

Item No	Application and Parish	No.	8/13 week date	Proposal, Location and Applicant
(1)	16/03518/FULD Brimpton Parish Council		23rd March 2016	Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a self-build replacement dwelling Pelynt, Crookham Common Road Brimpton, Reading, Berkshire, RG7 4PT Mr Hunt

To view the plans and drawings relating to this application click the following link:
<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=16/03518/FULD>

Recommendation Summary: To **DELEGATE** to the Head of Planning and Countryside to **REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION.**

Ward Members: Councillor Dominic Boeck

Reason for Committee determination: Requested by Councillor Boeck to allow Members the opportunity to assess the merits of the proposed new house in the context of its setting and the plot size and to view the existing building.

Committee Site Visit: 15th March 2017

Contact Officer Details

Name: Masie Masiwa
Job Title: Planning Officer
Tel No: (01635) 519111
Email: Masie.Masiwa@westberks.gov.uk

1. PLANNING HISTORY

There is no recorded planning history on the site.

2. PUBLICITY

- 2.1 A site notice was displayed on 31 January 2017 and expired on 21 February 2017. Neighbour notification letters have been sent to 13 local recipients. The Council has therefore complied with the publicity requirements of the Town and Country (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

3. CONSULTATION

3.1 Consultations

Parish Council:	No objection/support
Highways	No objection subject to condition
Waste Management	No objection
Ecology	No objection subject to condition
Tree Officer	No comments received at time of report
Environmental Health	No comments
Natural England	No comments

3.2 Representations

Total: 9	Object: 0	Support: 9
----------	-----------	------------

Summary of comments:

- Replacement dwelling can only be a significant improvement on the dilapidated bungalow.
- Young family that are making this application are already involved in and supportive of village activities
- Proposed development maximises the potential of the site and, in my view enhances the aesthetic quality of the local environs
- Application is in keeping with regard to its surroundings and plot size
- An asset to the local community providing a work unit for the householder.
- Need more young families in the village to support the local community.
- Proposed development is a big improvement on the ageing bungalow
- Advantage that they can work from home, which is more eco-friendly

- Bungalow a blot on the landscape
- Welcome construction of attractive proposed property
- Replacement house will be far more aesthetically pleasing than the current bungalow

4. PLANNING POLICY

4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the determination of any planning application must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory development plan for West Berkshire comprises:

- West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026)
- West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007)
- Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire (2001)
- Waste Local Plan for Berkshire (1998)

4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and who these are expected to be applied. It is a material consideration in planning decisions. The NPPF is supported by the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

4.3 According to paragraph 215 of the NPPF, due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

4.4 The West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) is the first development plan document (DPD) within the new West Berkshire Local Plan. It sets out a long term vision for West Berkshire to 2026 and translates this into spatial terms, setting out proposals for where development will go, and how this development will be built. The following policies from the Core Strategy are relevant to this development:

- NPPF Policy
- ADPP1: Spatial Strategy
- ADPP6: East Kennet Valley
- CS13: Transport
- CS14: Design Principles
- CS16: Flooding
- CS17: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- CS19: Historic Environment and Landscape Character

4.5 A number of policies from the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007) remain part of the development plan following the publication of the Core Strategy. The following saved policies from the Local Plan are relevant to this development:

- OVS.5: Environmental Nuisance and Pollution Control
- OVS.6: Noise Pollution
- ENV.23 Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside
- HSG.1: The Identification of Settlements for Planning Purposes
- TRANS.1: Meeting the Transport Needs of New Development

According to Paragraph 216 of the NPPF, decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- (1) The stage of preparation,
- (2) The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies and
- (3) The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF.

The Local Development Scheme (LDS) provides a timetable for the preparation of emerging development plan documents.

4.6 The emerging Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (HSA DPD) is the second DPD of the new West Berkshire Local Plan, which will allocate non-strategic housing sites across the district. The Proposed Submission Version of the HSA DPD was published in November 2015. According to the LDS, the Proposed Submission Version of the HSA DPD has been submitted for examination (commenced in June 2016). According to the LDS, adoption was anticipated for November 2016, subject to revisions. According to the latest LDS update, adoption of the HSA DPD is now anticipated in Spring 2017. It is therefore at an advanced stage of preparation. No specific housing allocations are relevant to this appeal, but its progress is relevant to the housing supply considerations raised by the Appellant. The following policies from the HSA DPD are relevant to this development and now carry significant weight.

