

Item No	Application No. and Parish	8/13 week date	Proposal, Location and Applicant
(1)	18/02575/HOUSE Newbury	23 November 2018 Extension of time 31 July 2019	Demolition of existing outbuildings and garage, new extension linking to house comprising double garage, store and family room with bedrooms above and attic den. The Gardeners Cottage, Tydehams, Newbury Mr and Mrs Arnold

To view the plans and drawings relating to this application click the following link:
<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=18/02575/HOUSE>

Recommendation Summary: **The Head of Development and Planning be
authorise to grant planning permission**

Ward Members: Councillor A. Abbs
Councillor D. Marsh
Councillor A. Vickers

**Reason for Committee
Determination:** More than 10 letters of objection

Committee Site Visit: Thursday 18th July 2019.

Contact Officer Details

Name: Ms Lydia Mather
Job Title: Senior Planning Officer
Tel No: (01635) 519111
E-mail Address: lydia.mather@westberks.gov.uk

1. Site History

104197, 1976, approval of alterations and new building work to extend existing dwelling.

132392, 1988, approval of renovation of external stores to form training room, changing room, workshop and double garage.

2. Publicity of Application

Site Notice Expired: 29 October 2018

3. Consultations and Representations

Newbury Town Council:

Objection. Matters raised:-

This proposal is for a three-storey extension of 4500 square feet to a two-storey house of 2800 square feet, which would be equipped as if it were a new dwelling. It would be disproportionate to the present dwelling. Fronting onto Tydehams, it would damage the spacious and open appearance characteristic of the road. Any extension should be constructed into the garden and not along the Tydehams frontage, which would constitute a bad precedent. The proposed use of render would be incompatible with the neighbouring properties. The neighbouring Brockwell House would be faced with a wall of 600 square feet two metres from their dwelling.

Highways:

No objection.

Tree Officer:

No objection.

Archaeology:

No objection.

Natural England:

No comment to make.

Ecology:

No objection subject to condition following receipt of full dawn and dusk bat emergence survey.

Correspondence:

10 letters of objection. Matters raised include:-

Extension of a size that is it capable of being a separate dwelling; resulting floorspace would be more than double and extension is not subservient to existing dwelling; the length of extension along the boundary in close proximity to Brockwell House impacting on the occupants amenity and causing a loss of gap between properties that would harm the character of the area and impact on the streetscene; proposed external materials are out of keeping with other properties and increases the prominence of the extension; the size, design and massing are not in keeping with that of the surrounding development; light pollution from the rear elevation glazing; and loss of parking area to the front of the property.

4. Policy Considerations

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.

4.2 The statutory development plan comprises:-

The West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026
Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2006-2026
The West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007
The South East Plan 2009 Policy in so far as Policy NRM6 applies
The Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire 2001
The Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998

4.3 The following Core Strategy policies carry full weight and are relevant to this application:-

National Planning Policy Framework Policy
Area Delivery Plan Policy 1: Spatial Strategy
Area Delivery Plan Policy 2: Newbury
CS 1: Delivering New Homes and Retaining the Building Stock
CS 13: Transport
CS 14: Design Principles
CS 17: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
CS 18: Green Infrastructure
CS 19: Historic Environment and Landscape Character

4.4 The Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document policies carry full weight and are relevant to this application:-

C1: Location of New Housing in the Countryside
P1: Parking Standards for Residential Development

4.5 The saved policies of the West Berkshire District Plan carry due weight according to their degree of conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework. The following saved policies are relevant to this application:-

TRANS.1: Meeting the Transport Needs of New Development
OVS.5: Environmental Nuisance and Pollution Control
OVS.6: Noise Pollution

4.6 Other material considerations include government guidance, in particular:-

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019
The Planning Practice Guidance Suite
Manual for Streets
Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

- 4.7 In addition the following locally and regionally adopted policy documents are material considerations relevant to this application:-

Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Design 2006
Supplementary Planning Document: Sustainable Drainage 2017
Supplementary Planning Guidance: House Extensions

5. Procedural Matters

- 5.1 Under the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule adopted by West Berkshire Council and the government Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations extensions to dwellings are liable for CIL where they increase internal floor space by 100m² or more.

6. Description of Development

- 6.1 The proposal includes demolishing the single storey building which is detached from the main house and comprises double car port and 2 store rooms/garaging, as well as a garden shed to the rear of the property and the hedge on 2 sides of it. Over the majority of the footprint of the garaging building would be a two storey extension which would join the existing dwelling approximately half way along the front east elevation.

- 6.2 The form of the extension is difficult to describe. In general terms it would be at right angles from approximately the centre of the existing dwelling which runs north/south. The part of the extension closest to the eastern boundary would protrude slightly to the front elevation and be slightly greater in height than both the existing dwelling and the other parts of the extension. To the rear of the proposed extension there is a single storey element closest to the eastern boundary. There would also be a gap between the existing dwelling and west side of the proposed extension (behind the link section joining them together).

- 6.3 In terms of measurements:

Extension footprint: 145.8 m²;
Extension maximum height: 8m;
Extension height to eaves: 5m;
Extension proximity to east boundary at closest point: 4.5m;

Footprint of existing dwelling and garage building 209.5 m²;
Height of existing dwelling: 7.7m;
Height of existing eaves: 5m;
Proximity to east boundary of existing garage building: 1m;

Total footprint of the retained existing and the proposed extension: 310m².

- 6.4 Also shown on the plans is an area of stone paving to the rear of the extension and a new close-boarded fence and pedestrian gate access of 1.8m height running from the east elevation of the proposed extension to the boundary.
- 6.5 The proposed materials are: Render to extension and existing dwelling walls above damp proof course, below that multi- red brick; plain clay roof tiles to match existing

with lead coloured Samofil; white upvc window frames; timber frame and aluminium powder coated external door frames.

- 6.6 The internal layout would provide a double garage, living room, dining room, shower room, hallway and staircase at ground floor level. On the first floor would be 2 additional bedrooms with en-suites and walk-in wardrobes, landing, and staircase to attic storage and den. The extended property would have a total of 7 bedrooms and 5 bathrooms (including the shower room at ground floor).

7. Consideration of the Proposal

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

- 7.1 Policy ADPP1 of the Core Strategy directs new development to within settlement boundaries. Policy C1 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD states that there is a presumption in favour of development within the settlement boundaries listed. The site is within the settlement boundary of Newbury, the main urban area of the district. The principle of a house extension is therefore established under development plan policies ADPP1 and C1.
- 7.2 A matter raised in the correspondence received on the application was that the extension is of a size and design that it could be a separate dwelling. The application has been made under a householder application, which the Development Management Procedure Order defines as being for development to an existing dwellinghouse or within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to it. It does not include applications for change of use or to change the number of dwellings in a building.
- 7.3 Were the extension proposed to be occupied separately from the existing dwelling a change of use under a full planning application would be required. Similarly if the extension were to be granted planning permission and subsequently occupied as a separate dwelling then such occupation would be in breach of planning and open to planning enforcement action.

DESIGN AND IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA

- 7.4 The site is in an area of potential archaeological interest. The Council's Archaeologist was consulted on the application. They advised no objection to the proposed extension. They note that part of the Gardeners Cottage proposed to be demolished appears to have been an outbuilding to the adjacent Brockwell House. It may be shown on the 3rd Epoch OS map of 1911, when the larger property was called Red House. Where there have been several alterations since, including the erection in the later 20th century of Red House Cottage, and then the evolution of Gardeners Cottage the Council's Archaeologist does not believe there are any archaeological implications to the proposal.
- 7.5 A number of development plan policies relate to design and impact on the character of the area. Policy ADPP1 states that the scale and density of development will be related to the site's current or proposed accessibility, character and surroundings.
- 7.6 Policy CS14 states that in demonstrating good design this relates not only to the appearance of a development, but the way in which it functions. Considerations of

design and layout must be informed by the wider context, having regard not just to the immediate area, but to the wider locality. Development shall contribute positively to local distinctiveness and sense of place.

- 7.7 Policy CS19 seeks to conserve and enhance the diversity and local distinctiveness of landscape character, with particular regard to the sensitivity of the area to change, and to new development being appropriate in location, scale and design in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern and character. Policy CS19 also requires development to have regard to the Quality Design Document which identifies the area immediately around the site and Tydehams as semi-rural.
- 7.8 The Supplementary Planning Guidance on house extensions states that they should be designed in relation to the whole street or group of surrounding buildings. In terms of design it states that an extension should reflect and add to the appearance of the house and its surroundings. In general it states that extensions should be subservient to the existing dwelling and not dominate the original.
- 7.9 As noted by the Council's Archaeologist, and raised in letters of objection, the site used to be part of Red House, now Brookwell House. Brookwell House, Monk's View and Tydehams Corner show on pre-1974 maps. The other dwellings around Brookwell House, on the private road off Tydehams and including the application site, are subsequent developments.
- 7.10 These developments are fairly typical of the semi-rural character identified in the Quality Design document as: detached 2 - 3 storey dwellings; at irregular intervals; of individual and varying styles; located off a main road; set back from footways with hedging on boundaries; parking and driveway within the setback; generous gardens with mature landscaping; a variety of materials which sometimes included painted render; generally pitched roofs; and part of a transition from more urban to rural character.
- 7.11 For the area around the site, Brookwell House is set such that the front elevation fronts the highway, whilst Gardeners Cottage, Long Acre to its north, Bay Tree House to its west are at an angle to the highway. There is no defined building line or particular pattern in the siting of the dwellings in their plots.
- 7.12 In this context the proposed extension would be set back from the highway, more so than parts of the existing dwelling. Whilst it would have a somewhat complicated roof form, the roof maintains the pitch and hipped roof of the existing dwelling. It would also have similarly sized window openings and pattern of fenestration as the existing dwelling, with the exception of the south rear elevation. There is no architectural detailing on the existing property that would be desirable to be maintained or replicated on the proposed extension.
- 7.13 With regard to external materials these would match with the notable exception of the walls which are proposed to be rendered on the whole of the property. It is understood that no other property off the private road is rendered, although there is at least one example along Tydehams. As there is no particular architectural detailing that is desirable to be retained, and as painted render is identified as a material used in semi-rural character areas such as this, the case officer is of the opinion that render is acceptable given the context of the irregular and low density pattern of development. A condition requiring specific details of the render can be

applied to control the type and colour of the render. Overall the siting and design of the proposed extension are considered in accordance with the development plan policies, documents and guidance.

- 7.14 With regard to the impact of the development on the semi-rural character of the area objections include the loss of gap between Gardeners Cottage and Brookwell House, that the extension should be to the rear of the property, and that the floorspace, height, scale and massing of the extension is disproportionate to the existing dwelling.
- 7.15 In terms of the gap, at 4.5 metres from the east side boundary the extension will be a lot closer than the 18 metre gap from the boundary to the two storey existing dwelling and will close off part of the street view over the existing garage building. However, 4.5 metres separation from the boundary would still be clearly within the site and not result in an urbanising terracing effect with Brookwell House. The mature landscaping towards the highway in-front of both properties would also continue to separate the two properties when viewed from the highway.
- 7.16 With regard to the extension not being located to the rear of the property, the application is to be determined as presented. The proposed location is relatively enclosed. It would not be particularly visible from the west as it is set behind the existing dwelling, and there is mature landscaping to the east boundary. The extension would also be set 21 metres back from the highway.
- 7.17 The Council's development plan policies do not include a floor space limit on extensions. There is also no policy requiring development to specifically maintain certain features of existing housing developments. There are guidelines on house extensions and the types of factors to be considered.
- 7.18 This guidance states that normally the basic shape and size of the extension should be subservient. In this instance the extension is not subservient in terms of height or footprint, but the guidance does not preclude this. The guidance states that the pitch of the extension roof match the existing main roof, which is the case with this application. With regard to front extensions the guidance states that larger front extensions may be acceptable where the dwelling is detached and set well back from the road in a good sized plot, where there are a number of similar extensions in the immediate area or where an adjoining dwelling or garage already projects to the front. In this instance the extension is to the front of the dwelling but to the side of the plot. The dwelling is detached and set well back from the road and in a good sized plot. It does not project forward towards the road.
- 7.19 It is acknowledged that the extension is large in footprint and size. However, due to the siting of the extension, the size of the overall plot, and the setback of the extension from the highway, the proposal is not considered to result in an overly dominant dwelling that would harm the character of the semi-rural area or be contrary to development plan policies and guidance on design and character. A condition for details of the specification of the render would be applied. With this the proposal is considered in accordance with development plan policies on design and character of the area.

AMENITY

- 7.20 Policy CS14 states that development make a positive contribution to quality of life. The supplementary planning document, Quality Design, and guidance on House Extensions includes factors to consider with regard to overlooking, loss of light, and private garden sizes.
- 7.21 The site is a large plot and the proposed extension would not result in a reduction of useable private garden area that would be below the 100m² identified in the Quality Design SPD.
- 7.22 The proposed extension would not have any first floor east side elevation windows that might overlook Brockwell House. There are no other properties within the 21 metres identified in the Quality Design SPD that might otherwise be affected by direct overlooking from the proposed extension.
- 7.23 With regard to loss of light and overshadowing the extension would be to the west of Brockwell House. The extension would be sited roughly forward of and alongside the single storey part of Brockwell House closest to the boundary, understood to be garaging and storage. The part of Brockwell House to the rear of the garaging and set further from the boundary with windows facing the boundary would not be in-line with the extension. The siting of the proposed extension is therefore considered not to result in loss of light or overshadowing of the dwelling of Brockwell House. The extension will cause some additional overshadowing in the afternoon/evening towards the front garden/driveway and garaging, but would not affect the main private garden area of Brockwell House.
- 7.24 Overall the impact on the amenity of Brockwell House, whilst it would be visible, would not result in direct overlooking, loss of light into the dwelling, or overshadowing that would be harmful in impact when considered against the Quality Design and House Extension guidance.

HIGHWAYS

- 7.25 Policies TRANS.1 and CS13 of the Core Strategy relate to highways considerations, and policy P.1 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD sets out the parking requirements for residential development. Highways have been consulted on the application and raise no objections with regard to traffic impacts and onsite parking provision. As such the proposal is considered in accordance with development plan policies on highways matters.

BIODIVERSITY

- 7.26 Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy requires biodiversity assets to be conserved and enhanced. As part of the proposal involves demolition a Phase 1 ecological assessment was submitted. This indicated that there were bats on site and an extension of time was agreed for detailed dawn and dusk emergence surveys to be undertaken, which can only be done between May and August.
- 7.27 The submitted survey found the roof voids to the existing dwelling had evidence of bat activity, whereas the garage building and garden shed proposed to be demolished had no evidence of bats and limited potential to host bats. The dusk

emergence and dawn re-entry surveys recorded passes of 4 different species of bats through the site. The bat day roost on site is not considered by the ecologist who undertook the survey to be affected by the proposed development.

- 7.28 The recommendations of the ecological report were that a bat box be installed on a nearby tree before any works to commence so that it can be used for any bats found during the works. The bat box shall be retained after the works to provide additional ecological enhancement. Furthermore, a working method statement to ensure any bats found are not harmed shall also be followed during the works. With regard to nesting birds, hedge and vegetation removal shall either not be undertaken between April and August, or hedges and vegetation are to be inspected prior to removal. The bat mitigation and enhancement measures can be secured by conditions and with these the development is in accordance with policy CS17.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

- 7.29 Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy sets out that green infrastructure, including tree preservation orders (TPO), is to be protected and enhanced by development. The Council's Tree Officer has been consulted on the proposal. They note that there are a number of TPO trees in the area; a group TPO close to the site and 2 individual trees within the site. The proposal is not considered to impact on these protected trees. The loss of some of the other garden shrubs/hedges which may need to be removed or pruned as part of the development they consider acceptable.
- 7.30 Overall the Tree Officer has no objection, subject to an informative to ensure protection of the trees during the construction works. As such the proposal is considered to accord with the development plan with regard to green infrastructure.

8. Conclusion

- 8.1 As the site is within the settlement boundary of Newbury the development plan policies are such that the principle of a house extension in this location is acceptable. The consultation responses from the Council's departments on transport, parking, archaeology, green infrastructure and ecology confirm that the proposed development raises no issues on these matters, with the proviso that conditions are applied to secure the ecological enhancements.
- 8.2 With regard to impact on quality of life it is the case that the proposed development would be visible from the adjacent Brookwell House in terms of outlook. In terms of the criteria set out in the Quality Design SPD there would be no direct overlooking from the proposed extension into the property of Brookwell House. Nor would there be any loss of light into the property itself of Brookwell House. There will be overshadowing over part of the front garden and side of Brookwell House, but this would affect a small area of the overall private garden area of Brookwell House.
- 8.3 The proposed extension would only be connected to the main house by way of a linking structure. Such an arrangement, whilst less common with more modern houses such as this, is not particularly uncommon where the existing dwelling is a heritage asset, in order to protect the integrity of a listed building. Whilst it is not necessary to protect the integrity of the existing dwelling in this instance, it does not necessarily follow that the two parts of the house would be separate dwellings.

Indeed as previously outlined a householder application/permission cannot grant change of use which would be required in order to occupy part of a house separately from the rest. In terms of development plan policies the layout of the extension with the link to the main house is considered acceptable.

- 8.4 The proposed extension would be large. As outlined it would be an increase in footprint of 310m², approximately double that of the existing dwelling. The plot in which the dwelling is set is large, the extension would be set back from the highway and the roof would have the same pitch as the existing. Combined, these factors are considered to indicate that in this particular instance the site is capable of accommodating the extension without harming the character of the area.

9. Full Recommendation

- 9.1 The Head of Development and Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

10. Conditions

10.1 Commencement

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

10.2 Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings 2018-212-002F titled proposed block plan and proposed plans and elevations received on 15 November 2018 and the GS Ecology bat survey report ref ECO2301 received on 20 June 2019.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

10.3 Materials

No development shall take place until a schedule of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply irrespective of any indications as to these matters which have been detailed in the current application. Samples of the materials shall be made available for inspection on request. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason: To ensure that the external materials are visually attractive and respond to local character in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, Policies ADPP1, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design 2006, and Supplementary Planning Guidance House Extensions 2004.

10.4 Ecology

No development shall commence until a bat box (Schwegler 2f or similar) has been installed on a suitable tree onsite by a licensed ecologist. The bat box will be used to receive any bats captured during the works to the building and shall remain on site for 5 years.

Reason: To provide biodiversity enhancements in accordance with policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

10.5 Informative on tree protection

Tree protection precautions informative note:

- To ensure that the trees, which are to be retained, are protected from damage, ensure that all works occur in a direction away from the trees.
- In addition that no materials are stored within close proximity i.e. underneath the canopy of trees to be retained.
- Ensure that all mixing of materials that could be harmful to tree roots is done well away from trees (outside the canopy drip line) and downhill of the trees if on a slope, to avoid contamination of the soil.
- To ensure the above, erect chestnut pale fencing on a scaffold framework at least out to the canopy extent to preserve rooting areas from compaction, chemicals or other unnatural substances washing into the soil.
- If this is not possible due to working room / access requirements The ground under the trees' canopies on the side of construction / access should be covered by 7.5cm of woodchip or a compressible material such as sharp sand, and covered with plywood sheets / scaffold boards to prevent compaction of the soil and roots. This could be underlain by a non-permeable membrane to prevent lime based products / chemicals entering the soil
- If there are any existing roots in situ and the excavation is not to be immediately filled in, then they should be covered by loose soil or dry Hessian sacking to prevent desiccation or frost damage. If required, the minimum amount of root could be cut back to using a sharp knife.
- If lime based products are to be used for strip foundations then any roots found should be protected by a non-permeable membrane prior to the laying of concrete.

DC