1. SUMMARY

1.1 The principal of building a dwelling on this site is acceptable and it is considered that the proposed dwelling would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of neighbouring dwellings and the street scene.

1.2 The proposed dwelling would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and it is considered that sufficient garden space would be provided for the new dwelling and No.84. Furthermore, the necessary parking requirements and noise insulation measures can be secured by condition. See conditions 8 and 9 in section 10 of this report.

It is recommended the Panel grants planning permission subject to the conditions listed in Section 10 of this report.

2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

- At the request of Councillor Bateson, only if the recommendation is to grant permission, due to concerns from residents and SPAE over the scale and bulk of the proposed development.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

3.1 The application site is currently the side/rear garden of number 84 which is located at the end of Beech Hill Road. The railway line runs past the other side of the site. The majority of houses in the area are either semi-detached or within a terrace, however, there are also some detached properties in the area. There are a mixture of materials used for the nearby properties and also a mixture of roof styles. Lynwood Crescent is a more modern development to the north of the site.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 The application is for a detached 3 bedroom dwelling within the side/rear garden of number 84 Beech Hill Road in Ascot. The proposal requires the demolition of existing garage on site. The proposed dwelling will have a ridge height of 6.5 metres, an eaves height of 5 metres and a hipped roof. The proposed dwelling will have a width of 8.1 metres, a depth of 5.1 metres and will be set 5 metres in from the front boundary (which is forward of the building line of No’s 82 and 84.
Beech Hill Road. The dwelling is proposed to be finished in brick and slate to match the neighbouring properties.

5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

National Planning Policy Framework,

5.1 Sections 17 and 56 to 68 – which requires good design and seeks a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Royal Borough Local Plan

5.2 The main strategic planning considerations applying to the site and the associated policies are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan</th>
<th>Within settlement area</th>
<th>Highways/Parking issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DG1, H10 &amp; H11</td>
<td>T5 &amp; P4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP/H2, NP/DG1, NP/DG2 &amp; NP/DG3</td>
<td>NP/T1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Supplementary planning documents adopted by the Council relevant to the proposal are:

- Sustainable Design and Construction

More information on these documents can be found at: [http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web_pp_supplementary_planning.htm](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web_pp_supplementary_planning.htm)

Other Local Strategies or Publications

5.4 Other Strategies or publications relevant to the proposal are:

- RBWM Landscape Character Assessment - view at: [http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web_pp_supplementary_planning.htm](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web_pp_supplementary_planning.htm)

6. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

6.1 The key issues for consideration are:

i Impact on the character and appearance of the area

ii Impact on neighbouring residential amenity

iii Parking and Highway safety

Design and the impact on the character of the area

6.2 As mentioned in section 3 there is a relatively wide mix of housing styles in the area and it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would appear out of place in this area or negatively impact on the character of the street scene. The proposed ridge height of the dwelling is below
that of number 84 and given the proposed dwellings location at the end of the street it would have a low impact on the street scene in general despite being set forward of the existing building line.

6.3 Concerns have been raised by the Parish Council and by the Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs (SPAE) over the height and bulk of the development and its proximity to the boundary, making the development appear oversized in relation to the size of the plot (an additional response to comments made by SPAE can be found in section 6.10 of this report). As mentioned in the above paragraph the height of the dwelling is lower than that of No.84 and the impact on the street scene is considered to be limited. Although wider than the majority of properties in the area the overall bulk of the proposed dwelling is not dissimilar to the properties along Lynwood Crescent to the north. The proposal (as amended) would have a minimum 1 metre separation distance between the proposed dwelling and the side boundary with no. 84 Beech Hill Road. There is also up to a 5 metre (and in some cases more) separation to the north, south and west boundaries. In addition the properties in the surrounding area are not set on spacious plots and it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would appear cramped on the site within the context of this area.

Impact on neighbouring residential amenity

6.4 The only immediate neighbour to the proposed dwelling is No.84. The proposed dwelling would be set 4 metres from the side elevation of this property; this distance is considered to be sufficient to avoid any loss of light to no. 84’s side windows. There are no side windows proposed in the new dwelling and as such there will be no impact on No.84’s privacy either. The closest first floor rear window serves a bathroom and can be obscurely glazed to help further protect No.84’s privacy. See conditions 6 and 7 in section 10 of this report.

6.5 The subdivision of the plot reduces the garden space of number 84, however, sufficient space still remains to provide both number 84 and the new dwelling with sufficient outdoor amenity space.