- C3: Design of Housing in the Countryside
- C7: Replacement of Existing Dwellings
- P1: Parking Standards for New Residential Development

4.7 The following local policy documents adopted by the Council are material considerations relevant to the development:

- West Berkshire Supplementary Planning Guidance: House Extensions (adopted July 2004)
- West Berkshire Supplementary Planning Guidance: Replacement Dwellings and Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside (adopted July 2004)
- West Berkshire Supplementary Planning Document Series: Quality Design (SPDQD), (adopted June 2006)
 - Part 1 Achieving Quality Design
 - Part 2 Residential Development
- West Berkshire Supplementary Planning Document Delivering Investment from Sustainable Development
- The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.
- National Planning Practice Guidance (Use of Planning Conditions reference ID: 21a)

5. DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT AND THE SITE

5.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of a replacement dwelling at Pelynt, Crookham Common Road, Brimpton, Reading, Berkshire, RG7 4PT. The applicant indicates that the proposed dwelling would be a self-build project.

- 5.2 The bungalow is located just off Crookham Common Road via a single driveway.
- 5.3 There are a number of other properties accessed in this way, including two sets of semi-detached properties to the north of Pelynt. The semi detached pair of Stone House Cottage and Butlers House are designed with pitched roof gables and subservient extensions to the side and rear. The semi detached properties at No. 1 and No. 2 Ivy Cottages share a boundary with the site and are more modest 1.5 storey traditional cottages with pitched roof dormer windows. The site is flanked by two listed buildings at the Old Thatch to the west and Oaklands to the east. Although a fair distance from the site at approximately 130 metres and 150 metres respectively, the two dwellings' setting can be viewed from within the site due to the open fields to the west and east. There are open fields to the south, east and west, Public Right of Way footpaths BRIMP/6/1 and BRIMP/8/1 are located to the east and run in a north to south direction. The path BRIMP/8/1 intersects BRIMP/9/1 which is located to the south-east and runs in a north-east to south-west direction.
- 5.4 The site is open to view and prominent within the landscape.
- 5.5 Currently Pelynt is a 2 bedroom detached bungalow measuring approximately 6 metres to roof ridge height and measuring approximately 9.7 metres by 9.8 metres. It is set back from the highway by approximately 32 metres. A dual line of trees to the front driveway offers partial screening from the road. These trees will be retained.
- 5.6 At its highest, the proposed replacement dwelling would be 9.8 metres to the ridge of the main roof. Including the chimney, the width would be 16.1 metres, and the depth would be 12.9 metres. The ground floor will comprise a kitchen, sitting room, dining room, snug, boot room and utility room, whilst the upper floor will provide 4 bedrooms and 3 bathrooms together with a galleried landing.
- 5.7 The external façade of the building will be brickwork with white upvc fascias and soffits, lead clad dormer windows and plan roof tiles.
- 5.8 A carport, store with a first floor office above is also proposed. The office space above includes a WC and a kitchen area. The carport outbuilding would be 6.2 metres in width, 11.9 metres in length and 6.6 metres in height. The new car port/ garage are proposed to the front of the new dwelling with office accommodation on the first floor. The external façade of the building will be brickwork with white upvc fascias and soffits, lead clad dormer windows and plan roof tiles. It is worth noting that the carport/ store/ office building is both higher and longer than the existing dwelling.

6. APPRAISAL

The main issues for consideration in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of the development
- The impact on the character and appearance of the area
- The impact on neighbour amenity
- The impact on Highway safety
- The impact on biodiversity
- The impact on Trees
- Community infrastructure levy
- The presumption in favour of sustainable development

6.1 The principle of development

- 6.1.1 The application site is located outside a defined settlement boundary and in open countryside for planning purposes.

