
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/21/3278955

Kenrick, Chavey Down Road, Winkfield Row, Bracknell RG42 7PB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Neil and Tracey Tompkins against the decision of Bracknell Forest Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00262/FUL, dated 10 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension to the existing detached bungalow to facilitate on site care for a registered disabled dependant.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension to the existing detached bungalow to facilitate on site care for a registered disabled dependant in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/00262/FUL, dated 10 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2021-1399-PL SHEET 1 REV A and 2021-1399-PL SHEET 3 REV A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The accommodation hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwellinghouse known as Kenrick, Chavey Down Road, Winkfield Row, Bracknell, Berkshire RG42 7PB, and shall at no time form a separate dwelling.

Procedural matter

2. A new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021, after the date the appeal was submitted. The revised Framework does not significantly alter my assessments in this appeal. I

am satisfied that no parties have been prejudiced by my having regard to this change in national policy.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of this part of Chavey Down Road.

Reasons

4. Kenrick is a detached single storey bungalow sitting within a row of similar bungalows. Whereas the typical layout for these bungalows is roughly perpendicular to the road, Kenrick is aligned parallel to the road and set well back with a large front garden. The proposal is to build a new wing to the front of the bungalow, with a perpendicular layout and gable fronted form to match the other nearby bungalows.
5. The Council's Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises that front extensions should be carefully designed so that they do not erode local character. The proposed extension would be slightly narrower in width and lower in building height than the adjacent bungalows and would not extend forward of the established building line so that it would sit well in this row. It would also be narrower, lower and smaller than the existing bungalow so that it would be subordinate in scale. It would also fit in with the style and design of the bungalow.
6. The front garden has ample width and depth to accommodate this scale of extension without becoming cramped or over developed. The extension would be seen from a number of viewpoints but in all of these views it would complement the existing layout and character of the plot and the street.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of this part of Chavey Down Road. It therefore accords with the aims of Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy, saved Policies EN1 and EN20 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan, the SPD and the Framework, to ensure high quality design that respects local character and is appropriate in scale, mass, design, materials, layout and siting.
8. I have also considered the various matters raised by objectors. In particular, I note that the extension would sit in front of the side facing window and glazed door of the kitchen of the neighbouring house to the north, Papillons. Although this would cause some loss of outlook and light, I consider this to be within acceptable limits. The extension would be low in height, with a low pitched roof, and its side wall would be nearly 4m from Papillon's kitchen so that direct overshadowing would be minor in extent. A wide view of the sky would remain, so that the kitchen would continue to get daylight from the sky. Papillon would retain its main outlook to the front.
9. The proposal is put forward as accommodation for a disabled dependant. This is a material consideration under the Public Sector Equality Duty as set out in the Equality Act 2010, but is not critical to my assessment as I have found the proposal to be acceptable in any case.
10. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty and another requiring the use of matching materials to protect local character and

appearance. As the proposal includes a range of facilities, a further condition is needed to confirm that the use of the extension must be ancillary to the main residential use.

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR