
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W0340/D/19/3226874

10 Tyne Way, Thatcham, RG18 3DS

- 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 N Jewell against the decision of West Berkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00333/HOUSE, dated 30 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "Demolish Existing Rear Conservatory, Utility Room and Side Garage. Construct New Rear Orangery Extension, Double Storey Side Extension and Alterations".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to demolish existing rear conservatory, utility room and side garage. Construct new rear orangery extension, double storey side extension and alterations at 10 Tyne Way, Thatcham, RG18 3DS, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/00333/House, dated 30 January 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, Unnumbered Site Location Plan, Unnumbered Proposed Block Plan, Proposed 4 - Sheet 1 - Revision 1, Proposed - Sheet 1 - Revision 2, and Proposed 4 - Sheet 1 - Revision 2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. It is clear that the Council considers the proposed orangery to the rear of the appeal dwelling is acceptable. It also considers the impact of the proposal on the living conditions for occupants of neighbouring properties is acceptable too.

Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling house located on the south side of Tyne Way, in an area of modern housing of varying styles. The south side of Tyne Way is made up of semi-detached properties, such as the appeal dwelling, chalet style semi-detached properties and a single detached property. There are regular spaces between these properties, although the gap between Nos 7 and 8 is narrower. Larger, detached properties of different design and brick colour, sited closer together, occupy the north side of Tyne Way.
5. The two-storey side extension would replace the existing garage and would extend, as the garage does, up to the party boundary. However, the proposed drawings show the extension would be set back by from the front elevation of the dwelling. Both the eaves and ridge line would be set down in relation to the host property. The design of the extension is a proportionate addition that would achieve an appropriate level of subservience to the host building, thereby respecting its character and appearance.
6. The new extension would reduce the gap between the host property and its neighbour No 9. However, the retained gap would be similar to that at Nos 7 and 8 and the extended dwelling would not appear cramped within the street scene. Whilst the appearance of the area would change as a result of the proposal, this would not be to a degree that would cause harm, given the characteristics of the area and the context within which the extended dwelling would be viewed.
7. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host property and the area. There would be no conflict with Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 – 2026 or the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance and the Quality Design SPD, which amongst other things, seek to ensure good design and that new development is appropriate in terms of location, scale and design in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern and character. Moreover, there would be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to add to the overall quality of the area and be visually attractive, amongst other matters.

Other Matters

8. The Council suggest that an extension to one property should not prejudice a proposal for a similar extension to a neighbouring dwelling. In this case the Council's concerns are clear, that in allowing this proposal the neighbour at No 9 could seek to do the same, resulting in the complete loss of space between the properties. In determining this appeal, I can only assess the proposal before me and consider its effects in relation to the current context. Moreover, each case must be considered on its own merits. Any future proposal would need to be considered by the Council at the relevant time. This is not a determining factor in this appeal.

Conditions and Recommendation

9. The Council has suggested a number of conditions it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal is allowed. A condition is necessary to ensure that

the development is carried out in accordance with the approved drawings. A condition requiring the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development to match those used in the existing building is also necessary and reasonable to ensure that the materials are sympathetic to, and respect, the character and appearance of the host building and area.

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission be granted.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR