



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2023

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/23/3314123

72 Mickle Hill, Sandhurst, Berkshire GU47 8QU

- 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 James Bell against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00764/FUL, dated 9 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2022.
 - The proposed development is the erection of a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached chalet bungalow. It is one of two distinctive detached dwellings with steeply sloping pitched roofs located in an elevated position in a prominent location on a bend in the road. The dwelling on the appeal site has flat roofed side dormers to both sides with that fronting the road being across the whole width of the roofslope with single storey flat roofed side addition below. The road frontage to the south-west is marked by a steep embankment with vegetation and boundary fence above which the roof and dormer of the dwelling is visible.
4. The Council's Character Area Assessment (2010) (CAA SPD) identifies distinct character areas within the settlement, the appeal site lying in Area B. It notes that the area was developed on top of a hill allowing for long views. Recommendations seek to ensure that extensions relate to the architecture and materials palette.
5. The proposed extension would be above the existing single storey side extension and would form an addition to the side of the existing dormer. Whilst it would have a flat roof to match the dormer, it would considerably increase the bulk of the dwelling at first floor level and would not relate well to the existing dormer, which sits relatively comfortably within the existing roofslope. Furthermore, it would disrupt the existing balanced appearance of the dwelling with its relatively large but proportionate roof dormers.
6. Despite the existence of the boundary screening, it would appear as a bulky addition to the roof of the dwelling in what is a very prominent location. I

consider that it would fail to be sympathetic to the design and appearance of the existing dwelling and, by virtue of its prominent location, would fail to complement the street scene.

7. The immediate street scene of the appeal site consists of a variety of designs of dwelling, predominantly modern but including one of more traditional character of an unusual hexagonal shape on the corner of Sylvan Ridge. Notwithstanding this variation in design, two storey flat roofs are not a characteristic feature. As such the proposal would appear incongruous in this setting.
8. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. It would thereby conflict with Policy EN20 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (2002) and Policy CS7 of the Bracknell Forest Core Strategy DPD (2008) which seek high quality design which builds on local character, respecting local patterns of development and which is appropriate in scale, mass and design. It would also fail to accord with the guidance in the CAA SPD.
9. The Council has also made reference to the Council's Design SPD (2017) though it is not cited in the decision notice. Given that it also seeks to ensure that extensions respond to the scale, proportions and design of the original building and have regard to the character of the area, the proposal would also fail to meet this guidance.
10. With regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, I find that the proposal would fail to contribute to achieving well designed places and would not be sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Conclusions

11. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR