

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W0340/D/16/3162186

2 The Triangle, Upper Basildon, Reading, RG8 8LX

- 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 Ms K Greenslade against the decision of West Berkshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/01918/HOUSE dated 8 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is reconstruction of existing residential outbuilding with new single storey link to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for reconstruction of existing residential outbuilding with new single storey link to existing dwelling at 2 The Triangle, Upper Basildon, Reading, RG8 8LX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 16/01918/HOUSE dated 8 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, or as set out on the planning application form dated 8 July 2016.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 15119.101; 15119.102; 15119.103; 15119.104; 15119.105; 15119.108; 15119.109; 15119.110; 15119.111 and 15119.112.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - a) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area, with particular regard to its location within the North Wessex Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and
-

b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents of Nos 1 and 3 The Triangle, with particular regard to loss of light (daylight and sunlight), overshadowing and loss of outlook.

Reasons

Issue a) Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a mid-terrace cottage in a short terrace of three two storey dwellings, which together with another separate dwelling occupy a triangular shaped area of land within the settlement boundary of Upper Basildon. The terrace of three cottages front the eastern side of The Triangle, Blandy's Lane, and the rear garden of the appeal property extends to the south western boundary, where there is an existing single storey outbuilding and adjacent smaller shed. Further to the north-west on this boundary is a detached garage serving the appeal property. The property benefits from a generous garden area which extends to the rear of No 3 The Triangle. Given the nature of the site, both the front and the rear boundaries are seen within the street scene. The development within The Triangle as well as in the surrounding area is an attractive collection of dwellings, together with various outbuildings, with a range of scales, plot sizes, including more traditional and more modern designs, most of which are within a verdant setting. The appeal site, and the settlement of Upper Basildon, lies within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
4. The reconstruction of the existing outbuilding would be sited on a similar footprint on the south-west boundary, but would be longer and higher than the existing outbuilding and shed. However, I consider that its scale and proportions would still be modest and it would not appear visually dominant in the street scene. It would continue to be seen as a modest building, which together with the existing garage serving the appeal property and development at No 1 The Triangle punctuate this boundary, with planting in-between.
5. I agree that the linking element from the replacement outbuilding connecting to the existing cottage would be of an irregular floor plan, but it would be single storey and subservient in scale and height both to the existing property and the replacement outbuilding. Given the siting of the linking element within the site, and the development which has been undertaken at No 1 The Triangle, I consider that it would be barely perceived in street scene views.
6. Although the existing outbuilding and shed is and the replacement outbuilding would be seen in general street scene views, I do not agree with the Council that the existing development is and the proposed development would be highly visible from the public right of way BASI/22/1, particularly given the intervening boundary treatments. I am satisfied that where external views of the proposed development would be available, its modest scale and traditional design would complement the existing varied pattern of development found within the local vicinity and which contribute to the character and appearance of this part of the settlement.
7. I have had particular regard to the location of the site within the AONB where great weight should be given to conserving its landscape and scenic beauty. However, given the location of the site within the existing settlement, and the modest nature of the proposals, I am satisfied that the proposed development

would not be visually intrusive and would be seen within the context of existing built development. The landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB would not be harmed.

8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the local area, with particular regard to its location within an AONB. There would be no conflict with Policies ADPP5, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire (2006-2026) Core Strategy (Core Strategy), the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2006 – Quality Design: Part 1 Quality Design and Part 2: Residential Development and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004: House Extensions (SPG), as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), all of which seek a high quality of development which respects local distinctiveness, including the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.

Issue b) Living Conditions

9. No 1 The Triangle is the adjacent cottage on the southern side of the appeal property, with its garden extending to the southern corner of the 'triangle'. It has had alterations and building works on the western side of the property partly up to and partly within close proximity of the common boundary with the appeal property. The proposed development at No 2 would extend built development along or close to this shared boundary, which is irregular in shape. However, given the scale and height of the proposed built forms which would be on the north and north-west side of the extended property at No 1, I do not consider that the proposed development would materially affect light (daylight and sunlight) to the rooms at No 1 closest to the common boundary.
10. Given the existing built form at No 2, including the existing outbuilding and the modest scale and height of the proposed new development, I am also satisfied that the proposed development would not materially alter the existing outlook from the small number of windows that face towards this boundary in the neighbouring property at No 1.
11. No 3 The Triangle lies on the north side of the appeal property with a terrace to the rear and most of its garden area is on the northern side of the property. There is a two storey rear projection at No 2 which is not proposed to be altered. The existing conservatory beyond this two storey element would be replaced with new single storey accommodation. The proposed extension would be to the south-west of No 3. However, given its proposed height and scale, and the existing boundary treatment between the properties, I do not consider that the proposed development would exacerbate the existing situation in terms of effect on daylight and sunlight and overshadowing to the rooms facing to the rear at No 3 and its rear terrace area. The outlook from the rear rooms of No 3, including at first floor level, is predominantly towards the open rear garden of the appeal property and this would not be materially changed with the proposed development. The replacement outbuilding would be larger than the existing outbuilding and shed, particularly at the north western end. However, it would, in my view, be a sufficient distance from No 3 so that there would be no material effect on outlook.
12. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would not materially affect the living conditions of the neighbours at both No 1 and No 3 The

Triangle, with particular regard to loss of outlook, loss of light and overshadowing. There would be no conflict with Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy and the SPG, as well as the Framework, all of which seek to protect the amenities of existing and future occupiers.

Conditions and Conclusion

13. With regard to conditions I agree with the Council that the proposed materials should match the existing in the interests of protecting the appearance and character of the property. However, I have noted that the Appellant proposes different materials for the doors and windows to the existing materials. I consider that these proposals would respect the character and appearance of the existing property and locality. I have therefore worded the condition to require the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development to match those used in the existing building, or as set out on the planning application form. I also agree that a condition to list the approved plans should be imposed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR