



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2023

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/23/3318170

7 Waterham Road, Bracknell RG12 7NE

- 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 Ms Zoe Richardson against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00404/FUL, dated 15 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'Proposed erection of two storey side extension and part single storey, part two storey rear extension and front porch following demolition of existing store'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was amended following submission of the application; I have utilised the amended description.

Main Issues

3. The main issue for this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring property; specifically, no. 9 Waterham Road.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace dwelling situated within a predominantly residential planned estate. The most prevalent dwelling types in the area are terraces and semi-detached houses, creating a sense of regularity and uniformity. This uniformity is reinforced by the simplicity of architectural design in the vicinity, despite varied materials and fenestration.
5. The appeal scheme would introduce a two-storey side extension and porch following demolition of an existing single storey side store. The existing store is of modest proportions and has an unassuming functional appearance; its loss would not be of detriment to the character of the area. The proposed side extension would extend the property by approximately half the width of the existing house; it would have a small set-down from the roof and small set-in from the front elevation. Whilst the side extension would wrap-around to the

rear, little of its full depth and mass would be visible in the public domain due to the tight grain of development in the vicinity. As such, the appeal scheme would appear proportionate and subservient to the original dwellinghouse within the street scene. Its design and scale would mirror the simple architectural design of the host dwelling. Moreover, its appearance would be akin to other residential extensions in the vicinity, including immediately opposite the appeal site.

6. Terraced properties are an established type of housing in the area; indeed, the appeal property is terraced. As such, creating a terracing effect would not be out of keeping with the character of the area. However, the area does benefit from regular gaps between terraces and semi-detached properties, particularly at first floor level, and the appeal scheme would result in the loss of such a gap, thereby affecting the openness and spatial pattern of the area. This would be exacerbated by the siting of the proposal. No.9 Waterham Road and the appeal site are not on the same building line or ground level, and whilst the variance is minor, nonetheless the siting of the appeal scheme would have an awkward and cramped appearance.
7. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to saved policy EN20 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (LP), adopted 2002, policy CS7 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD), adopted 2008, and policies HO8 and HO7 of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan Pts 1 and 2 (NP), adopted 2021, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), and related guidance. These policies seek, amongst other things, development of a high-quality design which appreciates and integrates with the character of its surroundings.

Living Conditions

8. The appeal scheme would introduce a two-storey side and rear wrap around extension. Whilst the roof of the extension would slope away from no.9 Waterham Road, the full height and mass of its walls would be sited immediately abutting the boundary of the two properties.
9. No. 9 is situated close to that boundary. Whilst the majority of the extension would be sited parallel to the flank wall of no.9, and the rear elevation of no.9 extends a short distance beyond the existing rear elevation of the appeal site due to the aforementioned staggered building line, the extension would still result in an overbearing mass of development on the boundary. The minor variance in ground level would provide little relief to the additional mass.
10. As such, the projection of the rear extension, its height and siting would be visually intrusive to no.9 and would likely result in some overshadowing of the rooms served by windows in the rear elevation.
11. Whilst it is noted that the existing occupiers of no.9 have not objected to the appeal scheme, the appeal must nonetheless consider the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of affected property.
12. Therefore, the proposal is contrary saved policy EN20 of the LP and the Framework, and related guidance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal is contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR