

HOLYBROOK 12/00416/FULD  Pins Ref 2181857	4 Bainbridge Road, Calcot Mr C Keen	Demolition of side garage and erection of one 2-bed house	Delegated Refusal	Dismissed 14.1.13
--	---	---	----------------------	----------------------

The main issues of this appeal were considered to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the adequacy of private amenity space for both the existing and proposed dwellings.

Bainbridge Close forms part of a modern residential development comprising a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced family homes. No 4 forms half of a semi-detached pair and occupies a corner site between Dorking Way, the main through road, and Silbury Close.

The Inspector considered the change to a terrace of three dwellings would make good use of the land and would be fully in accord with the character and appearance of the area. It was considered that the additional hard standing to serve the existing dwelling would not unacceptably detract from the appearance of the area, as sufficient space would remain at the side of the dwelling to provide a grassed area that would maintain the open character of the junction.

The Inspector noted that the Council's 2006 Supplementary Planning Document – *Quality Design* (SPD) indicates that as a general guide dwellings of this type should have a minimum of 70 sq m outdoor amenity space and that as a result of the proposal both the existing and proposed dwelling would be below that (42sqm and 46sqm respectively). It was noted that a number of nearby dwellings have gardens of a similar size to those proposed, however each of those dwellings are set back from their access road and has an area of semi-private amenity space at the front that enhances the general amenities of the occupiers of those dwellings and to some extent off sets their small rear gardens. In contrast both No 4 and the proposed dwelling would be fully exposed to the public highway at both the front and (as regards the proposed dwelling) the side.

The Inspector felt that whilst the SPD figures are produced as a general guide the proposed gardens would be materially smaller than the recommended minimum size and although the appellant has demonstrated that gardens of the size proposed can accommodate a shed and a washing line with a sitting out area, it was considered that they would be of insufficient size to meet the combined functional and amenity requirements of a private rear garden as envisaged by the SPD and that the small size of the gardens were indicative of a poor standard of amenity in conflict with CS Policy CS14.