Parking and Highway Safety

6.6 There is space to provide 2 car parking spaces within the application site and a further 2 spaces within the curtilage of no 84. Details of the layout and the provision of these spaces will be secured by condition. See condition 9 in section 10 of this report.

Other Material Considerations

6.7 SPAE raised issues regarding the failure of the applicants to provide essential information such as the height of the proposed dwelling, the proposed materials and sustainability details. It is possible to measure the height of the dwelling on the plans which have been drawn at 1:100 at A2 size; the materials have also been listed within the application forms and can be controlled by way of a suitable condition. The proposed height of the dwelling is 6.5 metres and the materials are proposed to match the existing dwelling no 84.

6.8 It is not possible to require that a dwelling meets a code level 4 standard for sustainability as the government has withdrawn the code for sustainable homes. It is however possible to impose a condition (see condition 5) requiring that the applicant demonstrates compliance with the Council Supplementary Planning Guidance “Sustainable Design and Construction”.

6.9 The siting of the proposed dwelling so close to the railway line is considered acceptable subject to a condition requiring a noise impact assessment to be submitted and details of the measures to be taken to acoustically insulate all habitable rooms. See condition 8 in section 10 of this report.

6.10 Due to the size of the project there are no necessary or deliverable projects that comply with the CIL regulations and as such developer contributions are not be requested for this development.
CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Comments from interested parties

6 occupiers were notified directly of the application. The planning officer posted a statutory notice advertising the application at the site on 04.12.2015

1 letter was received from a neighbour, summarised as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The access to the land is off a public footpath which is a right of way for the railway and emergency services. Should planning permission be granted, the public footpath should be kept clear at all times and the new build should not impact on other roads in the immediate vicinity.</td>
<td>See comments from the public rights of way officer in 'other consultees and organisations' section below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property should be in keeping with the other properties in the immediate vicinity.</td>
<td>See sections 6.1 - 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consideration should be given to the sewerage system for any new build.</td>
<td>This not a material planning consideration. It is the responsibility of the applicant to consult with Thames Water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statutory consultees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunningdale Parish Council</td>
<td>Objection: The house is too large for the size of the plot and would be built on the boundary. The planning meeting was attended by a number of residents who were concerned about this development. As we looked at the powerpoint presentation created from files on the borough website there was a strong sense of lack of clarity on exactly what is proposed in terms of the location in relation to the existing garage, and height and bulk.</td>
<td>See section 6.1 to 6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other consultees and organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPAE</td>
<td>We have a number of concerns starting with the very sketchy level of detail supplied in this application for a new build which fails to provide essential detail such as the proposed height of the dwelling, the materials to be used, compliance with NP/DG5 to provide level 4 standards for sustainability and energy efficiency and so on. From the information provided with the application it would appear that the only way a detached house of this size can be fitted onto this site is by locating it hard up against the</td>
<td>See section 6.1 to 6.2 and section 6.7 to 6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
boundary instead of a minimum 1 metre gap. This is contrary to NP/DG2. The dwelling appears oversized in relation to the size of the plot and there will be very limited garden amenity space. We also have concerns about the proximity of the dwelling to the railway line and the impact of railway noise.

| **Highways** | Recommends approval subject to a condition requiring parking layouts to be submitted and approved for both 84 and the proposed dwelling prior to occupation. | Noted – see condition 9 |
| **Public Rights of Way** | No objection to the application on public rights of way grounds. | Noted |
| **Environmental Protection** | Recommends the inclusion of a condition requiring a railway noise impact assessment be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement. | Noted – see Condition 8. |

8. **APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT**

- Appendix A - Site location plan
- Appendix B – indicative layout drawings

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process and thorough discussion with the applicants. The Case Officer has sought solutions to these issues where possible to secure a development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area, in accordance with NPFF.

In this case the issues have not been successfully resolved.

9. **CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years from the date of this permission.  
   **Reason:** To accord with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development shall match those of the neighbouring property no 84 Beech Hill Road unless first otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.  
   **Reason:** In the interests of the visual amenities of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1.

3. Prior to the substantial completion of the development a water butt of at least 120L internal capacity shall be installed to intercept rainwater draining from the roof of the building. It shall subsequently be retained.  
   **Reason:** To reduce the risk of flooding and demand for water, increase the level of sustainability of the development and to comply with Requirement 4 of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document.

