



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2020 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/20/3255167

19 Sperling Road, Maidenhead SL6 7LB

- 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 Shakeel Ahmed against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03596, dated 2 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as alterations to the roof and 2 front roof lights and a rear dormer.
-

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 Matter

3. A similar appeal has been submitted for the attached property next door at No 17¹. However, whilst it appears that both properties are under the same ownership, the applications were dealt with separately by the Council and this is a separate appeal. As such I have considered each appeal independently.

Main Issue

4. The main issues in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. The appeal property is one of a traditional pair of semi-detached dwellings, set along a suburban street characterised by similar two storey semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs. There are examples of roof extensions and modest front and side dormers within Sperling Road, however the characteristic hipped roof form is mostly maintained.
6. Whilst the front roof lights would be limited in their visual impact, the proposed hip to gable extension would be out of keeping with the hipped roofs of the street scene and would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which

¹ Appeal reference: APP/T0355/W/20/3254785

the host property forms part. The rear dormer, would as a result of its width, depth and height, dominate and substantially compromise the existing character of the roof and property, substantially alerting its appearance. I note the appellant's assertion that a loft conversion is usually permitted development, however the proposal before me follows the refusal of planning permission and it is on this basis and the evidence before me that I have assessed the proposal.

7. The rear of the dwellings along the neighbouring street, North Town Road, are visible in gaps between properties on Sperling Road. Similar rear dormers at Nos 59 and 61 North Town Road are evident. These dormers (and roof extensions), by virtue of their scale, clearly overwhelm the original properties and detract from the street scene. Additionally, the appellant points to and provides plans for similar development nearby at No 14 Laggan Road.² Again, the hip to gable development appears out of keeping with the surrounding hipped roof forms. I consider that such unsatisfactory developments do not provide justification for further harm to the street scene. In addition, each application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits, and this is the approach that I have taken in my consideration of this case.
8. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposed alterations to the roof hip to gable extension and rear dormer would detract from the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area, in conflict with Policies DG1 and H14 of the Local Plan (2003) (LP), which, in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, seek to ensure that no harm is caused to the character of surrounding areas and that extensions should not adversely affect the street scene in general. The dormer would also conflict with the design advice given in Appendix 12 of the LP which sets out that '*overbearing or top-heavy dormers which destroy the existing roof slopes should be avoided*'.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR

² Application reference: 20/00179