



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2019

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/19/3226244

100 Ouseley Road, Wraysbury, Staines, TW19 5JH

- 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 Pele Bhambher against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 18/03063, dated 18 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to existing dwelling, provision of home office over garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area and whether it would constitute an increased risk to flooding.

Reasons

3. The proposal is described on the application form as set out above. It is described on the Council's decision notice as *Raising of roof to form two storey dwelling with accommodation in roof space, part two, part single storey front/side extension, changes to the external finish and raising roof of existing garage to create first floor habitable accommodation*. The latter is a fuller and more accurate description and I have determined the appeal in that context.
4. 100 Ouseley Road is a detached chalet bungalow with a steep gabled roof located at the end of Ouseley Road where it turns the corner into The Embankment. Views of it from the road are partially obscured by a neighbouring timber building of similar size with gabled roof located closer to the road at No. 102. It has a frontage onto the River Thames from where it is clearly visible. In this context, it appears as one of a group of four individual dwellings characterised by gabled elevations and extensive glazing and separated from the river by short sloping gardens. It has a detached flat roofed garage at the eastern end of the site. It lies within the Leafy Residential Suburb Townscape Assessment Area and Flood Zone 3.
5. I consider that the relevant policies in this case include saved policies DG1, H14 and N2 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 2003

(the local plan). These require, among other things, that new development should have no adverse impact on the surrounding environment or the setting of the River Thames and should be compatible with the established street facade. The Council refers to policies SP2 and SP3 of the Borough Local Plan Submission Version 2017 (the emerging local plan) which also require, among other things, that new development should positively contribute to the places in which they are located and respect the local character of the environment. Local plan policy F1 relates to development within areas liable to flooding. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (the Framework).

6. I consider that the proposed increase in height, bulk and scale of the proposed extensions would result in a form of development which would appear out of proportion with the existing dwelling itself and with the other properties in the immediate vicinity. The complete remodelling of the appearance of both the dwelling and the garage and the use of extensive areas of zinc cladding would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the area.
7. Notwithstanding the limited visibility of the dwelling itself from Ouseley Road, it would appear incongruous in the context of the other, more traditional style of dwellings in the street scene. The proposed increase in height of the garage and its cladding in a similar style to that of the dwelling would appear as a very prominent punctuation point in the view along Ouseley Road, out of keeping with the more traditional style of the other houses and the leafy character of the surroundings.
8. The extended property would appear very prominent in views from the river and from the opposite river bank. The houses at Nos. 96-100 are particularly visible as they are less obscured by trees and other vegetation than some other properties along this stretch of the river. They share some stylistic characteristics, but differ from properties further to the north and to the south which are larger and occupy larger plots.
9. The Framework promotes innovative design in some circumstances, but only where it fits in with the overall form and layout of the surroundings. I acknowledge the appellant's wish to create an innovative and individual design reflecting the riverside location of the site. I consider that an increase in height of the dwelling would not necessarily, in itself, be unacceptable. However, the proposed increase in width and bulk at first floor level and the additional floor above, together with the altered roof form and proposed materials, would result in a building which would appear out of proportion and unbalanced in respect of the ratio of its height to its width and within the setting of the limited width and somewhat cramped nature of the site.
10. I have taken note of the examples of other contemporary and larger dwellings in the area, but they typically occupy larger plots and are more in proportion with their sites and with the neighbouring properties.
11. I conclude that the proposal would fail to respect the local environment, particularly the character and setting of the water front. It would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling itself, the street scene in Ouseley Road and the setting of the Thames, contrary to policies DG1, H14 and N2 of the local plan and SP2 and SP3 of the emerging local plan.

12. The site lies within a Flood Zone 3. Local plan policy F1 does not allow for extensions in excess of 30sqm in such areas. There is some disagreement between the appellant and the Council as to the proposed increase in ground cover area. The appellant states that the proposal would add 28sqm, whereas the Council calculates it as 36sqm. Notwithstanding this disagreement, the appellant has suggested potential mitigation measures in respect of the garage. Although it may be possible to mitigate the flood risk, in the absence of detailed information regarding suitable measures, I conclude that the appellant has not demonstrated that the proposal would not increase flood risk, contrary to local plan policy F1.
13. I have found the proposal unacceptable in respect of its impact on the character and appearance of the area. Although the objection on grounds of flood risk might be overcome, this would not be sufficient to overcome the objection to the other main issue.
14. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR