
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022 by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W0340/D/21/3286807

8 Laylands Green, Kintbury, Hungerford RG17 9XH

- 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 & Mrs Jackson against the decision of West Berkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01738/HOUSE, dated 29 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of loft space to form habitable room, incorporating rear dormer window and 2 No. Velux roof lights to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located within a wider development of semi-detached and terraced dwellings of a similar two-storey scale, design and materials. The unaltered roofs of these properties create a consistent appearance which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Whilst set slightly down from the ridge and in from both sides, the proposed rear dormer would be substantial in scale. The form, window design and proportions of the dormer would relate poorly to the main roof and window style, particularly as the existing first floor only has one window and the dormer would have three. Whilst the materials proposed would match the existing property, due to its scale and bulk, the resultant visual impact of the dormer would still be significant, and it would overwhelm the existing rear elevation and dominate the rear roof plane. Consequently, it would not appear subservient to the host dwelling. Therefore, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing property.
6. Due to the large gap between No 8 and No 10, part of the dormer would be visible from the highway, in addition to being visible to the surrounding

properties. Given the lack of visible roof additions in the vicinity it would stand out in marked contrast to the otherwise largely unaltered roofscape and would be prominent and incongruous feature in the street scene. Therefore, the proposed dormer would also detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

7. I acknowledge that No 12 has been extended through a side/rear extension in addition to bay window and porch extensions. The parts visible from the road are however modest in scale and clearly subservient to the main dwelling. Therefore, the form and visual impact of that development is materially different to the scheme before me.
8. The appellant has also referred me to other dwellings with visible dormers in Kintbury. I have not been provided with details of how these came to be built, however each of these properties is of a materially different design and character to the appeal site, and not seen in the same context. Furthermore, none are in the area around the appeal site, which has its own distinct character. Therefore, while there are dormers elsewhere in the settlement, they have not altered the context of the appeal site and do not justify granting permission for otherwise harmful development.
9. Accordingly, the proposed dormer would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 Development Plan Document (2012) which set out that development should be of high quality and appropriate in terms of design, and respect and enhance the character and appearance of the area. There would also be conflict with the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004) which advises that whilst its guidance is not inflexible, flat roofed dormers should normally be avoided and that the design of dormers should reflect the main roof and window style of the house.

Other Matters

10. While the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbours or result in any other harm, this is to be expected of any well-designed development and does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

L McKay

INSPECTOR