

13/01229 Pins Ref 2209397	32 Salcombe Rd, Newbury, Berkshire RG14 6ED	Construction of a 2 storey extension on the front elevation with solar PV panels. Extension to replace existing single storey garage.	Dele. Refusal	Dismissed 14.01.2014
---------------------------------	--	---	---------------	-------------------------

Main Issue

The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

The host property is a two storey semi-detached house set within a road which contains a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced houses. The properties are generally arranged upon consistent building lines with relatively small but nevertheless distinguishable gaps between one another.

From the evidence before the Inspector, in particular the Council's delegated report, he considered the Council's primary objection to the proposal remains the absence of a significant set-back within the design of the proposed extension.

The proposed two storey extension would incorporate a very small set-back from the front of the existing building which would fall substantially short of the recommended minimum distance of 1m set out within the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004 (SPG). This promotes subservient extensions and those which avoid the creation of a "terracing" effect within the street scene.

He found that the gaps between the buildings were still in evidence within the street scene and play an important role in the differentiation between the different house types along Salcombe Road. He did not agree that the house types are intermingled to such an extent that they are not visually distinct from one another.

The proposal would result in an extension which, due to its significant size and prominent massing would unbalance the predominant symmetrical form between the host property and its attached neighbour at No. 30. In addition, the absence of a significant set-back from the front of the existing building would result in a "terracing" effect which would be harmful to the street scene and the character of the various building styles and types contained therein.

At his site visit, he noted the development at No. 46 which had a larger set-back from the front building line than the proposal which provides it with a more sympathetic and subservient appearance. The Inspector had not been provided with sufficient detail on the planning decision and street scene contexts of the other examples of development provided by the appellant and therefore he could not apply any significant weight to this in his decision.

In conclusion, the Inspector considered the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would thereby conflict with policies CS14 and CS19 of West Berkshire Core Strategy 2012 and the guidance contained within Quality Design – West Berkshire Supplementary Planning Document (Parts 1 and 2) which, amongst other criteria, seeks to support high quality residential development which respects and enhances the character of the area.

Furthermore it would also conflict with paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks high quality design and the SPG for the reasons he outlined above.

Other Matters

Although he recognised the obvious conflict between providing an additional bedroom at this property and the significant set-back sought by the SPG, the Inspector could only give this aspect of the appellant's case limited weight and it is outweighed by the harm to the character of the area he had outlined above.

The Inspector had not been provided with all of the evidence before the previous Inspector (APP/W0340/D/12/2173307) however it is clear from his decision that he also had significant concerns over the impact of the development upon "terracing" within the street scene. He therefore considered his decision was consistent with that of his colleague.

Whilst he noted and understood the frustration the appellant has experienced through successive planning applications and now a second unsuccessful planning appeal, the Inspector could only take into account the planning merits of the particular appeal before him.

For the above reasons, and having taken all evidence before him into account, the appeal was dismissed.

DC