- 6.1.2 Policy ADPP1 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 - 2026 (WBCS) designates the site as being within the open countryside. This states that only appropriate limited development in the countryside will be allowed.
- 6.1.3 The principle of replacement dwellings in the countryside is acceptable, however this is subject to full conformity with other material considerations consistent with the policies listed above, which are explored below.
- 6.1.4 The assessment is made on the application of the criteria of the extant Local Plan Policy ENV23:
- 6.1.5 Following a request from the Council to submit policy justification for the development, the applicant submitted a policy assessment for the proposed replacement dwelling. The applicant has stated that the proposed dwelling is not disproportionate in size to the dwelling being replaced. The applicant's agent stated that the existing dwelling covers 0.89% of the existing plot and that the new dwelling's footprint would cover 2.13% of the plot. The applicant states that the house would not materially change the amount of the site covered by built development or fundamentally change the nature of the site given that the entire plot forms part of the residential curtilage of the property. The applicant's agent also states that the proposal would increase the overall GIA (Gross Internal Area) of the existing building from 73.6sqm to 309 sqm and that this represented a dwelling approximately 4.19 times larger in terms of internal area than the existing. Notwithstanding that Policy ENV23 refers to measurements inclusive of external walls and not internally, the agent's figures amount to approximately a 319% increase in floor space. This figure excludes the proposed garage which should be included in the figures in accordance with Policy ENV23. The agent also states that in terms of footprint, the new dwelling itself amounts to 2.3 times the existing, with consideration that the existing dwelling is disproportionately small compared to the size of the site.
- 6.1.6 It is important to clarify that Policy ENV23 and Policy C7 of the emerging HSADPD, which will replace ENV23 do not mention a consideration of the plot size when considering countryside residential extensions. Rural dwellings are relatively modest but set within large plots, accordingly if extensions and replacement dwellings were allowed to extend according to plot size overly large extensions and replacement dwellings would be prevalent. National and local policies are quite restrictive of large dwellings within the countryside.
- 6.1.7 The applicant's agent also states that the proposed garage / office area will be located to the north-west of the new dwelling and will extend to a footprint of 72 sqm albeit with a carport on the ground floor, and an office above extending to 52 sqm(GIA). The applicant's conclusion is that when compared with the plot size or residential curtilage the increase in the footprint of the existing dwelling is minimal.
- 6.1.8 It is considered that the replacement dwelling and car port would be disproportionate to the original, overly large, prominent and dominant within this open landscape within the countryside. The Council's assessment is also made on the application of the criteria of Local Plan Policy ENV23:
- a) The existing dwelling is long established and is not the result of a temporary or series of temporary permissions:

The existing dwelling is original and long established

- b) The proposed dwelling is not disproportionate in size to the dwelling being replaced:

Saved Policy ENV23 sets out the circumstances in which a replacement dwelling would constitute disproportionately large development within the countryside. It is supported by Replacement Dwelling and Existing Dwelling in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance which states that any proposal for a replacement dwelling which more than doubles the original dwelling would normally be regarded as disproportionate as it would be more visually dominant than the original and have a materially greater impact upon the countryside, contrary to the aims of national and local policy. In this case the proposed replacement dwelling would result in a replacement dwelling representing a size increase of over 100%. Whilst officers accept that the dwelling requires modernisation and a replacement would be acceptable in principal a more sympathetic and proportionate approach should be sought. As such the applicant was advised to withdraw the application and revise the scheme. In addition the scheme includes an overly large outbuilding within a prominent location to the front of the site. The SPG states that garages that are within 5 metres of the dwelling should be included in calculating the cumulative increase in built form on a site. When the garage is factored in the resultant increase in floor space is approximately 425.3 square metres, which results in a percentage increase of approximately 421%. In addition to the proposed garage being overly large and dominant, the emerging HSADPD's Policy P1 excludes carports and garages as parking spaces. It is therefore considered that the garage could be removed to sufficiently conserve the open character and appearance of the area and limit the amount of built form on the site. A calculation of volume increase provides an indication of the scale, bulk and massing of the proposed buildings. The existing volume is calculated at approximately 2500 cubic metres. The increase of volume is approximately 312%. This includes the proposed garage, which is less than 5 metres from the proposed dwelling.

