
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2020

by Andrew Smith BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/19/3241639
7 Breadcroft Road, Maidenhead SL6 3PA

- 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 Graham Search against the decision of Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 19/01877, dated 9 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is front and side dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. It is apparent from the evidence before me that the emerging Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (Submission Version, 2017) (the EBLP) has reached examination stage. However, it is my understanding that its adoption is not anticipated imminently. Given that the content of its policies may yet change prior to formal adoption, the EBLP is at a stage that attracts limited weight. I shall consider the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated within a residential area. Breadcroft Road (the road) is addressed by properties to either of its sides, which are typically setback similar short distances from the highway. Whilst properties of varied scale and type are in place along the road, the appeal property makes up part of a short row of similarly sized and designed detached dwellings with hipped roofs. Indeed, roof forms along the road are generally hipped.
5. The proposal would not lead to an increase in the appeal property's height. Furthermore, the two newly proposed side dormer additions would be of matching design to each other and the proposed front dormer would closely resemble the design and form of an existing rear-facing dormer at the site.
6. Nevertheless, all three of the newly proposed dormers would be bulky and noticeable additions to the appeal property's roof. Indeed, each would be set in only short distances from the roof's ridge, eaves and sides. They would thus

cumulatively overwhelm and fundamentally alter the appeal property's established hipped roof form and appearance. Excessive enlargements are proposed that would lead to the property appearing out of place and at odds with its immediate surroundings.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a front-facing gable and side-facing dormers that serve a property that is situated opposite to the site and have highlighted other selected examples of gabled elements and dormer additions in the site's vicinity. I also witnessed during inspection, with respect to a further property situated on the opposite side of the road to the site, construction works being undertaken that involved the creation of gabled ends and the introduction of front-facing dormers.
8. However, none of the above referenced designs/features are directly comparable to the scheme that is before me here, which would lead to each main roof slope of a modestly sized dwelling accommodating a generously sized dormer. Indeed, of greater relevance here is the generally uncomplicated hipped appearance of neighbouring roofs within the same stretch of road frontage.
9. Whilst the proposal would provide enlarged living arrangements for the appeal property's existing occupiers, this does not provide justification for development that would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal conflicts with Policies DG1, H14 and Appendix 12 of The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (incorporating alterations, adopted June 2003), Policy Gen2 of the Hurley and Walthams Neighbourhood Plan (December 2017) and emerging Policies SP2 and SP3 of the EBLP in so far as these policies state that special attention should be given to the roofscape of buildings and require that 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.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not lead me to a decision otherwise. Thus, for the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Smith

INSPECTOR