

THATCHAM 11/00574/HOUSE Pins Ref 2156683	Bramley Cottage, Crookham Common Road, Crookham Common, Thatcham RG19 8EA (Mr P Martin and Ms E Clarke)	Proposed alterations and extension to semi detached house.	Delegated Refusal	Dismissed 5.9.11
--	---	---	----------------------	---------------------

The Inspector considered the principal issues to be the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of semi detached dwellings of which the appeal dwelling is part and the surrounding area.

Given the site characteristics the Inspector regarded the dwelling as being within the countryside. The Inspector found no reason to disagree with the Council's figures or approach that the proposal would result in an extension of approximately 119% in volume and about 112% in floor area in accordance with the Council's SPG Replacement Dwellings and Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside. The Inspector therefore found in favour of the Council's view that that the development was contrary to the intentions of the aforementioned SPG which seeks to prevent disproportionate extensions and criterion d) of Policy ENV24 which seeks to resist development which would result in an extended dwelling disproportionate in size to the original.

The Inspector noted that the extended dwelling would appear as a materially larger built form and would occupy a greater proportion of the plot than the existing dwelling. The Inspector recognised that the proposed extension would be seen from surrounding properties and that the effectiveness of boundary treatment in winter months would be reduced. The erosion of some of the present space between the building and the eastern boundary of the plot would also reduce some of the characteristic openness and increase the visual impact of the extended building within its rural surroundings. The Inspector therefore found the proposal to conflict with criterion (c) of LP Policy ENV24 which seeks to ensure that the extended building would not have a materially greater or more harmful impact on the rural character of the area.

The Inspector acknowledged that the width, height, size and scale of the extension and lack of any set back of the gable element from the present front gable the extended dwelling would be seen to dominate the overall appearance of the pair, notwithstanding extension to the adjoining property, model cottage. The Inspector noted that this would be contrary to the intentions in the House Extensions SPG to prevent side extensions unbalancing the appearance of a semi detached pair of houses.

The Inspector concluded that the overall design would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, pair of semi detached dwellings of which it is part and the surrounding area. The proposal would fail to accord policies designed to protect the general openness of the countryside and resist disproportionate extensions to dwellings in the countryside. Additionally, because the proposal would unbalance the appearance of the pair of properties it would represent

design which was inappropriate in its context and would detract from the character and quality of its rural surroundings.

The appeal was dismissed.