NEWBURY	78 Valley Road,	Construction of a	Delegated Refusal	Dismissed
12/02275/HOUSE	Newbury	garage, garden		8.1.13
		store, loft workspace		
Pins Ref 2187289		and associated		
		works		

Main Issues

The Inspector considered that the main issues were the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of nearby residents.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

Notwithstanding the proposed use ancillary to the main dwelling with some business storage, the size and two storey height of the proposed building with a front dormer window and porch means that it would have the scale and design of a house. Squeezed up against the back boundary of the site it would not respect the layout and appearance of other houses in the area or match the much less subordinate size of other domestic garages and garden outbuildings. Cropping the gables would not ameliorate the adverse visual impact of the building which essentially would be too big and not in keeping. It would be an incongruous feature harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal would not accord with the design aims of policy CS14 from the West Berkshire Core Strategy (CS).

Living Conditions

Due to the appeal building's position and orientation it would not impact unduly on the living conditions of surrounding neighbours with regard to light and sunlight. The positions of windows and the small size of the rooflights on the rear roof mean that the privacy of neighbours would not be materially harmed, particularly in the view of the fact that this is an area where some overlooking from and between existing windows is already prevalent. Although the appeal building would be large it would not dominate the outlook from nearby existing houses. From a living conditions point of view the appeal scheme would be acceptable. It would meet the quality of life aim of CS policy CS14.

Conclusion

All other matters have been considered. None either add to or detract from the above findings. Even though harm to the living conditions of neighbours has not been established, there would be harm to the character and appearance of the area. That is the prevailing consideration and so it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

DC