



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2025

by **Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/24/3357518

19 Sutherland Chase, Ascot SL5 8TE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Rose Hackett against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 24/02222.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application as “Two storey rear extension to existing two storey detached dwelling and a single storey rear extension to an existing single garage”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
 - The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling at 21 Sutherland Chase, with regard to whether the development would appear overbearing.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a two storey detached dwelling where a two storey extension would be constructed at the rear. There would be a hipped roof but the ridge would be at the same height as the main roof. It would also extend significantly rearwards across virtually the full width of the rear elevation. Because of the resultant excessive scale and bulk it would be overly dominant, disproportionately large and monolithic.
4. As a result, the character and appearance of the host dwelling would be harmed. This would be the case despite the use of matching materials and window finishes, as well as the streetscene not being harmed. There would be conflict with Borough Local Plan (LP) 2013-2033 Policy QP 3, which, among other things, seeks high quality design that respects and enhances the local environment with regard to scale and bulk.
5. There would also be conflict with the Council’s Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Borough Wide Design Guide, 2020 Principles 10.1 and 10.4, which indicate that extensions should be sympathetic and subordinate to the original building and not over-dominant.

6. The rear double storey extension would immediately adjoin the side boundary with the adjacent dwelling at 21 Sutherland Chase at a full two storey height beyond the back of the neighbouring dwelling. Because of this and the appreciable depth there would be significant additional bulk in unduly close proximity to the adjacent amenity space despite the hipped roof form. There is a garage in the rear garden of the adjacent property that abuts the boundary and would be next to the extension. However, given its flat roof form and fairly limited height and size, it would not prevent an unacceptably oppressive sense of enclosure in the adjacent rear amenity space.
7. In consequence, the development would appear overly dominant and overbearing to neighbouring residents. This adverse effect would occur regardless of acceptability in relation to matters such as daylight and sunlight. There were no objections to the planning application from the occupiers of no 21. However, this does not, in itself, confer acceptability and I must consider the appeal on its own merits. I acknowledge that this concerns a relatively subjective matter but nevertheless such judgements must still be made.
8. For these reasons, it is concluded that the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling would be harmed. The Council's reason for refusal refers to LP Policy QP 3 but this only concerns specific matters that do not include overbearing effects. Nevertheless, the scheme would be contrary to SPD Principles 10.1 and 10.4 which indicate that extensions should not be overbearing with no material erosion of neighbour amenities.
9. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) which indicates that decisions should ensure that developments satisfy a number of considerations. These include adding to the overall quality of the area, being visually attractive and creating a high standard of amenity for existing users, which would not be satisfied in this instance.
10. I am reinforced in my view regarding the unacceptable nature of the development by the importance placed on design in the Framework where it is indicated that the creation of high quality buildings is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and good design, which would not be achieved in this case, is a key aspect of sustainable development.
11. The Appellant makes specific reference to extensions that have been built at 4 Nash Gardens and 3 Sutherland Chase. However, I have not been provided with the full details and background to enable any meaningful comparison with the current proposal. As a result, it has not been demonstrated that the Council's decision making has been unreasonably inconsistent. Because of the harm that would arise and taking account of all other matters raised, it is determined that the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR