



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/19/3237866

18 Gloucester Road, Maidenhead SL6 7SN

- 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 Mrs Butt against the decision of The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01384, dated 30 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "single storey side extension, part single part two storey rear extension and a loft conversion with a rear dormer" [sic].
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The copy of the Council's decision notice provided in this matter does not display the date that the decision was made. I have taken the decision date in the header banner above from Section C of the appeal form and have assessed the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this matter is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the junction of Gloucester Road and Moffy Hill. The property currently benefits from a small flat roofed rear extension. The proposal is for the erection of a single storey side extension, a part single/part two storey rear extension and rear roof dormer. The Council do not object to the single storey side extension, and having considered this matter, I concur. The main issues of contention therefore are the rear extension and the rear roof dormer.
6. The host property is of simple design and is well proportioned. The rear extension by virtue of its design, size, bulk and overall scale would fail to relate

well to the host property or achieve an appropriate level of subservience to it. As a result, it would dominate the rear of the dwelling and appear as an incongruous feature. Similarly, the proposed roof dormer, by virtue of its box-like design and scale would dominate the host roof and imbue the dwelling with a top-heavy appearance. This harm would be exacerbated by its relationship to the two storey element of the rear extension, whereby the roof of the extension would appear to crash into the face of the dormer, resulting in an awkward visual relationship. In addition, the proposal would incorporate three different roof forms, which in conjunction with the overall design of the rear extension, would result in a haphazard and confusing appearance. Consequently, when considered collectively, or in isolation, both the rear extension and rear roof dormer would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property.

7. Due to the location of the appeal site and the topography of the area, the proposals would be visible from Gloucester Road to the west and Edinburgh Road to the east, as well as from the rear gardens of a number of the surrounding properties. Due to their harmful effect on the host property, the proposed rear extension and rear dormer would diminish the contribution that the property makes to the character and appearance of the area, which in turn would be demonstrably harmed.
8. In conclusion, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. There would be conflict with Policy H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in June 2003) (LP). This seeks, among other things, to ensure that house extensions should not have any adverse effect upon the character or appearance of the original property or any neighbouring properties, nor adversely affect the street scene in general. There would also be conflict with Policies SP2 and SP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033 Submission Version 2017 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These seek, among other things, to ensure that development respects the character of the surrounding area, should positively contribute to the places in which they are located and are expected to contribute to achieving sustainable high quality design in the Borough. The Council also refer to Policy DG1 of the LP. However, the proposal, despite the harm that has been set out does not conflict with the guidelines set out under this policy.

Other Matters

9. The appellant states that the Council did not consult with them for changes to the proposal prior to refusing the application. However, I must consider the appeal on its planning merits and this is not a matter to which I can attach any significant weight. The Council will have its own complaints procedure should the appellant not be satisfied with how the application was processed.
10. The appellant also indicates that there is permission for a single storey rear extension of five metres depth at the property and that dormers are usually permitted development (PD). However, no details of the single storey rear extension have been submitted and so I afford only limited weight to this argument. Further, at single storey, such an addition is likely to have considerably less effect on the host dwelling and surrounding area than the appeal proposal. No details of an alternative, PD dormer have been provided

and, in any case, I have to consider the merits of the case before me. Consequently, I afford this argument limited weight.

11. The appellant has also referred to approved development at two other properties in the area. From my observations of these properties, it was not clear that any similar works to those proposed herein have been undertaken. In any case, such works, even if they were similar, would be viewed in a different context, and I am mindful that each case must be considered on its own merits. Consequently, I afford this argument limited weight.
12. I have taken account of these other matters; however, they do not outweigh the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR