

Appeal Decision Report

4 August 2018 - 3 September 2018

WINDSOR URBAN

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

Appeal Ref.: 18/60048/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/03077/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/18/3198369

Appellant: Mr K Suri **c/o Agent:** Mr John Quartermaine FEUK Ltd 30 Cobblers Close Farnham Royal Slough SL2 3DT

Decision Type: Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse

Description: Enlargement of first floor front extension as approved under 14/01700/FULL.

Location: **Westfield 141A Slough Road Datchet Slough SL3 9AE**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 24 July 2018

Main Issue: The proposal would look discordant and incongruous in the street scene and result in a prominently sited mass and bulk at first floor level which would fail to relate to or respect the appeal building's existing pitched roof design. It would be an unsympathetic form of development which would harm the character and appearance of the area and the appeal dwelling itself. Consequently, it would not comply with paragraph 17 of the NPPF or Policies DG1 or H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 2003 which seek high quality design and the protection of the character and appearance of the property and area.

Appeal Ref.: 18/60084/REF **Planning Ref.:** 18/00556/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/18/3204058

Appellant: Mr Manmeet Gill **c/o Agent:** Mr Ravinder Gill 26 Cranmore Avenue Isleworth TW7 4QW

Decision Type: Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse

Description: Raising of the ridge height to form habitable accommodation, Juliette balcony, side dormer and 8 no rooflights.

Location: **6 Leigh Park Datchet Slough SL3 9JP**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 24 August 2018

Main Issue: The proposed extension of the roof into a gable to the rear would appear awkward and incongruous and although much of the impact of the gable would be to the rear and would not readily visible to public view, it would be visible from the properties side elevation. This, together with the bulky appearance of the side dormer and the addition of rooflights, would result in a form of development which would fail to respect the character of the existing building and the surrounding area. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to local plan policies DG1 and H14 and the NPPF (2018).
