



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2019

by Tim Crouch DipUD MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Tuesday, 07 May 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W0340/D/18/3219372

Winterley House, Kintbury Road, Kintbury, Hungerford RG17 9SY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs M McNally against the decision of West Berkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01506/HOUSE, dated 30 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is the extension of existing property with part single and part two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building, which is a non-designated heritage asset, and the wider North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Reasons

3. Winterley House is a handsome two storey over basement detached brick building with Georgian origins. It has been extended and remodelled over time during different eras to become a substantial and mostly symmetrical building of square proportions. The existing north, west and south elevations have an attractive regular appearance due to the height, length and depth of the elevations which results in a squareness of built form. This is enhanced by the arrangement of the size, positioning and design of windows and door openings. Whilst not a Listed Building the Council consider the building to be a non-designated heritage asset.
4. The building sits comfortably surrounded by substantial grounds. It is positioned centrally on its north, east and south boundaries which gives it a spacious character and open setting within the enclosed plot. It has an existing single storey ancillary brick building separated and distinct to the east.
5. The proposal seeks to add a two storey extension to the east elevation which would also include a significant linear ground floor projection. The proposed two storey extension element seeks to extend along from the existing ridge height and the building line of the historic building. As a result, the scale of the proposed two storey addition would not appear subservient and would have an

- unbalancing impact on the appearance of the Heritage Asset. This would be exacerbated by the introduction of a curved element on the northern corner which would be out of keeping with the existing architectural style. The detailing on the southern elevation would also accentuate this harm by introducing a new fenestration pattern which would be at odds with the existing regular window and door arrangement.
6. The proposed single storey projection would introduce a strong linear element contrary to the compact, square form of the existing dwelling. This would have a dominating impact given its substantial length, especially when compared with the existing footprint. This would not therefore appear a subservient addition. This length of built form extending to close to the eastern boundary would also erode its spacious setting which complements the Heritage Asset. This harm would be exacerbated by the proposed design, including uncharacteristic features such as an external chimney stack, and its L-shape form, despite quality materials being proposed.
 7. Whilst wider views are limited, the proposed extension would extend close to the boundary and would be visible from the public domain. The size and scale of the extension would be recognised and it would detract from the appearance of the wider area. The proposal would also therefore fail to conserve the special qualities of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
 8. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the non-designated Heritage Asset, adversely affecting its significance, and would fail to conserve the special quality of the AONB. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies ADPP1, ADPP5, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) (2012), policies C3 and C6 of the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) (2017), the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2014-19 (2014), the West Berkshire House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004) and the Council's Quality Design West Berkshire Supplementary Planning Document (Part 2) (2006).
 9. Taken together, these policies require extensions, amongst other objectives, to be subservient to the original dwelling and designed to be in character with it, to have no adverse impact on the historic interest of the host building and to conserve the local distinctiveness of the AONB.

Other Matters

10. My attention has been brought to another two storey extension permitted by the Council. However, limited details have been provided. In any event, the fact that apparently similar development may have been permitted is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

11. I note that no objections were received to the proposal from local residents. However, the absence of opposition to this development in circumstances when I have found it would be harmful to a Heritage Asset and the wider AONB does not persuade me that it would be appropriate for me to allow this appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Tim Crouch

INSPECTOR