

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2017

**by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 5<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/17/3173228**  
**19 St Michael's Road, Sandhurst GU47 8HD**

- 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 Marc Bradley against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 17/00011/FUL, dated 5 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2017.
  - The development proposed is the erection of side and rear extension with rooms in loft space.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. The Council has adopted the *Design Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) which is referred to as an emerging document in the reason for refusal.

## Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow located within a predominantly residential area which comprises detached and semi-detached bungalows and 2-storey dwellings of varying designs. Fronting St Michael's Road there are bungalows of a similar design to the property. Some of these bungalows have been altered but their extensions are predominantly subservient additions.
  5. The proposed development includes an increase in the size of the existing single storey front gable projection and a side extension which would, with other additions, combine to provide living accommodation at first floor level within the enlarged roofspace. The Council has not objected to the rear alterations because other properties have been similarly extended and there
-

are no reasons for me to disagree with the Council's assessment on this matter.

6. In principle, an increase in the height of the property's front gable to 2-storeys would reflect alterations undertaken to other similarly designed properties fronting the road. A roof extending over an open porch and asymmetrical eaves heights are also features associated with the front gables of altered bungalows. However, these other front gables remain subservient in scale and appearance to their host bungalows and they retain pitched roofs with ridges extending from or below the original ridgelines. These pitched roofs both respect and are sympathetic to the character and appearance of their host dwellings.
7. The combination of the height, width and crown roof of the proposed gable extension would result in a form of development that would be a visually dominant and incongruous addition to the appeal property. The proposed front extension would be of an unsympathetic appearance, especially the roof form, and would not be subservient in scale. This proposed extension would conflict with the guidance contained in the Council's SPD concerning front extensions generally following the style of the original building in terms of design, materials and detailing, including roof materials and pitch.
8. Although a gap would be maintained to No. 17, the combined scale of the proposed gable and side extensions would visually overwhelm the character and appearance of the host property. The overall scale of these extensions would also unbalance the appearance of this pair of semi-detached bungalows. The visual harm caused to the character and appearance of these modest sized bungalows would be accentuated by the loss of the hipped roof form which would be replaced by a materially smaller half hipped element. Overall, the proposed gable and front extensions would result in an enlarged property which would fail to adequately respect the character of other altered and unaltered dwellings, in particular the bungalows of a similar design, which contribute to the streetscene along St Michael's Road.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, and, as such, it would conflict with Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document, Policy EN20 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan and the SPD. Amongst other matters these policies require development to respect local patterns of development and to be in sympathy with the appearance and character of the locality. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's core principle of securing high quality design. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

*D J Barnes*

INSPECTOR