

NEWBURY 18/02578 Pins ref: 3220095	4 The Court Enborne Place Newbury Berkshire RG14 6BD	2 nd floor loft conversion	Dele. Refusal	Dismissed 07.5.2019
----------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------

Main Issue

The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would be appropriate given the context of the surrounding area.

Reasons

The proposed box dormer window would be level with the ridge of the host property and extend almost the full width of the roof. This would be a large square addition to the existing sloping roof, changing its profile and appearance dramatically. It would result in a large bulk, unbalancing and dominating the appearance of the property and the rear elevation of the terrace which is otherwise characterised by plain and angled lines.

Whilst set in from the eaves and end elevation, the large scale of the proposed addition would be exacerbated by the size of the new window which would be significantly larger than the other windows on this elevation in width and height. This would be stark and appear incongruous within the simple rear elevation. The proposed positioning of the window, which does not sit centrally within the proposed dormer or align with the windows below, further adds to the harm to the appearance of the host dwelling.

Policy CS14 West Berkshire Core Strategy (CS) (2006-2026) (2012) requires new development to demonstrate high quality. The Council also has an adopted House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) (2004). This guides dormer windows to be designed to keep their size to a minimum and their position as low as possible on the slope of the roof. It also advises that the design should reflect that of the main roof with the new windows to match the window style of the house. The proposal before the Inspector would fail to do this and would harm the character and appearance of the host property.

The site is set within a private corner plot and away from the main streetscene. However, there are very few other dormer windows in the surrounding area, which is characterised by mostly simple, plain roof slopes. The main addition is proposed to the rear with limited public views, but it would be visible in the rear gardens and circulation spaces of neighbouring properties. Whilst wider views are limited, Policy CS19 of the CS requires development to be appropriate in terms of location, scale and design in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern and character. Given the plain roof slopes in the wider character context, the proposed large box dormer covering most of the width of the property, and to its full ridge height, would fail to be appropriate in scale and design. It would therefore not be appropriate given the context of the surrounding area.

Whilst there are limited wider views, and the Inspector noted that no objections were received from neighbours or the Town Council, the proposal would not comply with these policies of the development plan. He was aware that the proposal would provide additional floorspace for a local family and would not result an unacceptable level of overlooking of neighbouring properties. However, planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Inspector did not consider that the design requirements of policies CS14 and CS19 are outweighed by other material considerations in this case.

Therefore, due to the size, positioning and design, the proposal would be contrary to policies CS14 and CS19 of the CS, the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the SPG. Taken together, these require development to demonstrate high quality design that respects the character and appearance of the area and is appropriate within its context.

Other Matter

The Inspector's attention was brought to another box dormer close to the appeal site. He did not have full details that led to this being accepted. In any event, the fact that apparently similar development may have

been permitted is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. He had considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

For the reasons given above, the Inspector concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

DC