



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2024

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/W/23/3328021

10 Redvers Road, Bracknell RG12 7JS

- 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 K Turner against the decision of Bracknell Forest Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00229/FUL, dated 4 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an end terrace dwelling which sits at a prominent corner where Redvers Road and South Lynn Crescent meet. There is a generous area of predominantly grassed amenity land between the appeal dwelling and South Lynn Crescent and this open land makes a valuable contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
 4. The proposed extension would project significantly in both width and depth from the host dwelling. The appellant also points out that the appeal property has not been extended in the past.
 5. However, when compared to the dimensions of the host dwelling, the proposed development would nevertheless appear unsympathetically disproportionate in size given its significant proportions when compared to the host dwelling.
 6. This harm would be further compounded as the proposed development's projection toward South Lynn Crescent would also disrupt the building line and existing pattern of development along this frontage.
 7. While amenity land would be lost, a considerable area of green open land would be retained between the proposed development and South Lynn Crescent. Nonetheless, the in-combination effect of the dimensions of the proposed extension, as set out above, and the erosion of amenity land would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
 8. The significance of the Easthampstead Conservation Area ("CA") is derived in part for its social importance as an example of a modern planned new town.
-

The Council's Conservation Officer states that the CA's significance is not dependant on its architectural interest and detailing.

9. The Council and its Conservation Officer did not object to the proposed development on the basis of any harm to the CA and given there is no evidence to suggest the social importance of the CA would be harmed, I am inclined to agree.
10. However, while there would be no harm in this regard, this does not extinguish the need for development proposals to comply with the development plan as a whole. Accordingly for the reasons as set out above, the proposed development is unacceptable and would not sympathetically respond to the existing character and appearance of the area.
11. The proposals would therefore fail to comply with the relevant provisions of Policy EN20 and Policy H12 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (2002) and Policy CS7 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008). These, amongst other things, require development proposals to contribute positively to the appearance of the public realm.

Other Matters

12. I have considered the matters raised in support of the appeal proposals, including the provision of extra parking and absence of neighbour objections. However, any benefits arising would be modest and would not outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. The proposal is contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR