

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2017

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/16/3164115

18 Kingswood Creek, Wraysbury, Staines TW19 5EN

- 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 Hothi Design Build against the decision of Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 16/02695, dated 16 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2016.
 - The development is proposed roof extension and front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Hothi Design Build against the decision of Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

3. The appeal site lies within the Green Belt. The main issues are therefore:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development for the purposes of development plan policy and the National Planning Policy Framework;
 - The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt;
 - If the development would be inappropriate, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, as to amount to very special circumstances necessary to justify it.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development?

4. The appeal site comprises a detached residential dwelling. The property is set on a private road and extends almost the full width of the plot. The host property and surrounding dwellings are all set in similar sized plots.
 5. The Framework identifies that new buildings within the Green Belt are inappropriate unless, amongst other things, it involves the extension of a building. This is provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
-

6. Policy GB4 of the Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (LP) 2003 advises that the Council will only approve proposals for the extension of an existing dwelling where it would not cause a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The supporting text to the policy goes on to note that floorspace will be a guiding factor, as well as the bulk and scale of the proposal and their effect on openness.
7. The officers report advises that the original property has a floorspace of 178m². The report goes on to note that planning permission has recently been granted for an extension which would see the floorspace increase by 42% when compared to the size of the original dwelling. The proposal before me would add a further 80m² of floorspace. This would represent an 87% increase in floorspace when compared to the size of the original dwelling.
8. When compared to the size of the original dwelling house, the proposal would in my view represent a disproportionate addition in both scale and bulk to the host property. It would by definition result in development which would be inappropriate and thus harmful to the Green Belt. For these reasons, I conclude the proposal would therefore be contrary to policy GB4 of the LP as well as paragraphs 88 and 89 of the Framework.

Effect on Openness

9. The Framework makes it clear that one of the essential characteristics of Green Belt is their openness. The proposed roof extension and dormers would significantly increase the bulk and mass of the dwelling. This increase in the bulk and massing of the property would be particularly evident from both the front and rear elevations as shown by drawing PA2/PP/2632-05.
10. As a result, I therefore conclude the proposal would be in conflict with policy GB2 (A) of the LP as it would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. Furthermore, it would also conflict with paragraphs 88 and 89 of the Framework.

Other Considerations

11. The appellant has made reference to other properties along Kingswood Creek. From my site visit, I was able to see that there are a number of existing roof dormers in the area. This matter constitutes a reason to conclude the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the Green Belt. Whilst this may be the case, it does not represent a benefit to weigh in favour of the development.
12. I have taken the above matter into account. However, I do not find that there are any issues either collectively or individually which would clearly outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and loss of openness. Consequently, no very special circumstances exist to justify allowing the development.

Conclusion

13. For these reasons, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

C Masters

INSPECTOR