

**EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE  
ON 27<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2013**

**UPDATE REPORT**

<b>Item No:</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>Application No:</b>	<b>13/02394/HOUSE</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>21-36</b>
-----------------	------------	------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------	--------------

**Site:** Little Paddocks, Woolhampton Hill, Woolhampton

---

<b>Planning Officer Presenting:</b>	Cheryl Willett
-------------------------------------	----------------

**Member Presenting:**

---

<b>Parish Representative speaking:</b>	Mr Tony Renouf, Woolhampton Parish Council
--	--

<b>Objector(s) speaking:</b>	N/A
------------------------------	-----

<b>Supporter(s) speaking:</b>	N/A
-------------------------------	-----

<b>Applicant/Agent speaking:</b>	Mr Andrew Robinson and/or Mr Ian Lasseter
----------------------------------	---

<b>Ward Members:</b>	Councillor Irene Neill
----------------------	------------------------

**Update Information:**

**1.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

1.1 Since the committee report the Council has received the comments from Woolhampton Parish Council. The parish council support the application, noting that the proposals will improve the design and look of the existing build. The parish council were disappointed that previous applications have been refused.

1.2 No other comments have been received.

**2.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND CONSIDERATION**

2.1 Following the committee site visit a plan of the front elevation was provided illustrating a change to the ground floor windows serving the utility/boot room and w.c. The windows have been enlarged and are more in line with the other windows proposed throughout the house. The applicant states that this plan was supposed to have been sent with the application. The changes are considered to be an improvement on the small windows previously proposed. The changes do lessen the extent of the blank façade, and the previous small windows were considered to increase the prominence of the size of the dormer window. Upon reflection of the proposed changes whilst these are an improvement it is still considered that the dormer, and

overall two storey extension, is quite prominent. The proposed extensions would be materially greater than the original dwelling.

- 2.2 To reflect the amendment to the ground floor windows, the sentence 'the large dormer window and two small windows on the ground floor of the extension are not considered to be generally in keeping with the style of the fenestration across the remodelled house' will be removed from the reason for refusal.

### 3.0 CLARIFICATION

- 3.1 The table outlined in the committee report at 6.1.3 has been updated to be more consistent and to outline the volume of the existing dwelling as provided by the architects.

	Original House	Existing	11/00575/HOU SE	12/01144/HOU SE	13/02394/HOUSE
Floor Area	154sqm	444.4sqm	566.37sqm	569sqm	444.4sqm (taking into account the 110 sqm to be demolished)
Percentage Increase over original	-	188%	268%	269%	0% on existing, and 188% on original.
Volume	477m <sup>3</sup>	1341.2m <sup>3</sup>	1988.76m <sup>3</sup>	1901m <sup>3</sup>	1386.2m <sup>3</sup> (taking into account the 295m <sup>3</sup> to be demolished)
Percentage Increase over original	-	181%	316%	298%	3.4% on existing and 190% on original.

- 3.2 The figures for the three planning proposals reflect the floor area including the existing dwelling and the extensions proposed as part of those particular planning applications. The table in the main committee report showed the difference between the original floor space and the floor area of the proposed extension and previous extensions, for 11/00575/HOUSE and 12/01144/HOUSE.

- 3.3 The volume for the current application reflects the overall volume of the extended dwelling, taking into account previous extensions and the volume to be removed from the proposed demolition. As the volume of the existing dwelling was shown to be incorrect on the table presented in the main committee report, Members will note that the existing dwelling is much larger in volume terms than previously presented. The increase over the existing is smaller than the originally calculated 4.8%, at 3.4%, though larger on the original than previously calculated 114%, at 190% in volume. It is still clear that the proposed extensions, when taken with existing extensions, are in excess of the 50% increase on the original house as advocated by the Council's SPG on Replacement Dwellings and Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside.

- 3.4 The design considerations as outlined in the committee report are relevant and remain unchanged.

#### **4.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.1 The recommendation for refusal remains unchanged, and the reference to the dormer and ground floor windows are removed from the reason for refusal, as follows.
- 4.2 Little Paddocks is located outside of any defined settlement boundary, in the countryside in planning policy terms. Guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the Core Strategy 2006-2026 requires the achievement of high quality design appropriate to their setting. Policy ENV24 of the West Berkshire Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007 seeks to prevent the over development of sites in the countryside and a material increase in visual intrusion into the countryside.

Little Paddocks has been greatly extended and its extensions already represent disproportionate additions. Although the proposal involves the demolition of 110 square metres of floor space and its replacement with 110 square metres of floor space as this area would be placed mainly into a two storey extension this would increase the bulk of the dwelling, and would be visible from public vantage points. The nil increase over the existing dwelling in terms of floor space does not negate the significant change in character from the character and appearance of the original dwelling, which was a relatively modest house. Volume would be increased, and overall the extensions would still be regarded as disproportionate additions, greater than a 50% increase as advocated by the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Replacement Dwellings and Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside', July 2004. When considering the design aspects the proposed extensions would be materially greater than the original dwelling. Despite the changes and improvements made to the schemes previously refused and dismissed on appeal they are not considered to outweigh the harm created by the proposal.

The proposal therefore fails to comply with guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Policy ENV24 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007), West Berkshire Council's Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (Part 2) (June 2006), West Berkshire Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance notes 'House Extensions' and 'Replacement Dwellings and Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside' (July 2004).