
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2020

by Adrian Hunter BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/19/3240867

65 Treesmill Drive, Maidenhead, Berkshire SL6 3HS

- 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 S Ali against the decision of Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 19/01502, dated 25 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a new four bedroom detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The decision notice refers to policy SP2 of the emerging Borough Local Plan. Emerging policy SP2 has now been amended and renumbered to Policy QP1. As this emerging policy does not form part of the development plan for the Borough, I have afforded it limited weight in my consideration.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies in a predominately residential area and comprises the side and part of the rear garden of No. 65 Treesmill Drive. The existing property is a linked detached dwelling, set within a reasonably large plot. It has a gable that runs the width of the building, with a small two storey gable fronted extension. Part of the appeal site is occupied by a garden shed.
5. The proposal would involve the erection of a four bedroomed dwelling. Car parking and pedestrian access would be provided via Treesmill Drive. A rear garden area would be provided through the sub-division of the existing rear garden area. The dwelling would be erected from materials similar in appearance to the existing property. The eaves and ridge height of the proposed dwelling would be similar in height to the host dwelling and would have a pitched gable roof running from front to back. To the north, the dwelling would have a hipped, two storey side projection. There would be single storey projections to the front and rear.

6. The surrounding dwellings comprise a mix of semi-detached and link detached dwellings. Dwellings are generally set within reasonable plots, with areas to the front being open and used for off-street parking. Dwellings are mainly of the same height and generally have a similar design approach. There is no predominant building line, with dwellings staggered. This creates visual interest in the street scene and responds to the slight curve of the roads.
7. The dwelling proposed is different from the adjoining and surrounding properties in regard to its design. The roof of the proposed dwelling would not respect those of the adjoining property and would therefore introduce a roof design that would detract from the host building.
8. The appeal site lies at the end of Treesmill Drive and borders Shoppenhangers Road, which is a main estate road that serves this part of Maidenhead. Whilst there is some screening along the boundary, the appeal proposal would be prominent in views along this road. At present these views are of the regular and consistent roof scape. However, given the design of the dwelling, the appeal proposal would introduce a prominent feature into these views and would appear as an incongruous form of development.
9. In response to the reduced width of the front part of the appeal site, the front elevation of the proposed building would appear relatively narrow. Consequently, when viewed from the front, there would be less generous spacing between the host dwelling and the new dwelling. This would result in a cramped appearance, indicative of overdevelopment. As a result, the proposal would introduce a pattern of development which would be out of keeping and harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
10. I have been referred to other similar designs within the estate, but do not find that these are comparable, and in any event, I have determined the appeal on its merits.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and, in this respect, is contrary to Policies. As such the proposal conflicts with policies DG1 (Design Guidelines), H10 (Housing layout and design), H11 (Housing layout and design) of the Local Plan and QP1 (Sustainability and Placemaking) of the emerging Borough Local Plan. These policies seek amongst other things to ensure that new development relates to the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

12. It is acknowledged by the Council that, at this moment in time, they are unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. On the basis of the information before me, I see no reason to disagree with this position and I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.
13. Paragraph 11 of The Framework states that where relevant policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as whole or where specific policies in the NPPF, indicate that development should be restricted. Footnote 7 does not apply to this case.
14. The proposed development would contribute a single dwelling towards the existing housing stock within the Borough. Whilst this is considered to be a

benefit, given the modest scale of the contribution, I find that the adverse impact of the proposed development upon the street scene, significantly and demonstrably outweighs this limited benefit.

Conclusion

15. I conclude that for the above reasons the appeal should be dismissed.

Adrian Hunter

INSPECTOR