
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2017

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/17/3181841

**Rosemount, Burchetts Green Road, Burchetts Green, Maidenhead,
Berkshire SL6 6QS**

- 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 Robert Creer against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01445, dated 2 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is proposal for a rear extension at first floor level.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The planning application form and the submitted plans indicate that the appeal site is on Burchetts Green Lane but all other documents refer to Burchetts Green Road. I have taken the correct address to be Burchetts Green Road.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. I consider that the main issues are:-
 - whether the proposed extension constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt and its effect on openness; and
 - whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

Green Belt

4. The site is within the Green Belt and the National Planning Policy Framework¹ explains that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 (the Framework).

Belt. The extension or alteration of a building is not considered inappropriate provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. This is generally reflected in Local Plan policies GB1 and GB4².

5. There seems no doubt that Rosemount has been extended in the past although it is difficult to identify what was the original dwelling. It is described as originally being a two-up two-down dwelling and I have little doubt that extensions and alterations may well have been required to bring the house up to modern standards. The planning history refers to a two storey extension and there is a flat roofed single storey extension to the rear. Needless to say the house has been fairly extensively extended from the original although any disproportionate addition seems to have taken place some years ago.
6. Nevertheless, the Framework is clear in its description of 'original building' i.e. a building as it existed on 1 July 1948, or if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally. From the information submitted I consider that the building has already been extended and altered to such an extent that previous works amount to disproportionate additions to the original building. Whilst the proposed extension may not represent a disproportionate addition to the existing building, this is not the test set out in the Framework.
7. Given that the proposal would extend the house above the existing flat roofed extension at the rear of the house and Rosemount is set within a generous plot, I do not consider that the openness of the Green Belt would be unduly harmed. However, this does not override the harm caused by inappropriateness which carries substantial weight.

Other Considerations

8. I have considered the other matters raised including the fact that previous extensions have been constructed some time ago and the requirement to further update the living accommodation. I also note the appellant's comments about the security issues arising from the flat roofed single storey rear extension and the wish to re-arrange internal accommodation to address the matter of noise from road traffic on Burchetts Green Road. However, these matters carry limited weight.
9. I agree with the appellant that the extension would not fall foul of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt as set out in the Framework and the effect on the openness on the Green Belt would be limited.
10. I have also considered the effect on the occupiers of neighbouring properties but do not consider that their living conditions would be unduly harmed. I also note the appellant's reference to other properties in the area that have been extended, altered or re-built but I have afforded these matters limited weight.

Conclusion

11. The Framework makes it clear that inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of

² The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in 2003).

inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other circumstances.

12. The harm caused by inappropriateness carries substantial weight and I have only afforded limited weight to the other considerations raised. I have taken all matters raised into account but conclude that very special circumstances do not exist to outweigh the harm caused by inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposal would conflict with the Framework and Local Plan policies GB1 and GB4. Accordingly I dismiss the appeal.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR