



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2017

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

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

Decision date: 14 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/16/3165965

25 Moor Lane, Maidenhead, Berkshire, SL6 7JX.

- 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 Shea against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application ref: 16/02364, dated 15 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and amendments to fenestration on side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - a) The effect of the proposed single storey extension upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.
 - b) The impact of the extension upon the living conditions of nearby residents.

Reasons

- a) *Effect upon character and appearance.*
3. 25 Moor Lane comprises a semi-detached, post-war bungalow located within a run of similar dwellings.
 4. At the time of my site visit a single storey extension had recently been added to 23 Moor Lane next door (planning permission ref: 16/02162). A copy of the approved drawings has been provided to me indicating a maximum rearward projection of just under 4m, compared to the 9m as proposed by the scheme before me.
 5. I am satisfied that although the proposed extension would project into the rear garden area, adequate amenity space would remain to serve the bungalow as extended.
-

6. I accept that the roof of the proposed extension is lower than that of the host building. Nevertheless, having regard to its size and rearward projection it would dominate the rear garden and appear as an excessive and incongruous addition that would be both out of scale with and at odds with the modest credentials of the bungalow as originally constructed. For these reasons, the proposals would fail the test of subservience.
7. The extension would not be highly visible as seen from Moor Lane. It would, however, be out of keeping with the established character of the immediately surrounding area, which comprises the bungalows as originally constructed, some with very modest extensions.
8. It is claimed in the appellant's grounds of appeal that Council guidelines allow extensions to a depth of 9m. It is unclear from these comments whether this reference is to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or to a Council policy or Supplementary Planning Document. However, in the absence of any more detailed information upon this issue I am unable to afford that assertion any weight in my assessment of these proposals, which has been based upon the detailed drawings before me and the observations made during my site visit.
9. I have therefore found upon the first main issue that development as proposed would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area, contrary to "saved" Policy H14 1) of the Local Plan¹.

b) Impact upon living conditions.

10. I was able to view the proposals from within the adjoining bungalows (23 and 27 Moor Lane) as part of my site visit.
11. The new structure would be set away from the common boundary with no. 23 by virtue of the width of the existing driveway and would be partially screened from it by the detached garage serving that property.
12. In the case of no. 27, the rearward projection of the extension would be some 4m only. It would also be set away from the common boundary with no. 27, which comprises a 2m high fence and cupressus hedge.
13. Part of the roof of both elements of the scheme would be visible from within the gardens of the adjoining dwellings. Nevertheless, I am satisfied from the observations made during my site visit that this would neither be excessive nor dominating as viewed from neighbouring properties, particularly no. 23 whose garage would act as a partial screen.
14. I therefore find upon the second main issue that development as proposed would not have an unacceptable adverse impact upon the living conditions of nearby residents, as required by Policy H14 2) of the Local Plan.

Conclusion

15. Notwithstanding my finding on the second main issue, my concerns as to the harmful effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area are paramount.

¹ The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in June 2003).

16. Accordingly, and for the reasons given above, I have concluded that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR