

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2017

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/17/3168355

29 Ray Mill Road West, Maidenhead, SL6 8SA

- 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 Peter Dines Hersom against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02742/FULL, dated 22 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey side extension, two storey rear extension at first floor, hip roof to facilitate loft conversion into habitable accommodation, and amendments to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal relates to an end of terrace house situated within a residential street predominantly comprising two storey brick dwellings. All dwellings within the terrace have been altered to some degree, including changes to fenestration with no29 also finished in a painted render to its front elevation.
4. The proposal would comprise a number of component parts which would give rise to increased internal living accommodation. I note that the ridge line of the terrace would be extended and a new hipped roof constructed, along with a two storey side extension, first floor extension to the rear and the provision of dormer window extensions to both the side and rear elevations. In totality these would add considerable bulk to the host dwelling and, rather than appearing as seamless additions, by virtue of their overall scale and form, would appear as discordant additions which, overall, I consider would be detrimental to the original character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part.
5. I acknowledge that the appellant agrees that the dormer to the side elevation is too large and that he would have been willing to change this if the Council had contacted him. Whilst I respect his willingness to make improvements, in itself, I consider that a reduction in the scale of this dormer would not overcome the

harm that I have identified; this is notwithstanding the fact that the height of the roof would be the same as the rest of the terrace to facilitate adequate internal head height, as well as being a robust form of construction.

6. I note that the owner of no27 supports the proposal, in that it would enable a first floor extension over his kitchen to be constructed, however, this does not outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause upon the character and appearance of the area through the sheer presence of the extensions as proposed. I find the proposal contrary to Policies DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 1999 (incorporating alterations adopted in June 2003), which seek to prevent harm caused to the character of the surrounding area and specifically highlight that extensions should not have any adverse effect upon the character or appearance of the original property, nor adversely affect the street scene.

Conclusion

7. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR