

NEWBURY 13/00713 Pins Ref 2209783	3 Wenden Rd, Newbury Mrs A Fox-Jones	Section 73A: Variation of Condition 2 of approved plans: amended dormer design.	Delegated Refusal	Dismissed 6.2.14
--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------

Preliminary Matters

The application, the subject of the appeal, concerns extensions that were constructed following a previous grant of planning permission. The roof extension was not built in accordance with the approved plans and the current proposal seeks to amend a condition specifying these by substituting revised drawings.

However, the purpose of such a condition is to give an opportunity to seek minor amendments to an approved scheme before it is carried out. Given that the development has already taken place, the Inspector treated the appeal as being concerned with a refusal of planning permission, as shown in the heading above, rather than as indicated on the appeal and application forms.

He also considered that the development can most appropriately be described as given in the heading above. Despite the project having already been completed the Inspector, nevertheless, considered the appeal strictly on its own planning merits.

Main Issue

The main issue in the consideration of this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, street scene and locality.

Reasons

The appeal concerns a detached property where the extended main roof has a flat part on top but with slopes around the outside that form the dominant aspect when seen from ground level. The new dormer additions are all in relatively close proximity to the top of the main roof, as well as being flat roofed and significantly wider than their height. As a result they appear unacceptably bulky and box-like, jarring with the sloping character of the part of the roof in which they are set. The side additions also have glazed areas significantly greater than those of the single openings in the walls below.

In consequence, although the materials used are acceptable, the dormer additions are poorly related to the host dwelling appearing incongruous and overly dominant. Because of their pitched roofs the previously approved dormer additions would have had a different form while also being noticeably less bulky and, therefore, lend no significant support to the appeal.

The design of buildings in the locality varies and there are dormer extensions found elsewhere. However, the latter features tend to be of a noticeably lesser bulk and scale, while also generally being more appropriately proportioned with a greater ratio of height to width, than those this appeal is concerned with. This is the case even where they have a flat roof, as with those on the relatively large building visible from the rear garden at the appeal site. Moreover, the dormers to the sides at No. 3 Wenden Road are readily seen from the street, while that at the rear is visible from other properties, so that their disharmonious presence is apparent in the vicinity.

As a result it is concluded that the new dormer additions have harmed the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality, as well as the street scene. The development has failed to achieve the high quality of design sought by West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026), July 2012, Policy CS 14. The unacceptably dominant nature of the additions is contrary to the general thrust of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance, House Extensions, July 2004, regarding such development. There is also conflict with the core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework that planning should always seek to secure high quality design.

The absence of any objections from interested parties is acknowledged but this does not, in itself, confer acceptability. The Appellant suggests that the approved scheme was deficient in a number of respects such as the stability of the building and cill heights. Nevertheless, such matters have been addressed at the undue expense of the quality of the environment in this instance. Because of the harm that has resulted and taking account of all other matters raised, it is concluded that there are no considerations sufficient to justify permitting the development and the appeal fails.

DC