

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2017

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/17/3172564

192 Chobham Road, Sunningdale, Ascot SL5 0JA

- 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 K Davies against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 17/00044 was refused by notice dated 16 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing front conservatory and the construction of a new single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on living conditions at the neighbouring property, 194 Chobham Road, in terms of the effect on outlook.

Reasons

3. 192 and 194 Chobham Road are both mid-terrace houses with 2 storey and single storey projections to the front. At issue here is a proposal to replace a front conservatory with a larger flat roofed extension, infilling all of the narrow gap to the boundary with No 194. A planning permission (Ref 17/01030) has now been granted for a smaller version of this extension - the difference being that the appeal proposal would stretch a further 1.4m along the boundary with No 194. Both versions also include a non-contentious single storey section to the side away from No 194.
 4. No 194 has a living room window at the front, looking out into the gap between the 2 properties, plus 3 kitchen windows facing the existing conservatory. The main effect would be on the living room window, which already has a very restricted outlook due to the existing front projections on both sides. This creates a tunnel effect which would be exacerbated by the proposal, creating an oppressive sense of enclosure. The additional 1.4m length of 3m high wall on the boundary is significant in this respect.
 5. The plans show that the living room at No 194 is a through room, with its main glazing at the back. It is a long room, however, and occupiers should be able to expect a reasonable outlook in both directions. Owners of No 192 have
-

blocked off the outlook from a similar living room by building the conservatory, but that is their own choice.

6. On the other hand, the proposal would have little impact on the outlook from the kitchen windows, which is already closed down by the conservatory and the 2 storey projection. There would furthermore be no significant difference here between the approved extension and the appeal proposal, as views of the extra 1.4m of wall would be sharply angled.
7. I note that the occupiers of No 194 have not objected and agree with the Council that there no undue loss of light would be caused. I nevertheless conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm living conditions at No 194 due to the impact on outlook from that property. It therefore conflicts with the aims of Policy H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in June 2003) and the National Planning Policy Framework, to ensure that extensions do not significantly affect the amenities of neighbouring properties and to secure a good standard of amenity for all.
8. Although I recognise the appellants' wish to improve their home, my concern in regard to the main issue is sufficiently compelling for me to conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR