



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W0340/D/22/3305304

2 Goodwin Close, Calcot, Reading RG31 7ZW

- 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 Kirk Lim and Ms Jun Yong against the decision of West Berkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00797/HOUSE, dated 29 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front/side extension; a double storey side and rear extension; and a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front/side extension; a double storey side and rear extension; and a single storey rear extension at 2 Goodwin Close, Calcot, Reading RG31 7ZW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00797/HOUSE, dated 29 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 794/098, 099, 100, 101, 102 and 103.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The West Berkshire House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004 ('SPG') states that its advice should be applied flexibly, but that extensions should usually be in harmony with, and subservient to, the original building, and should have regard to their context. Whilst it appears to be directed primarily at new housing, Part 2 of the Council's Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document 2006 ('SPD') sets out the need for good design which pays appropriate regard to an area's character and appearance.
4. The dwellings at this end of Goodwin Close are two storey, detached and set back from the road. They display some variety in terms of their form and are

finished in brickwork of varying hues. Compared to the host, the adjacent property at No 2A has a taller, more steeply pitched roof, whilst to the other side No 4 has a longer two storey front face. On the opposite side of the road the dwellings at No 1 and No 1A have a slightly different half-hipped form and are faced in lighter masonry.

5. As a result of this scheme, the two storey proportions of the host would be extended across its front face. However, viewed from the streetscene, the side extension's fenestration, and its shape and horizontal emphasis, would reflect the form and appearance of the host. Whilst it would not be set down or set back, its front face would be less than half that of the host, thus ensuring that it would not appear over-dominant. The form of the proposed two storey gabled rear extension would also broadly reflect the style and appearance of the host, and it would also be faced in matching materials.
6. The Council raises no significant concerns to the proposed single storey front and rear extensions. Having regard to cumulative impacts, given their modest scale and clearly subordinate size, neither do I.
7. For those reasons, the proposed extensions would not appear out of keeping with the existing dwelling and, in the context of this varied streetscene, they would not appear over-dominant or incongruous.
8. Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 (2012) sets out the need for high quality design that respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons above, the scheme would not conflict with that approach, nor with the similar approach in the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework'). Whilst the scheme would not appear fully subordinate to the host, it would not conflict with the broad stance in the SPG and the SPD. The appeal will therefore be allowed.
9. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the Framework's tests. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of good design, a matching materials condition is also necessary.
10. The Council has suggested a pre-commencement condition requiring the submission and approval of a tree protection scheme. However, as acknowledged by the Council's Tree Officer, two elms which were protected by a Tree Preservation Order are no longer present, and I observed on my visit that a Cherry tree in the front garden had been removed. The firs on the plot's western boundary are of limited public amenity value, and the only significant tree on its rear boundary is in the north-eastern corner, a significant distance from the proposed extensions. Consequently, I am not persuaded that significant trees would be adversely affected by the proposal and the Council's suggested condition is unnecessary.
11. Summing up, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR