
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2017

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/16/3161134
3 Willant Close, Maidenhead SL6 3NL

- 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 N Collett against the decision of Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 16/02059, dated 16 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2016.
 - The development is a proposed single storey side extension and loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed single storey side extension and loft conversion with rear dormer at 3 Willant Close, Maidenhead SL6 3NL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02059, dated 16 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: '1519 03' and '1519 04'.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The dwelling on the appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow within a road that includes similar dwellings set behind open plan front gardens. To the sides of the dwellings set further back from the road are garages with primarily flat roofs. The original front elevations of these bungalows remain obvious with only some minor alterations being apparent.
 4. The bungalow at the site has a flat roofed element to the side that links with the flat roof garage. At the rear, there is a modest garden with a low enclosure and therefore open aspect towards the aerodrome that adjoins the site. The
-

garden at the site and some of those nearby include outbuildings and rear additions. Although I could see the low profile of the bungalows along this side of the road there is a less orderly appearance at the rear side of the dwellings than there is at the front.

5. The proposal would involve the construction of a pitched roof over the existing flat roofed part of the building which would be set back from the road and would be much lower than the roof on the main part of the dwelling. This part of the proposal would not be prominent within the street scene and would respect the character of the existing building.
6. The conversion of the loft space would require the construction of a large dormer that would be positioned centrally on the rear of the main roof. The gable facing the aerodrome would be centrally glazed also with a glazed Juliette balcony. The original roof would still be obvious given that the structure would be set in from each side. In my view, this would look balanced and proportionate on the existing roof. It would be a contemporary addition to the building which would complement the proposed modern alterations at ground floor level.
7. The ridge of the proposed dormer would protrude above the ridge on the existing bungalow. This would be visible from the road but would be a minor change to the roof overall. There is a substantial gap between the side gable of the existing bungalow and that of the adjoining dwelling. The substantial set back of the cheeks of the proposed dormer from the side of the dwelling would limit how visible the dormer is from the road. The additional pitched roof over the single storey link would also interrupt the view of the new dormer. This would not be prominent and would not cause an adverse effect upon the street-scene within Willant Close.
8. In relation to the main issue, the proposal would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the existing bungalow and the surrounding area. This would comply with Local Plan¹ Policies DG1 and H14. This would represent good design as required by paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
9. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty that the development will be implemented as proposed. Another condition will ensure that the materials used match the existing building.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Harwood

INSPECTOR

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