Comparison table

	Agent's ENV23 figures (excluded garage and included internal areas only) Square metres	Case Officer's ENV23 figures (including garage and including external areas) Square metres
Existing bungalow	73.6	81.5
Proposed dwelling	309	425.3
Proposed garage	Not included	425.3 (includes garage)
% increase	319%	421%

The size and volume increase is considered disproportionate and not commensurate to the dwelling being replaced. There are no dwellings significantly extended in a similar manner within the vicinity of the site. Overall

the scheme is considered disproportionate to existing surrounding development. The site is considered open and prominent within the wider open landscape, as such the site would not be able to accommodate the size of the proposed dwelling which would significantly alter the spacious open nature of the site and surrounding area without a significant negative visual impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area:

The proposed design of the new dwelling and carport/garage could be reduced in size, roof ridge height and the outbuilding excluded to achieve a higher quality standard of sympathetic design appropriate to the open rural character of the area, whilst still providing a significant increase in the accommodation available on the site.

- c) The proposed design of the new building is of a high standard and appropriate to the rural character of the area:

The design is considered low quality within the setting of the site. The scale of the dwelling and the increased ridge height would be significantly higher than that of neighbouring Ivy Cottages. The architectural detailing, particularly the flat roof dormer windows are not in keeping with the main roof design. In addition the large glazing to the front elevation would present a grandiose building not in keeping with the rural character of the area:

The garage building is high profile and overly large and as stated above is both larger and higher than the garage being replaced. With its prominent positioning in front of the dwelling and given its size it would dominate the dwelling's frontage or the view from the street scene.

- d) The development where appropriate incorporates or complements the existing building or features in the locality:

The dwelling and garage is not considered to complement the style of surrounding houses.

- e) The development is appropriate and sympathetic in scale, design materials, layout and siting to the character and setting of adjoining buildings and spaces:

The development fails to demonstrate appropriate limited development within the countryside and cannot be considered sympathetic to conserving and enhancing the character of the area. In addition the proposal is not considered sympathetic in scale, design, materials, layout and siting to the existing character and setting of adjoining buildings and spaces:

The development is not considered appropriate and sympathetic to the site and the surrounding open countryside. The size figures indicate a disproportionate replacement the dwelling which is considered to fall short of being respectful of the property being replaced, of the relationship of neighbouring properties and open spaces. The plot would remain spacious in character.

- f) The development includes an acceptable landscape scheme to retain and improve the rural nature and locality:

The development does not include an acceptable landscape scheme to retain and improve the rural nature of the locality. In addition Officers would be concerned that significant additional landscaping of the site would erode the openness that the site contributes to the character of the area. Officers consider that securing a high quality design, acceptable scale, size and bulk would be key in providing an acceptable scheme on this site and any attempt to mitigate the impact by significant landscape would be inappropriate and harmful to the character of the area.

6.1.9 Policy C1 of the emerging HSADPD states that there will be a presumption against new residential development outside of the settlement boundaries. Notwithstanding the submitted design statement, the Council consider that the submitted justification from the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposal is not materially larger physically and visually than the original bungalow on this site and that its impact is acceptable. As assessed within this section of the report the submitted proposal indicates that the replacement dwelling would be materially larger than the original both in size and volume. The proposal also fails to comply with Policies C3 Design of Housing in the Countryside and Policy C7 Replacement of existing dwellings meeting all the criteria within the policies. The proposal does not meet Policy C3: Design of Housing in the Countryside and Policy C7: Replacement of existing dwellings. In terms of Policy C7 the dwelling fails to meet criteria (ii) as the proposed dwelling is disproportionate in size and will have a significant detrimental impact on the character and local distinctiveness of the rural area and the dwelling's setting within the wider open landscape.

6.1.10 As the proposed dwelling is not acceptable in terms of the quality of its design, and its scale, bulk and appearance it demonstrably fails to comply with the NPPF, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy along with the Supplementary Planning Document Series: Quality Design (SPDQD) and also fails to comply with Policies C1, C3 and C7 of the West Berkshire Council's Proposed Housing Site Allocations DPD (November 2015).

6.2. Impact upon the character and appearance of the site and the area

6.2.1. The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, and securing high quality design is one of the core planning principles of the NPPF.

6.2.2. The site is located within a sensitive location within the countryside, as such the proposal has been considered in terms of its impact and harm on the character and visual attractiveness of the area.

6.2.3. The Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that in relation to design, Councils should always seek to secure high quality design which respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area. The NPPF is clear that good design is indivisible from good planning and attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. It emphasises the importance to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings. The NPPF also adds that the visual appearance is a very important factor, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations.

6.2.4. Paragraph 58 of the NPPF states that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, respond to local character and history, and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

- 6.2.5. Core Strategy Policy CS14 states that new development must demonstrate high quality and sustainable design that respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area, and makes a positive contribution to the quality of life in West Berkshire. It further states that design and layout must be informed by the wider context, having regard not just to the immediate area, but to the wider locality.
- 6.2.6. Core Strategy Policy CS19: Historic environment and landscape character also outlines that in order to ensure that the diversity and local distinctiveness of the landscape character of the District is conserved and enhanced, the natural, cultural, and functional components of its character will be considered as a whole. In adopting this holistic approach, particular regard has been given to the sensitivity of the area to change and ensuring that the new development is appropriate in terms of location, scale and design in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern and character.
- 6.2.7. The Council has adopted a Supplementary Planning Document series entitled Quality Design (SPDQD). Part 2 of SPDQD provides detailed design guidance on residential development. It offers guidance on how to preserve residential character by emphasising that respecting the physical massing of an existing residential area is a critical part of protecting residential character. The physical bulk of the proposed development has been considered in terms of its footprint, length, width and increased height in line with the guidance within SPDQD part 2. The replacement dwelling and outbuilding have been designed such that the resultant buildings' appearance, size and scale appear out of context in relation to the modest adjacent properties. Officers consider that the development fails to sufficiently respect and enhance the character and appearance of the site and the area.
- 6.2.8. The applicant's agent also suggests that paragraph 3.3.2 (Possible Exceptions to Size Guidelines) within the Replacement Dwellings SPG (2004) is applicable which refers to 'small and large original buildings' and states 'where the "original" dwelling is relatively small and where a large percentage increase may be necessary, for example to bring the dwelling up to modern living standards'. Officers are of the view that a well designed replacement dwelling of up to 100% might be acceptable in this case but proposed development is approximately double the size of what might be considered acceptable.
- 6.2.9. The primary purpose of this supplementary planning guidance is to amplify the requirements of criterion (b) which seeks to avoid dwellings which are disproportionate to the original dwelling; that is excessive in scale or massing and thereby physically and visually intrusive on the countryside. It states that the replacement of small country dwellings with more grandiose houses can radically change the character of a site to one of a more suburban nature and also reduce the supply of the smaller rural dwellings. A replacement dwelling, when clearly disproportional to the original, can be tantamount in its impact to a new dwelling and can therefore undermine both national and local policies on restriction of new development in the countryside. Even where a site is well screened there is a wider concern to maintain the essential rural nature and qualities of the area.
- 6.2.10 As outlined in the previous section the design of the replacement dwelling is not considered limited or appropriate, and the layout, size and scale would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area.

6.3. Impact upon neighbouring amenity

- 6.3.1. Securing a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings is one of the core planning principles of the NPPF. Core Strategy Policy CS14 further states that new development must make a positive contribution to the quality of life in West Berkshire. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Quality Design' and

Supplementary Planning Guidance House Extensions provide guidance on the impacts of development on neighbouring living conditions.

- 6.3.2. The nearest dwellings to be affected by the proposal are No 1 and No 2 Ivy Cottages. However due to the distances between the dwellings it is not considered that there will be a significant impact on neighbouring amenity.

6.4. On-site amenity and facilities for future occupiers

- 6.4.1. According to Part 2 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document "Quality Design (SPDQD)", the Council considers it essential for the living conditions of future residents that suitable outdoor amenity space (e.g. private gardens) is provided in most new residential development.

- 6.4.2. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document "Quality Design" Part 2 suggests a minimum garden size of 100 square metres for houses with 3 or more bedrooms. A more than sufficient garden area will be retained on the site. Officers do not accept that the red line plan accompanying the application accurately reflects the size of the lawful curtilage on site.

