eaves height of this extension has been lowered from 5.2 to 2.4 metres and the maximum height of the pitched roof is now 4.1 metres. This reduction allows for the existing 7 metre first floor separation distance to be largely maintained apart from where this is breached by the mono-pitched roof. The 25 degree test has confirmed that the side extension would not interrupt this line from the side window of No 27 and so the side extension would not result in harmful loss of light. It is therefore considered that this redesign of the scheme allows that no significant overbearing or loss of light impact will result on the first floor habitable bedroom of No 27. The single storey design is not considered to appear oppressive from this habitable room.

21. It was also concluded by the inspector that the previous proposals would have a harmful impact on the amenity space of No 27 by virtue of the side/rear extension being seen at close quarters from the property's main side entrance well above the roofs of the shed and garage currently located adjacent to the boundary. The conclusion was drawn that the mass, bulk, height and proximity of the proposal to No 27 would be perceived as overwhelmingly oppressive and overbearing from this property. Though the height of the two storey element is to be the same, this has been shortened in depth by 1 metre and inset a further 2 metres from the boundary. It is considered that this reduction in mass and bulk (as well as the offset of the garage demolition) would ensure that no significantly harmful overbearing impact would result to the amenity space of No 27.

Highways access:

22. It was previously determined that space for 5 vehicles exists on the driveway which would be unaltered as a result of the proposal. The highways officer was previously consulted and had no concerns with the off-road parking capacity in light of the increase in habitable rooms, despite resident concerns about the potential for on street car parking. Given the level of parking provision and the lack of objection from the council's highways expert it is considered that the proposal would have no identifiable highway impact.

Amenity Space

23. The proposal would increase the foot print of the dwelling, however the remaining amenity space would be of a size that would exceed the guidelines set out in the Borough Design Guide. It is therefore considered that the amenity space would be of a size that could accommodate typical garden activities and as such no

harmful impact is considered to occur.

Impact on protected species

24. An initial bat survey was received, as part of the previous application, on 13.06.2014 which recommended that two dusk emergence and one dawn re-entry surveys were carried out. These were subsequently received on 01.09.2014. At that time the Biodiversity Officer raised no objection subject to a condition to secure the implementation of mitigation and contingency measures. The Council's current Biodiversity Officer has been consulted on this information and is satisfied that an appropriate level of survey work has been undertaken and at a relevant time for this new application. It is therefore considered that subject to the application of Condition 6 the proposal will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the bat species concerned at a Favourable Conservation Status in their natural range.

CONCLUSION

25. The proposal is considered to have overcome the concerns raised by the planning inspector at appeal and accords with development plan policies. The application is therefore recommended for conditional approval.

CONTACT DETAILS

Service	Telephone	Email
Development Management and Regulatory Services	0118 974 6428 / 6429	development.control@wokingham.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank