

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: 21st October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/16/3149232

Oak Cottage, 1 High Street, Sunningdale, Ascot, SL5 0LX

- 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 T Malhas against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 16/00159, dated 13 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached 2 storey replacement dwelling with associated off road parking, access and landscaping following the demolition of the existing buildings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a triangular patch of land which sits on the junction of Station Road and High Street. At present a bungalow occupies the site which addresses High Street. In general, the properties along the side of High Street to which the appeal property belongs are single or one-and-a-half storeys tall. On the opposite side of High Street, which sits at a lower level, there are taller two storey dwellings.
 4. The proposal before me seeks to replace the existing bungalow with a two storey detached dwelling. Although the proposed dwelling would sit lower than the adjacent property 3 High Street, it would be taller, by some 490mm, and would have a higher eaves level. It would also be visually bulkier than No 3, and the other properties along this side of High Street, due to it having a full second storey. A two storey dwelling in this position would therefore be at odds with the pattern of development along this section of High Street, where taller properties are located on the opposite side on lower ground, and lower single storey and chalet style properties are on the side of the appeal site.
 5. The proposed dwelling would also be quite deep. I note that in order to restrict the ridge height a flat crown roof would be used. However, roof forms of this nature do little to disguise the overall scale and bulk of the dwelling itself which would be out of character with the more restrained size of properties along this
-

- side of High Street. Such a roof form would also be completely out of character with the predominantly pitched roof forms which surround the site.
6. The above points, in conjunction with the very prominent corner location of the appeal site, and the slightly forward siting of the proposed dwelling in relation to No 3, lead me to conclude that it would be an overly dominant and harmful addition to the immediate street scene which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Existing hedging at the appeal site would do little to mitigate this harm.
 7. It would therefore conflict with policies DG1, H10 and H11 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (2003) which, amongst other things, require development to be compatible with the established street facade, having regard to the scale, height and building lines of adjacent properties. I also find conflict with Policies NP/DG1, NP/DG2 and NP/DG3 of the Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2026 (2014) which similarly require the bulk and scale of new development to respect the existing character of areas.
 8. The appellant refers to 1 Station Road as being very dominant and makes the point that the ridge of the proposed dwelling would be lower than this property by 3.35m. 1 Station Road, however, forms part of a different street scene and it also sits on much higher ground. It does not, therefore, justify the proposal given the harm I have found.
 9. There is no objection from the Council in respect of any harm to the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. I also note that the proposal before me has been reduced in size from a previously refused planning application (ref 15/02876/FULL). These matters do not, however, alter my findings above. Finally, the appellant states that the refusal of this application is at odds with other consented applications in the borough. However, no specific examples have been provided, and, in any event, each application and appeal must be determined on its own planning merits.
 10. For the reasons set out above the proposed replacement dwelling would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Hayley Butcher
INSPECTOR