6.5. Impact on Highways (safety and use)

- 6.5.1. Road safety in West Berkshire is a key consideration for all development in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS13.

- 6.5.2. The Council published its Proposed Submission Housing Site Allocations DPD for consultation. As the DPD has been approved by Council and published for consultation it is now a material consideration and the new parking policy needs to be considered as part of this application.

- 6.5.3. Policy P1 of the DPD provides new standards for residential parking for new development. The new parking policy sets minimum standards for residential parking provision based on location. As the proposed development is a 4/5 bedroom dwelling and is located within Zone 3, the minimum parking requirements are set at 3 parking spaces.

- 6.5.4. Part IV of Policy P1 states that carports or garages will not be counted as a parking space for the purposes of meeting the required levels of parking set out in this policy. The proposed garage/carport cannot be justifiable as development for parking purposes.

- 6.5.5. The Council's Highways Officer was consulted and has reviewed the application with reference to the new parking guidelines and has raised no objection to the scheme.

- 6.5.6. Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a material impact on highway safety and would be provided with sufficient parking. The application is therefore considered to comply with Core Strategy Policy CS13 and the parking standards as set out within the published Proposed Submission Housing Site Allocations DPD.

6.6. The impact upon green infrastructure and biodiversity

- 6.6.1. Core Strategy Policy CS17 (Biodiversity and geodiversity) states that biodiversity and geodiversity assets across West Berkshire will be conserved and enhanced. Policy CS17 also states that, in order to conserve and enhance the environmental capacity of the District, all new development should maximise opportunities to achieve net gains in biodiversity and geodiversity in accordance with the Berkshire Biodiversity Action Plan and the Berkshire Local Geodiversity Action Plan.

- 6.6.2. No adverse comments have been received from Natural England and from the Council's Ecologist. As the dwelling is to be demolished a bat survey accompanies the application, and has been reviewed by the Ecologist. The Council's ecologist is satisfied with the recommendations of the survey and suggests appropriate conditions.
- 6.6.3. Policy CS18 seeks to protect and enhance the District's green infrastructure. The trees on the site are not subject to any protection by Tree Preservation Orders. It is recognised that the trees on the site may be of value in terms of landscaping within the site, at the time of writing the report no comments had been received from the Tree Officer. Any submitted comments will be made available on the update sheet.

6.7. Impact on Flooding and Drainage

- 6.7.1. The Framework states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. Core Strategy Policy CS16 (Flooding) applies across the district and highlights the cumulative impacts of development on flooding within the district. The application site is located within Flood Zone 1, which has the lowest probability of flooding. It is essential that Sustainable Drainage Methods (SuDS) are adopted to mitigate the cumulative impacts of development on flooding within the area and the wider district.
- 6.7.2. Policy CS16 states that on all development sites, surface water will be managed in a sustainable manner through the implementation of Sustainable Drainage Methods (SuDS).

6.8. Other matters

6.8.1. Community Infrastructure Levy

- 6.8.2. Core Strategy Policy CS5 (Infrastructure) states that the Council will work with infrastructure providers and stakeholders to identify requirements for infrastructure provision and services for new development and will seek to co-ordinate infrastructure delivery. The Council has implemented its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as from 1st April 2015. Planning applications which have been decided since the 1st April 2015 may be liable to pay the levy.

- 6.8.3. The proposed new build in terms of the gross internal floor space area (GIA) as defined by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) is more than 100m². Under the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule adopted by West Berkshire Council and the government Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, residential development of 100m² or more will be liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy.

- 6.8.4. The proposal's new GIA is 219 m²

- 6.8.5. As such this application is CIL Liable and the Community Infrastructure Levy Liability Notice detailing the chargeable amount will be sent attached to the decision notice. Applicants may claim an exemption (subject to meeting the criteria) from the charge where the required forms for the Assumption of Liability, Exemption request and supporting documentation have been provided to the local authority.

6.8.6. The assessment of sustainable development

- 6.8.7. When considering development proposals the Council is required to take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

6.8.8. The NPPF identifies three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The policies of the NPPF, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system and emphasises that a presumption in favour of sustainable development should be the basis for every plan, and every decision. Planning applications must result in sustainable development with consideration being given to the economic, social and environmental sustainability aspects of the proposal.

6.8.9. Economic Dimension: It is considered that the proposal makes no significant contribution to the wider economic dimensions of sustainable development. There would be a minor benefit in terms of additional employment during the construction period.

Environmental dimension: With regard to the environmental role of fundamentally contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment, the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area has been assessed as part of this application. It is considered that the proposal fails to sufficiently respect and preserve the existing natural and built environment and that the proposal does not protect and enhance the prevailing pattern of development in the local area nor the character of appearance of the site itself.

Social dimension: It is considered that the proposal makes no significant positive contribution to the social dimension of sustainable development and are to the significant visual intrusion it will cause which will damage the character and amenity of the local area to the detriment of its enjoyment by local residents.

6.8.10. For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposed development is not sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.

7. CONCLUSION

7.2. Having regard to the relevant development plan policy considerations and the other material considerations referred to above it is considered that the proposed development is unacceptable and should be refused for the reasons set out below:

7.3. This decision has been considered using the relevant policies related to the proposal. These are; ADPP1, ADPP4, CS1, CS4, CS5, CS13, CS14, CS15, CS16, CS17, and CS19 of The West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Policy OVS5, HSG1 and TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007, Policy P1 of the Draft West Berkshire Council Proposed Submission Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (November 2015) (DPD), and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. FULL RECOMMENDATION

To **DELEGATE** to the Head of Planning & Countryside to **REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION** for the reasons set out in Section 9.1

8.1 Reasons:

1. The application site is located on a very prominent and within the countryside. The existing dwelling on the site is a modest bungalow and the new two storey replacement dwelling and carport/garage will significantly increase the built form on the site. The replacement dwelling is overly large and by virtue of its design, size, scale, bulk and massing would dominate the area and would have a detrimental impact on the open character of the area. The proposed dwelling can be viewed from surrounding vantage points including Crookham

Common Road and local, thus failing to respect the original dwelling's design, size, scale, massing, character and its setting within the site and the wider landscape and the pleasant rural character and appearance of the surrounding area.

As such, the proposal fails to demonstrate a high standard of design contrary to the requirements for high quality design within the NPPF, and the provisions of Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy. The proposal is contrary to the guidance contained in West Berkshire Supplementary Planning Document- Quality Design 'Residential Development'. The proposal is further contrary to Policies C3 and C7 of the emerging West Berkshire Council Proposed Submission Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

2. The proposed replacement dwelling and proposed garage will result in a total cumulative increase in floor space of approximately 421%, and the proposed developments are significantly disproportionate to the original dwelling. Furthermore proposed replacement dwelling and proposed garage will result in a total cumulative increase in volume of approximately 312% the proposed replacement dwelling and garage would result in a large, visually prominent, incongruous and bulky residential development within the countryside. Its size, scale, bulk and massing would result in a materially large and dominant structure within the site, not subservient or sympathetic to the original dwelling.

The design, size, bulk and scale of the proposal are contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies ADPP1, ADPP6, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026. The proposal fails to accord with Policy ENV23 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007 and the guidance contained within the West Berkshire Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Design: Part 2 Residential Development and the Replacement Dwellings and Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside (July 2004). The proposal is also contrary to Policies C3 and C7 of the emerging West Berkshire Council Proposed Submission Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

3. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, the NPPF identifies three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The policies of the NPPF, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system and emphasises that a presumption in favour of sustainable development should be the basis for every plan, and every decision. The proposal makes no significant contribution to the wider economic dimensions of sustainable development as there would only be a minor benefit in terms of additional employment during the construction period. With regard to the environmental role of fundamentally contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment. It is considered that the proposal fails to sufficiently respect and preserve the existing natural and built environment and does not protect and enhance the prevailing pattern of development in the local area and the site specifically and the character and appearance of the site itself. The proposal makes no significant contribution to the wider social dimension of sustainable development due to the significant visual intrusion it will cause which will damage the character and appearance of the local area to the detriment of its enjoyment by local residents.
4. For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposed development is not sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.