



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2022

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W0340/D/22/3302187

Byways, Hillside, Burghfield Common, Reading, West Berkshire RG7 3BQ

- 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 Olivia and Adam Hewitson against the decision of West Berkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00386/HOUSE, dated 10 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is Alterations and Extension to existing detached property. Demolition of existing garage and porch to form new porch and glazed link extension. Two Storey Rear and Side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Alterations and Extension to existing detached property. Demolition of existing garage and porch to form new porch and glazed link extension. Two Storey Rear and Side extension at Byways, Hillside, Burghfield Common, Reading, West Berkshire RG7 3BQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00386/HOUSE, dated 10 February 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: 21011 AL (0) 001B (Location Plan); 21011 AL (0) 002 (Existing Site Block Plan); 21011 AL (0) 003 (Proposed Site Block Plan); 21011 AL (0) 020 (Existing Elevations 01); 21011 AL (0) 021 (Existing Elevations 02); 21011 AL (0) 120C (Proposed Elevations 01); 21011 AL (0) 121C (Proposed Elevations 02); 21011 AL (0) 010 (Existing Ground Floor Plan) 21011 AL (0) 011 (Existing First Floor Plan) 21011 AL (0) 110E (Proposed Ground Floor Plan); 21011 AL (0) 111D (Proposed First Floor Plan); 21011 AL (0) 012 (Existing Roof Plan); 21011 AL (0) 112B (Proposed Roof Plan); 21011 AL (0) 130A (Proposed Sections).
 - 3) All new external work and finishes and work of making good shall match existing original work adjacent in respect of materials used, detailed execution and finished appearance except where indicated otherwise on the drawings and application hereby approved.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached two storey cottage constructed of red brick with a slate tile roof. There are elements which are painted render, and I was able to see additions to the dwelling, primarily the flat roofed garage to the side. The site is located at the end of a private driveway, with the garden and parking areas wrapping around the site. There is parking to the front of the property, which is located at the end of the private drive. I was able to see more modern dwellings to the rear of the site, with more period dwellings located along the private driveway leading to the appeal site. The appeal site is not easily visible from the main road and is surrounded by dwellings on two sides, with open countryside beyond.
4. The development would introduce a two storey extension to the existing dwelling, to the front and side of the property in an L shaped form. This would also include a glazed link to the new porch. The development would match the height of the existing dwelling, and make use of matching materials, as well as modern glazing to the gable end.
5. The proposal whilst relatively large, makes use of the existing dwelling within its plot shape and size, respects the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, and takes its cues from the layout of nearby dwellings. The proposal would not detract from the original character or appearance of the dwelling. The use of modern glazing, oak timber framing and modern materials such as zinc would help to clearly identify the proposed development as later additions. The L shape of the development would limit the impact to the house and garden as a whole, whilst retaining an adequate amount of garden space to the side and rear.
6. Whilst the extension would be sizeable, it remains within the confines of the space associated with the dwelling and its plot, and this combined with its location at the end of a private driveway would respect the character and appearance of the local area. The proposal would be at best glimpsed and not easily visible from the street and would not be dominant nor interfere with the overall character and appearance of the local area, and the L shape would provide some element of definition to the termination of this private driveway at the appeal site. The scale and location of the development, retained within the existing front garden and parking area would ensure that the plot and area would retain its open character beyond.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would comply with Policies CS14 and CS19 of the Core Strategy¹, which expect that (amongst other things) new development represents high quality and sustainable design, being of scale, appearance and design in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern and character. I have also had regard to the Council's SPG² and Quality Design SPD³ which acknowledge that larger front extensions at sites where this would affect detached dwellings in substantial plots which are set well back from the

¹West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 (July 2012)

² West Berkshire Supplementary Planning Guidance; House Extensions (July 2004)

³ West Berkshire Quality Design Supplementary Design, Part 2 Residential Development (June 2006)

road may be acceptable. The development would also accord with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, relating to design.

Other Matters

8. I note that there are concerns raised with regard to the impact of construction vehicles crossing the public footpath along Reading Road to access the site. At the time of my site visit I was able to see that there was no dropped kerb at this location, and that the access did not appear to be well used, or easily available to be used. Even so, the appeal site includes access from Hillside, which is passable to vehicles. Any construction or alterations to the public highway for the purposes of the construction of the development would require separate agreement with the local highway's authority.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard timescale for implementation condition, it is necessary to attach a condition to confirm the approved drawings in the interests of certainty. Given the nature of the proposed development, I have considered it necessary to attach a condition relating to the materials to be employed in the construction.

Conclusion

10. I therefore conclude that, subject to the above conditions and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR