



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2021

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/20/3263900

Harefield, River Road, Taplow, Maidenhead SL6 0BG

- 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 Neil Burgess against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/20/2127/FA, dated 3 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is First floor side extension over existing balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for First floor side extension over existing balcony at Harefield, River Road, Taplow GL6 0BG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/20/2127/FA, dated 3 July 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block Plan; Site Plan; Location Plan; 201 Proposed elevations; 101 Existing & Proposed Plans; 102 Existing elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council altered the description of the development from "*extending master bedroom at first floor level over existing balcony to enclose accessible bathroom and installation of disabled lift*" to "*First floor side extension over existing balcony.*" This is also the description used by the appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposals and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property, also a non-designated heritage asset, and the conservation area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within the Taplow Conservation Area (CA) and is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). The CA, in its entirety, is a designated heritage asset. The statutory duty within Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas, applies.
5. River Road is a residential street which culminates in a public right of way, following the route of the river. Travelling from the main road along River Road, dwellings become more spaced out, with the appeal property being a detached dwelling located in spacious gardens, and open countryside beyond. Dwellings have many similar features including feature gables, tile hangings, verandas and balcony features, although there are more modern dwellings interspersed at intervals. Dwellings vary in design, but carry similar features and materials such as red brick, clay tiles, timber detailing and some rendered properties. The dwellings along River Road are arranged in a linear layout, set back from the road, with the riverbanks on the opposite side of the road. Front garden areas are a variety of hardstanding with shrubbery, hedges and trees featuring in most.
6. Harefield is a detached dwelling described as being four bay, rendered and painted with red tile hanging above. It has a plain clay tiled roof with overhanging swept eaves. There are features of the house such as leaded casements, bay windows, canted bay windows, mullioned and transom windows and sprockled eaves roofs using clay tiles. The appeal site is an existing flat-roofed element with a bay window to the ground floor and a bay window to the first floor sitting over the balcony, and a window to the side. The Council states that the fenestration of the building is typical of the CA, being of small panelled windows and dormers to the third storey, and as well as this the property demonstrates typical hipped roof with gable ended features and dormer windows to the principle elevation.
7. The proposed development would make use of the existing balcony footprint, effectively enclosing the balcony, providing full height glazing with a crown roof. The development would use materials to match that of the remainder of the dwelling for the roof. The use of materials to ensure appropriate match to the existing dwelling could be secured by an appropriate condition.
8. The proposed panelled glazing would not match the leaded casements which are one of the features of the dwelling, nonetheless I was also able to see that the property has other more modern glazing, to the rear of the dwelling in the conservatory and the four glazed doors leading to the patio. As such, the proposal would not be wholly out of keeping with the existing dwelling and its features and would not be unacceptably dominant or obtrusive. I was able to see on my site visit that leaded or panelled windows were not the only type of fenestration along River Road, with some dwellings having larger panelled glazing in places. As such I consider that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the CA.
9. Whilst I acknowledge that the roof arrangements would result in eaves that are set higher than the eaves on that gable end of the host dwelling, this is marginal and the use of matching materials combined with the location to the side of the dwelling would ensure harmony with the dwelling. In addition to

this, the roof arrangements would reflect the pitch and design of the existing features of the house and would remain set at a level below the main roof. The location of the development to the side of the dwelling combined with these factors ensures that the inherent character and appearance of the property are not harmed and as such there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the CA.

10. I therefore conclude that the siting, design, glazing and other materials and respect for existing detailing of the proposals would not harm the character or interest of this undesignated heritage asset. In this respect, the proposal would comply with policy H11 (Alterations and Extensions to Dwellings) and policy EP3 (The use, design and layout of development) of the South Bucks District Local Plan¹ ("Local Plan") which expect (amongst other things) that extensions should be integral to the dwelling and would harmonise with the existing building in terms of scale, height, form and design and provide high quality design of development, for all the reasons set out above I have found that the proposed extension would comply with these policies.
11. Policy CP8 of the South Bucks Core Strategy² ("Core Strategy") sets out provisions for protection and enhancement of the built and historic environment, including the protection, conservation and enhancement where appropriate of locally important heritage features. Policy C1 of the Local Plan expects development to protect the significance and settings of CAs.
12. The National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), states that when considering the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the conservation of the heritage asset. New development should respond to local character and history, add to the overall quality of the area and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and landscaping.
13. The Framework is clear that the effect of an application on the significance of a NDHA must be taken into account and that a balanced judgement will be required with regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.³
14. The proposed development is located to the southern end of the existing property, making use of the existing footprint of the small side extension at the house and as such would not protrude further than the existing dwelling. The front boundary of the house is located adjacent to where River Road ends, and the public right of way begins. There is a substantial hedge along this boundary and the house is set some distance from the road and the path. The proposed development might be glimpsed from the public footpath, however this would not harm the overall Victorian/Edwardian character of the Taplow Conservation Area as seen from this location.
15. With the above in mind, the characteristics and the appearance of the CA would be preserved as would those of the NDHA. Therefore I find that the proposal would be in accordance with policies C1, EP3 and H11 of the Local Plan and CP8 of the Core Strategy which seek to conserve the historic environment, including NDHAs and their settings.

¹ South Bucks District Local Plan (Adopted March 1999, Consolidated September 2007 and February 2011)

² South Bucks Core Strategy (Adopted February 2011)

³ Paragraph 197

16. I find no conflict with the policies found in the Framework, which seek to secure developments which are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, whilst not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

Other Matters

17. The Framework states that development within the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it falls within one of the exceptions set out in paragraphs 145-146 of the revised Framework. These exceptions include the extension of a building, so long as this would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The Council has concluded that the proposed development would not represent a disproportionate addition to the original dwellinghouse. I have therefore not considered this issue any further.

Conditions

18. As well as the time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans for certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the CA and NDHA, I have imposed a condition requiring that all external facing materials match the existing.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons set out above and subject to the conditions attached, I allow the appeal.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR