



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2023 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/23/3319109

92 London Road, Datchet, Slough SL3 9LQ

- 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 J. Phull against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00066, dated 10 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey side extension, 2no. rear dormers, new dropped kerb and vehicular entrance gates. (Part retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. In the interest of accuracy, the description of development in the header above is based on the decision notice and appeal form.
4. This appeal is part-retrospective as most of the main structural and exterior works have been carried out. This case follows an enforcement investigation by the Council as the development had not been constructed entirely in accordance with application ref. 21/03441/FULL approved in July 2022.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located on the southern side of London Road within an established residential area characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached properties. The appeal dwelling features prominently in the street scene given its position set forward of the building line on London Road.
 7. The appellant argues that the form of the first-floor side extension closely relates to what was approved as part of application ref. 21/03441/FULL. Whilst
-

they opine that the overall scale and mass of the side extension is reasonable and comparable to the extension previously deemed acceptable by the Council, I find that it appears unduly bulky because of its excessive width. Whilst I accept that there are other examples within the area of similar style of roof, the overall scale of the crown roof in this instance is disproportionate and visually prominent in the streetscene when seen from London Road to the west of the appeal site. The overall appearance of the extension appears to have been poorly finished which exacerbates the adverse visual impact of the scheme.

8. The appellant states that the rear extension as built provides a more coherent elevation and is not visible in the street scene. However, it is clearly visible from London Road as well as from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. The scale of the rear extension and crown roof appears excessive and jars with the pitched roof. Although the crown roof is lower than the ridge of the pitched roof, its width and depth is significant and does not appear sufficiently subordinate to the main dwelling.
9. The excessive scale of the extensions and visibly inadequate finishings have resulted in an awkward and disjointed appearance to the development. The extensions constitute discordant and incongruous additions to the appeal dwelling, which detract from the character and appearance of the main dwelling and the surrounding area.
10. The proposed retention of the development would therefore adversely impact the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy QP3 of the Council's *Borough Local Plan 2013-2033*, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in which they lie.

Other matters

11. I recognise the importance that the enlargement of the property plays in providing practical and additional living space for the current occupiers. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that improvements to the accommodation and layout sufficient to meet the needs of the occupants could be achieved with an alternative and more sympathetic design that would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
12. Whilst the construction of the development may have provided employment for local builders and traders, I attach no more than limited weight to this positive consideration given that an acceptable scheme would also have provided a similar level of opportunity, and this does not therefore outweigh the harm I have identified. Similarly, I appreciate the use of sustainable materials and modern insulation is good practice however, as above, this consideration does not outweigh the adverse impact of the proposal.

Recommendation

13. The proposal would adversely impact the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Given this, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the NPPF, which outweigh this finding.

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

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR