Appeal Decision Report

2 December 2017 - 28 December 2017

WINDSOR RURAL



Appeal Ref.:	17/60105/REF Planning Ref.:	17/02137/FULL Pins Ref.: APP/T0355/D/17/ 3188432				
Appellant:	Mr & Mrs Van Der Zijl c/o Agent: Mr Damian Hill Basepoint Business Centre 377-399 London Road Camberley Surrey GU15 3HL					
Decision Type:	Delegated	Officer Recommendation: Refuse				
Description:	Replacement roof to facilitate loft conversion with a rear facing dormer window					
Location:	6 Sidbury Close Ascot SL5 0PD					
Appeal Decision:	Allowed	Decision Date: 20 December 2017				
Main Issue:	The Inspector found that the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling. The proposal would accord with Local Plan Policies DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan, and with the Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan Policy DG3.					
Appeal Ref.:	17/60106/REF Planning Ref.:	17/00765/FULL Pins Ref.: APP/T0355/D/17/ 3188477				
Appellant:	Mr Mark Glover c/o Agent: Mr Andrew Bandosz D _ M Planning Ltd 1A High Street Godalming Surrey GU7 1AZ					
Decision Type:	Delegated Officer Recommendation: Refuse					
Description:	Erection of part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension.					
Location:	Milford Cottage 180A Chobham Road Sunningdale Ascot SL5 0JA					
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed	Decision Date: 22 December 2017				
Main Issue:	Due to its irregular design, multiple roof forms, gable ends, the proposed development would form a contrived, fussy and complicated addition to the property, which contrasts and is harmful to the simple design of the original building, contrary to Local Plan Policy DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan or with policies NP/DG2.2 and NP/DG3 of the Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan. These state that extensions should not have any adverse effect upon the character or appearance of the original property or neighbouring properties, and that the design of new buildings should be good, compatible, and respect established building lines, plot widths and separation distances between buildings and side boundaries and be of similar proportions with buildings in the surrounding area and of neighbouring properties.					

Appeal Ref.:	17/60109/REF	Planning Ref.:	17/00021/FULL	PIns Ref.:	APP/T0355/D/17/ 3183383		
Appellant:	Mr James Wood c/o Agent: Mr Nadeem Kayani 2 Sunnyside Cottages Colham Green Road Hillingdon UB8 3QP						
Decision Type:	Delegated		Officer Recommendation:		Refuse		
Description:	Two storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and store						
Location:	27 Park Drive Ascot SL5 0BB						
Appeal Decision:	Allowed		Decision Date:	20 December 2017			
Main Issue:	The Inspector was satisfied that the proposed development would not be visually dominating or significantly overbearing, or would cause any significant harm to outlook to the occupiers of number 29. The Inspector found no conflict with Local Plan Policies DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan.						
Appeal Ref.:	17/60111/REF	Planning Ref.:	17/01914/FULL	PIns Ref.:	APP/T0355/D/17/ 3182805		
Appellant:	Mr Jonny Hayhurst 85 Upper Village Road Ascot SL5 7AJ						
Decision Type:	Delegated Officer Recommendation: Refuse						
Description:	Erection of part two storey/part single storey rear and side extensions following demolition of exiting rear ground floor extension, garage and outbuilding. Conversion of roof space including alterations to the roof. Dropped kerbs to facilitate new vehicular access to accommodate off-street parking						
Location:	85 Upper Village Road Ascot SL5 7AJ						
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		Decision Date:	20 Decemb	er 2017		
Main Issue:	The Inspector considered the proposed development would conflict with policies DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan, and with policy NP/DG3 of the Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan. The Inspector considered the proposed extensions would dominate the existing dwelling and would result in the additions appearing out of character with the design of the host dwelling. The scale, form and design of the extensions would result in harm to the character of the surrounding area.						