4. No development shall take place until a scheme for the mitigation of the effects of the development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall make provision for the delivery of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and for provision towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM). In the event that the proposal is for the physical provision of SANG, the SANG shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme before any dwelling is occupied.  
   **Reason:** To ensure that the development, either on its own or in combination with other plans or projects, does not have a significant adverse effect on a European site within the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.
5 No development shall take place until details of sustainability measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall demonstrate how the development would be efficient in the use of energy, water and materials in accordance with the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document. The development shall be carried out and subsequently retained and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure that measures to make the development sustainable and efficient in the use of energy, water and materials are included in the development and to comply with the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document.

6 No window(s) shall be inserted at first floor level in the east elevation of the dwelling without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

7 The first floor bathroom window in the rear elevation of the proposed dwelling shall be of a permanently fixed, non-opening design, with the exception of an opening toplight that is a minimum of 1.7m above the finished internal floor level, and fitted with obscure glass and the window shall not be altered without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

8 Prior to the commencement of the development a railway noise impact assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall include details of the measures to be taken to acoustically insulate all habitable rooms of the development against railway noise, together with details of measures to provide ventilation to habitable rooms. In accordance with British Standard BS 8233:2014 internal noise criteria shall be set as 35 dB LAeq, 16 h for the daytime and 30 dB LAeq, 8 h for the night-time. Individual LAmax levels during the night-time should not exceed 45 dB in bedrooms. The approved measures shall be implemented in full before the development is first occupied and retained thereafter.
Reason: To provide suitable living condition to future occupiers.

9 No part of the development shall be occupied until vehicle parking space for both No. 84 Beech Hill Road and the proposed dwelling has been provided in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The space approved shall be retained for parking in association with No. 84 Beech Hill Road and the development.
Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and to highway safety. Relevant Policies - Local Plan P4, DG1.

10 Prior to the commencement of the development details of the proposed access for both the proposed dwelling and No.84 Beech Hill Road shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access shall thereafter be retained.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic. Relevant Policies - Local Plan T5, DG1.

11 Prior to the construction of the new dwelling the side conservatory at number 84 Beech Hill Road shall be demolished in full.
Reason: To ensure that sufficient outdoor amenity space can be provided at number 84 Beech Hill Road in accordance with the core principals of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

12 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.
Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved particulars and plans.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The application proposed a two storey side / rear extension following demolition of the existing single storey rear extension and construction of a porch to the front door. The proposal is considered to respect the design and proportions of the existing dwellings and would not have a harmful impact upon the character of the area or the street scene. Officers have visited the adjoining property and it is considered that there would be no harmful impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining property to warrant refusing the application.

It is recommended the Panel grants planning permission with the conditions listed in Section 9 of this report.

2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

- At the request of Councillor Hilton, only if the recommendation is to grant permission. I have been asked by the Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council to call in this application on the following grounds. The Parish Council Planning committee considered the application to be an overdevelopment of the site, unsympathetic to the area, to have an adverse impact on the neighbour amenity and have inadequate amenity space and parking. Thus the application was considered contrary to policies NP/DG1.3, NP/DG1.4, NP/DG1.6, NP/DG3.2 and NP/T1.2 and LP H14.1, LP H14.2. Members requested a 1 metre gap at ground level should the Borough be minded to approve the application.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

3.1 The dwelling is a semi detached house set back from Lower Village Road. It is a more modern house than others in the road. Lower Village Road comprises a mix of semi detached and detached dwellings with a variety of designs.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 There is no planning history for the site.

4.2 The proposal is for a two storey side and rear extension to the semi-detached dwelling at no. 44 Lower Village Road. This will replace the existing single storey flat roof rear extension and create a new front porch.

4.3 The land to the rear of the site falls within the Green Belt but the site (and the proposed extension) is not located in this area.

5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION
National Planning Policy Framework,

5.1 Sections 17 and 56 to 68 – which requires good design and seeks a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Royal Borough Local Plan

5.2 The main strategic planning considerations applying to the site and the associated policies are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Within settlement area</th>
<th>Green Belt</th>
<th>Protected Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan</td>
<td>DG1, H14, P4</td>
<td>GB2,</td>
<td>N6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascot, Sunninghill and</td>
<td>NP/DG1.4, DG1.6,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan</td>
<td>DG3.2 and T1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Local Strategies or Publications

5.3 Other Strategies or publications relevant to the proposal are:


6. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

6.1 The key issues for consideration are:

i Acceptability of the proposed extension and impact upon the character and appearance of the area

ii Impact upon amenities of nearby occupiers

Acceptability of the proposed extension and impact upon the character and appearance of the area

6.2 The property at no. 44 is set well back from the road on a lower ground level and is part of a mixed street scene. The bulk of the extension at the rear would not be visible and therefore it is considered that the appearance of the wider street scene would not be harmed and the proposal would not result in any detrimental overdevelopment of the site.

6.3 It is noted that the semi-detached property at no. 46 has been previously extended to the side and rear at two storey level, enlarging what was a small original dwelling. It is considered that the proposed additions to no. 44 would serve to balance the established built form of the other half of this semi-detached block and would therefore be sympathetic to the character of the host dwelling and the local area where other properties have been previously modified.

6.4 There is no uniform character with some differentiation between neighbouring properties and therefore the proposal would not harm the appearance of the road. No. 44 is set back from the street so it would not dominate the street scene and the proposed side extension will be set in from the side boundary by one metre in accordance with Local Plan policy H14. This - together with the set forward position of no. 42 Lower Village Road - would prevent any harmful terracing impact and the proposal is considered to be sensitively positioned in this context, in accordance with the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan.
The existing garden area at the front of the dwelling and the woodland at the rear will not be adversely affected by the proposal (the existing area at the rear is hardstanding that forms a patio) and therefore it is not considered that the proposal would harm the character of the area identified in policy NP/DG1.3.

**Impact upon amenities of nearby occupiers and future occupiers**

Visits to both the site and the neighbouring property at no. 42 have been undertaken to assess the relationship between these properties and the potential impact of the proposals. No. 42 Lower Village Road is set significantly further forward on its plot and has a single storey rear extension with flank windows facing the site. These openings serve a kitchen/dining room and the Case Officer has been into this room to view the site from inside. From this visit it was noted that the neighbour's side windows are secondary openings and already have their light and outlook affected by the existing two storey flank wall of no. 44, as does no. 42's rear patio area immediately outside the extension. As with the rear window of the extension, the patio area will continue to receive daylight and outlook from the east side of the site. It is therefore not considered that the proposal would cause a significant additional impact on these parts of the neighbour's property in terms of loss of light or overbearing that would justify a refusal on these grounds.

No. 46 has existing two storey rear extension with a windowless flank wall along the boundary. The proposed rear extension to no. 44 will not project past the neighbour's extension and therefore will not result in any additional loss of light to this neighbour's rear garden or windows.

The proposal includes a first floor flank window but this will serve a bathroom and can be conditioned to have obscured glass - as can the other side-facing windows - so no additional impact on privacy will be caused. A further condition can also be imposed to prevent the insertion of any additional flank windows in future. See conditions 4 and 5 in Section 10 of this report.

The proposed new bedroom windows at no. 44 will be rear-facing and therefore will not have direct views over the rear garden of no. 46, with views being at an oblique angle that would not significantly affect the immediate amenity space at the rear of this neighbouring property. As such it is not considered that a refusal could be justified on the basis of loss of privacy to no. 46.

The bulk of the garden space for no. 44 currently lies to the front of the dwelling and this existing situation would be retained (the area to the rear is poor quality, being limited in size and overshadowed by trees, so the loss of some of this area as a result of the extension is not considered to have a significant adverse impact on the amount of amenity space available to the dwelling). Whilst a front garden is not ideal in terms of privacy this will replicate the existing situation at the site and therefore it is not considered that a refusal could be justified on this basis.

**Other Material Considerations**

No. 44 already has an existing driveway which opens onto Lower Village Road and the modifications to create a new parking area would not change the access point (except to make it wider for two vehicles to park side by side). The property would not be reliant on on-street parking and therefore would not conflict with policy NP/T1.2. It is considered that adequate space can be provided to accommodate the car parking for the resulting three-bedroom dwelling in compliance with the adopted parking standards in Appendix 7 of the Local Plan as amended by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Parking Strategy, May 2004.

There is woodland and two TPO trees (a sycamore and an oak) located to the rear of the site. These trees will not be adversely affected by the proposed development. The only vegetation to be removed is the small leylandii hedge running the entire length of the northern boundary of the site. Its loss will not have any impact upon the sylvan character and appearance of the area and therefore there are no objections to the proposed re-development of the property.

The impact of construction works would be temporary and cannot form part of the planning assessment.
6.14 The land to the rear of the site falls within the Green Belt but the site (and the proposed extension) is not located in this area. In this case it is considered that the proposed extension given its size and siting would not have a detrimental impact upon the character of the adjacent Green Belt in accordance with Local Plan policy GB2.

6.15 A bat survey has been submitted with the application and concludes that the building comprises negligible potential for roosting bats. Taking into account the proposed plans, the physical survey and the desk study it is considered highly unlikely that bats will be present in the property and no objections are raised in this respect. If any bats are found during construction works then works should stop and Natural England should be contacted.

6.16 Concerns about local schools being over subscribed and affordable starter homes in the village are noted. These matters are beyond the remit of the current application as the proposal is not for a new dwelling and a family could potentially occupy the existing property.

6.17 The impact on the sewage disposal cannot form part of the planning assessment. If there are issues, contact should be made with Thames Water.

7. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Comments from interested parties

6 occupants were notified directly of the application.
The planning officer posted a notice advertising the application at the site on 3.12.15

4 letters were received objections to the application, summarised as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Where in the report this is considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In the Neighbourhood Plan NP/DG1.3 states ‘Development proposals in Townscape Assessment zones Leafy Residential Suburbs and Villas in a Woodland Setting should retain and enhance the sylvan, leafy nature of the area, which, where possible and appropriate, should include the planting of trees and/or shrubs along the street and neighbouring sites boundaries.’ Had this been a new build it would not satisfy the development criteria as this is not sympathetic to a leafy residential suburb, it is purely for commercial gain.</td>
<td>6.2-6.4 6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Neighbourhood Plan NP/DG1.4 states ‘Development proposals in Townscape Assessment zones Victorian Villages must respect the form and character of the street and of the surrounding area.’ The proposed development will result in overdevelopment of the site that will make the house stand out on the road as the plans indicate it is being extended to nearly the full footprint.</td>
<td>6.2-6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neighbourhood Plan NP/DG1.6 states ‘Throughout the Neighbourhood Area, development proposals should comprise high quality design and seek to demonstrate how they will enhance the character of the local area.’ The scale and form of this development will not enhance the local area, by constructing a 3 bedroom property on a site that was originally planned to be a two-up two-down.</td>
<td>6.2-6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Page 37 of the Neighbourhood Plan states ‘That they are sensitively positioned in their plots and do not dominate, in height or bulk, the streetscape or the neighbouring properties.’ The proposed development damages the rhythm of architecture on streetscape as there will be two full height buildings side by side. The proposed design of the side elevation will mean there will be a full face up to the apex of the roof, in stark contradiction of the neighbouring property.</td>
<td>6.2-6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Page 37 of the Neighbourhood Plan states ‘Proper consideration is</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
given to the need to increase capacity for schools and/or health services.’ The local schools are heavily over-subscribed. The development is aimed at bringing in a family tenant to an area which already suffers from insufficient school places.

6. Page 20 the Neighbourhood Plan states ‘delivering a mix of housing that is affordable by “ordinary people” – the people who generally live here. Local residents wish to see more houses built “that our children could afford” – the development of this property reduces the number of affordable starter homes within the village.

7. The drawings presented provide limited details on true dimensions of the extension. They do not take into consideration scale in context to the neighbouring property. No. 44 sits back significantly from the main road and the side of the extension is overbearing onto the property at no. 42. There would be significant loss of light during afternoon periods on the patio and garden area on number 42.

8. There will be loss of light caused to no. 46 Lower Village Road.

9. Extending the property to within 1m of the boundary line will have significant impact on the use and privacy of number 42. The upstairs window will look directly onto the patio, garden and the kitchen diner. This is in breach of Local Plan Policy H14.2 ‘extensions should not cause an unacceptable loss of light or privacy to adjacent properties, or significantly affect their amenities.’

10. The proposal will create new windows closer to the boundary and will therefore result in increased overlooking of no. 46’s rear garden.

11. There is no back garden to the property. Neighbourhood Plan policy NP/DG3.2 States ‘All dwellings capable of being inhabited by families should provide sufficient private garden amenity space to meet household recreational needs. These should be in scale with the dwelling, reflect the character of the area and be appropriate in relation to topography and privacy.’ The only outside recreational space will be at the front of the property, providing no privacy for the resident.

12. The extension is aimed to mirror an extension that took place to the adjoining property which has significantly more rear land that lends itself well to a larger property.

13. Page 31 of the Neighbourhood Plan states ‘Ensuring infrastructure is put in place to support the proposed development’ Current drawings indicate that the property will be building on top of the current sewer. This sewer has flooded the property at no.44 and no.42 on three separate occasions over the last 4 years and the sewer infrastructure is not sufficient to cope with the proposal.

14. Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP/T1.2 states ‘Development proposals must, wherever possible, provide adequate parking on-site and not rely on on-street parking. Development that includes a reliance on parking on existing streets shall not be permitted where the streets are narrow, already heavily trafficked, have identified parking issues, or where such on-street parking would impact on the safety of road users or adversely impact the character of the area.’ Lower Village Road suffers from poor parking facilities and is heavily trafficked as a ‘rat-run’ through the village. No.44 is situated at a ‘pinch-point’ of the road and there are concerns over access and the safety of pedestrians and cyclists if the number of occupants and cars increases.
15. Constriction works at no. 44 with associated vehicles would cause disruption along Lower Village Road. 6.13

16. The Tree Plan does not appear to accurately reflect the proximity of the extension to the protected trees at the rear. 6.12

### Statutory consultees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Where in the report this is considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascot and Sunninghill Parish</td>
<td>Ascot and Sunninghill Parish Council have objected on the grounds that the application represents overdevelopment of the site, is unsympathetic to the area, will have an adverse impact on neighbour amenity and inadequate amenity space and parking, contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policies NP/DG1.3, NP/DG1.4, NP/DG1.6, NP/DG3.2 and NP/T1.2 and LP H14.1 and LP H14.2. Members requested a one metre gap at ground level should the Borough be minded to approve the application.</td>
<td>This is discussed in detail in the assessment. It is noted that a one metre gap between the proposed flank wall and the boundary has been shown on the submitted plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other consultees and organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Where in the report this is considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree Officer</td>
<td>No objections - The only vegetation (trees/shrubs/hedges) to be removed is the small leylandii hedge running the entire length of the northern boundary of the site. Its loss will not have any impact upon the sylvan character and appearance of the area and therefore there are no objections to the proposed re-development of the property.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAE</td>
<td>The Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs (SPAE) have objected on the grounds of conflict with Local Plan policy H14 and Neighbourhood Plan policies DG1, DG3 and EN4. It is considered that there would be an unacceptable loss of privacy, light and openness to no. 42. The size of the extension will represent overdevelopment of the existing dwelling and fails to respect the character of the immediate area. The extension would reduce the size of the small back garden and would result in cramped amenity space that fails to respect the character of the area. As the roof space will be accessed a bat survey is required. The proposed parking would be harmful to highway safety.</td>
<td>The applicant has submitted a bat survey with the application. These matters are discussed in detail in the Officer assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A - Site location plan
- Appendix B – Plans and elevations
Documents associated with the application can be viewed at http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/pam/search.jsp by entering the application number shown at the top of this report without the suffix letters.

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process and thorough discussion with the applicants. The Case Officer has sought solutions to these issues where possible to secure a development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area, in accordance with NPFF.

In this case the issues have been successfully resolved.

9. CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED

1 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development shall be in accordance with those specified in the application unless any different materials are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1.

3 Prior to the substantial completion of the development a water butt of at least 120L internal capacity shall be installed to intercept rainwater draining from the roof of the building. It shall subsequently be retained.
Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding and demand for water, increase the level of sustainability of the development and to comply with Requirement 4 of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document.

4 The ground floor and first floor windows in the east side elevation of the extension (facing no. 42 Lower Village Road) shall be of a permanently fixed, non-opening design and fitted with obscure glass and the window shall not be altered without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

5 No further window(s) shall be inserted at first floor level in the east flank elevation(s) of the extension without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To prevent overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers. Relevant Policies - Local Plan H11.

6 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.
Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved particulars and plans.
SITE PLAN

44 LOWER VILLAGE ROAD
SUNNINGHILL BERKS SL5 7AU
DATE OCT 2015 SCALE 1:1250
DRAWING NO 44 LVR/1

plans ahead by emapsite

Prepared by: sarah payne, 22-09-2015
Existing Bay
Demolished and two new windows installed.

PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR

- No. 46

PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION

NOTES:
- Roof to be new gray color.
- Composite slates to original and new roof. Code 4 lead to all change in levels and valley details.
- External walls to be finished smooth render painted with smooth masonry paint.

PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION

PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR

Timber framed porch with slate roof.

PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATION

Obscure glass.

drawing number
44LVR/4
44, Lower Village Road, Ascot

Scale 1:500

PARKING SHOWN FOR
TWO VEHICLES

PARKING PLAN
44 LOWER VILLAGE ROAD
SUNNINGHILL BERKS SL5 7AU
DATE OCT 2015 SCALE 1-500
DRAWING NO 44 LVR/6