

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2023

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/22/3312635
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 Shazia Butt against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02514, dated 20 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached house currently being extended and with a second floor dormer roof extension under construction which, in itself, is a sizable addition to the host dwelling.
4. The proposal before me would comprise a further box dormer at first floor level over a single storey rear extension that is yet to be completed. Combined with the previously permitted extensions this scheme would appear as an incongruous and alien feature that would not be sympathetic to the design and scale of the existing house.
5. I acknowledge that the appellant requires extra space to accommodate a growing family, however I consider that this is very much a situation of form following function and notwithstanding the reference to a box dormer extension that has been constructed at 33 Edinburgh Road, ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.
6. I am not in a position to doubt that the proposed dormer would not break a 45° line being taken from both houses either side of no 18, although this has not been demonstrated on a drawing. Notwithstanding this any benefits of the proposal are clearly outweighed by the harm that would ensue to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

7. The proposed dormer would be poorly positioned and would not be sympathetic or subordinate to the design or scale of the existing house, contrary to the Borough-wide Design Guide and in particular principles 10.1 and 10.4 as set out therein. The appeal proposal also would conflict with Policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033 (adopted February 2022) which requires new development to contribute towards achieving sustainable high quality design that respects and enhances the local character of the environment, paying particular regard to scale, bulk, massing and proportions.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR