
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022 by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/21/3286497

153 Dukes Ride, Crowthorne, RG45 6DR

- 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 Luke Ferrar against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00582/FUL, dated 7 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a proposed erection of part two storey/part first floor side extension, first floor side extension and alterations to roof. Erection of canopy to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to a proposed erection of part two storey/part first floor side extension, first floor side extension and alterations to roof.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the erection of canopy to front, and planning permission is granted at 153 Dukes Ride, Crowthorne, RG45 6DR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00582/FUL, dated 7 June 2021, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan, MJH_DR_003_B, MJH_DR_004_B, MJH_DR_006_B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the roof of the front canopy hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

3. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

4. The description of development above is taken from part E of the appeal form and the Council's Decision Notice as it more accurately describes the proposal than the description on the application form.

5. Additional plans have been submitted by the appellant as part of the appeal, providing clearer CAD drawings. As they have not altered the scheme in any way, I can consider these plans without prejudice to any party.
6. The Council's second reason for refusal relates to a lack of information regarding the possible impact of the proposed development on nearby protected trees. An arboricultural statement and tree protection plan have now been provided by the appellant as part of this appeal. The Council has had the opportunity to comment on these documents and has confirmed that it no longer has any objection on these grounds subject to the inclusion of conditions to secure protection measures. Based on the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the potential impacts of the proposal on the protected trees could be mitigated by suitably worded planning conditions, therefore I find no conflict with the development plan on this issue.

Main Issue

7. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

8. No 153 Dukes Ride is a detached property set within a row of 6 similar dwellings, set back from the main road within the centre of Crowthorne. Whilst the surrounding context is mixed, with some commercial units and larger apartment buildings evident nearby, this group of dwellings retain a similar scale and character despite various extensions and alterations.
9. The proposal would extend No 153 to two storeys high on both sides of the existing main gable, more than doubling the width of the property at first floor level. It would also significantly extend the roof at the existing ridge height. While the materials would match the main house and the overall footprint of the property would not be increased, its massing would be significantly greater, despite the use of a hipped roof and step back from the front elevation on one side. In combination, due to their scale, the proposed extensions would not be sympathetic or subordinate to the scale of the host dwelling.
10. The original form of the property would be overwhelmed by the extensions and its original character and appearance would not be readily apparent. Whilst the direction of the roof ridge would match that of the neighbouring properties, the resultant dwelling would be significantly larger than others in the row and would appear out of scale. Furthermore, the hipped roof would be distinctly different to the gabled form of the rest of the row. Consequently, the proposal would detract from their consistent character. This would result in a minor, but nevertheless harmful impact given the consistency of this row within the otherwise mixed character of the area.
11. Therefore, the proposed side extensions would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area. They would conflict with Policy EN20 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (2002) (LP), Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) (CS), and Policy CR1 of the Crowthorne Neighbourhood Plan (2021) (NP), which collectively require development to be of high quality and appropriate in scale and design.
12. There would also be conflict with the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local

character, and the advice set out in the Supplementary Planning Document 'Design' (2017) which sets out that extensions should be subordinate to, and follow the style of, the original building.

13. The Council has raised no concerns regarding the front canopy. It would be a small feature matching the pitch of the existing roof and therefore would not be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing property or surrounding area. There would be no conflict with LP Policy EN20, CS Policy CS7 and NP Policy CR1, or the SPD in this respect.

Other Matters

14. The absence of harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties is to be expected of any well-designed development and is of neutral consequence. The appellant mentions in their appeal statement that the officer report was not publicly accessible however the report has been submitted as part of the appeal. The matters raised in it were set out in the Council's reasons for refusal, which the appellant has been able to respond to.

Conditions

15. In respect of the canopy, the standard implement condition and compliance with the application plans is necessary in the interest of certainty. Matching materials are necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. I have found that the side extensions would result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area. There are no material considerations that outweigh this harm or justify granting permission for this part of the proposal contrary to the development plan.
17. The proposed front canopy is however a separate and clearly severable development from the side extensions, which would not result in harm. Therefore, I recommend that a split decision could be made, dismissing the proposed side extensions and allowing the front canopy subject to the conditions set out above.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed in respect of the front canopy and dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of part two storey, part first floor side extension, first floor side extension and alterations to roof.

L McKay

INSPECTOR