



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2019 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/19/3232541

1 Australia Avenue and 49 Cookham Road, Maidenhead, SL6 7DJ

- 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 Mrs Khan against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 19/00379, dated 4 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "A loft extension to both houses and alterations to the fenestration of both houses".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of development was amended during the application process to reflect the development that required planning permission. The Council describe the proposal as, "Two storey front infill extensions, two storey rear extension, new entrance canopies and single storey side extension to 49 Cookham Road, following demolition of the existing single storey rear element of 1 Australia Avenue and raising of main ridge, 2 No. front dormers, rear rooflights, first floor front balcony and alterations to front, rear and first floor side facing windows." I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host properties and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a pair of semi-detached dwellings in a prominent location at the junction of Cookham Road and Australia Avenue. Although the dwellings face towards the corner of the road junction, they are not viewed in isolation, but within the context of nearby development, both within Australia Avenue and Cookham Road.

6. The appeal properties are typical examples of the local vernacular with the pair bookended by projecting gabled wings. They have hipped roofs and elevations that reflect the character of the area. To the front, the properties have first floor windows which extend above the eaves.
7. The proposal is a revision to an earlier scheme which has been granted planning permission, and a number of additional elements are proposed. The areas of dispute are limited to the proposed front roof dormers, the raising of the ridge height and the proposed balcony on the front elevation.
8. The proposed dormers would be sited on the front facing roof slope and would as a result of their high-level position and design result in prominent incongruous features within the roofscape of the dwellings which would detract from and compete with the vertical gable features which are a characteristic of the dwellings. This harm would be exacerbated by the raising of the ridge of the main roof and the provision of an area of flat roof, along with the provision of front glazed balconies at first floor level across a large section of the dwellings, all of which would significantly detract from the pleasing proportions of them.
9. The appellant has provided a number of photographs of other developments in the locality. However, they do not appear to be within the same context as the appeal site. Furthermore, I have not been provided with details or the circumstances within which they were considered and accordingly I am unable to ascertain whether these examples are directly comparable to the proposal before me. This therefore limits the weight that I can give this matter in my overall consideration of this case. In any event, each proposal must be considered on its own merits.
10. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host properties. The contribution that the dwellings make to the character and appearance of the area would be diminished as a result of the new extensions and alterations. Moreover, the proposal would introduce a type of development into the locality which would be uncharacteristic, and this would result in significant harm to the established character and appearance of the area. The proposal results in conflict with Policies DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in June 2003) and emerging Policies SP2 and SP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033 Submission Version, which collectively seek, amongst other things, for development to be of a high quality design that is compatible with the established street façade and that extensions to houses should not have any adverse effect upon the original property nor adversely affect the street scene in general. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires, amongst other matters, that development is of a good design that adds to the overall quality of the area and is sympathetic to local character. There are no material considerations before me which outweigh this harm.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR