

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2017

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/17/3170900

41 Westmead, Windsor, Berkshire SL4 3NN

- 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 Ms Berrin Erdogan against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 16/02839 was refused by notice dated 16 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. I note that there was some discussion about potential amendments during the application process, but these were never formally submitted. The Council considered the application on the basis of the original plans (as submitted in September 2016) and I have also considered the appeal on that basis.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and the local area.

Reasons

4. 41 Westmead is a linked semi-detached, hipped roof house set within a residential estate of similar properties. It is set away from the street and accessed via a public footway. The proposal is to build a full depth, gabled first floor side extension up to the boundary with the next house, No 39.
 5. Although many of the houses in the local area have been extended to the side at first floor level, these generally retain the hipped roof form and are set back at the front and/or set back from the side boundary in order to complement the character of the building and maintain a somewhat open character. There are some gabled houses on the estate, but not in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
 6. The introduction of a full height gable at No 41, built right up to the front of the house and up to the side boundary, would be out of character with the design of this pair of semis and other houses nearby. It would also close down the
-

visual gap between the Nos 39 and 41 creating a densely built-up appearance. Although located away from the carriageway of Westmead, No 41 is a very visible presence on the public footway linking Westmead to Bulkeley Avenue. The proposal would appear as unsympathetically designed overdevelopment in those views.

7. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the building and the local area. It therefore conflicts with the aims of Policies DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in June 2003) and the National Planning Policy Framework, to secure high quality design and to ensure that extensions do not adversely affect the original property or the street scene.
8. I recognise the appellant's need to extend her house and note that no neighbours have objected. It is suggested that the design of this extension would be exactly the same as others nearby, but I saw none on my site visit that were quite so uncompromising. Weighing up the various factors, I find nothing that overrides my concerns in regard to the main issue.
9. Having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR