
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2016

by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/16/3158107

Katura, Fifield Road, Fifield, Maidenhead, Berkshire, SL6 2NX

- 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 A Kolelis against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 16/01201, dated 7 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage to the side of the existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached garage to the side of the existing house at Katura, Fifield Road, Fifield, Maidenhead, Berkshire, SL6 2NX, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01201, dated 7 April 2016, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan, KFR/1.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Reasons

3. Katura is a single storey detached dwelling which sits in a ribbon of development along Fifield Road. The garage which forms the basis of this appeal had, at the time of my site visit, been erected. The proposal therefore seeks the retention of this.
 4. The appeal site is located in the settlement of Fifield and falls within the Green Belt. Policy GB1 of The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (2003) (LP) sets out that development within the Green Belt will be strictly controlled. The Council is of the opinion that as the detached garage is a new building in the Green Belt it is therefore inappropriate development.
 5. The garage is a free standing single garage positioned very close alongside the existing dwelling. It has a low pitched roof, is constructed of matching materials to the main house, and its size and scale is subordinate. It is exactly the sort of structure which is very commonly associated with domestic dwellings for uses such as the secure parking of a vehicle undercover, and also for domestic storage.
-

6. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt. However, as set out in paragraph 89, an exception to this is the extension or alteration of a building, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Katura has not been extended previously. Although the garage is not directly attached to the house, its close proximity, and use in connection with it, leads me to conclude that it should, in this case, be regarded as an extension to the main dwelling. In any event, if the garage had been attached to the house it would not be a disproportionate addition, when compared to the form, bulk and height of the main house, and as such would accord with Greenbelt Policy. That the garage before me is not attached is therefore of no material consequence.
7. For these reasons the garage would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and as such would comply with Policy GB1 of the LP which, by its reference to Policy GB4, allows extensions to existing dwellings where they are not disproportionate.

Other Matters

8. The Council raise the impact of the garage on openness. However this is implicitly taken into account in the exceptions within paragraph 89 of the Framework, therefore, in light of my findings above, there is no need for a subsequent assessment of the effect of the development on Green Belt openness.
9. Although it did not form part of the Council's reason for refusal the officer's report raises concern about the loss of space between Katura and the adjacent property Ashberry. Some of the properties in the row to which Katura belongs have gaps between them, others do not. Maytrees and Sunnymead, located just to the south of Katura, more or less completely fill their plots. Sunnybend, also just to the south, has a similar single garage to the side to that proposed, which also results in much of the plot at ground floor level being filled. Given the existing character of the area I therefore find no conflict with Policies DG1 or GB2 of the LP which, amongst other things, require development to not be harmful to character.
10. The Council refer to a detached outbuilding at the rear of the property which does not have the benefit of planning permission and as such is to be subject to an investigation by the Council's enforcement officers. This matter is not for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under S78 of the above Act which is focussed on the planning merits of the proposal before me.

Conditions and Conclusion

11. It is not necessary to attach the standard time limit condition or require the use of matching materials as the development has already taken place. I have, however, included a plans condition for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. For the reasons given, and subject to this condition, the appeal is allowed.

Hayley Butcher

INSPECTOR