

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2020

**by Peter Mark Sturgess BSc (Hons), MBA, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: Wednesday, 09 December 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/20/3261309**

**4 Winchester Drive, Maidenhead, SL6 3AH**

- 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 S Krishnamurthy against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
  - The application Ref 20/01955, dated 3 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2020.
  - The development proposed is single and two storey front extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. Winchester Drive is a street of mid to late twentieth century detached and semi-detached houses. The overall character of the road is of a spacious development of a uniform style which is evident through the dwellings' relationship to Winchester Drive, their materials and landscaping. The majority of the houses in the street have ridge and eaves lines parallel to the road. Where gables, which are parallel to the road do occur, they are usually subservient to the dwelling and they occur singly.
4. The appeal property lies closer to the road than many of the other properties in Winchester Drive. Common to other of the detached houses in the street, it has a single gable parallel to the road, with the remaining eaves and ridge parallel with the road. It is also just past a significant bend in the street when the property is approached from Highfield Lane/Old Court Road. This would make any front extension prominent in the street scene.
5. The proposal would introduce another gable next to the existing. The new gable would be wider than the existing gable and give the property an unbalanced, asymmetrical appearance. The side of the gable and its roof would also be visible when the property is approached from Highfield Lane/Old Court Road. Whilst gables facing the road are common on the large detached houses, double or side by side gables are not.
6. The front extension as a whole and the two gables in particular would appear as a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene and would unbalance

the front of the dwelling. As a consequence, the development would harm the character and appearance of the locality.

7. The development plan for the Borough includes the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 1999 (incorporating alterations adopted in June 2003) (LP). The relevant policies are DG1 and H14 which expect developments, including residential extensions, to be compatible with the area within which they are located and not to have any adverse effect upon the existing dwelling or the street scene.
8. I note that the LP predates the current version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Paragraphs 124 and 127 of the Framework adopt a similar approach to the LP with regard to the development of high-quality places and to ensuring that developments are sympathetic to the local surroundings. Therefore, I find the relevant policies of the LP consistent with the Framework.
9. As a result, I find that the proposal is in conflict with Policies DG1 and H14 of the LP as it fails to respect the character of the local area by the introduction of elements which would be visually prominent and incongruous in the street scene. As a result, it would harm the character and appearance of the area.

### **Other Matters**

10. The appellant has referred to other examples where front extensions have been permitted in Winchester Drive. However, I consider there are material differences between the examples and the appeal proposal. For instance, the front extensions at Nos 21, 23, 25 and 29 are all single storey, set well back from the road and have eaves lines which are parallel to the road. Moreover, they all link up with an existing single storey projection which also helps to reduce their prominence. This contrasts with the appeal proposal which is two storey and introduces a gable which is parallel to the road.
11. The two-storey extension at No 2 Winchester Drive appears to harmonise well with the façade of the building and retains a single gable. The appeal proposal would introduce an additional gable which would be wider than the existing.
12. In any event I am required to deal with the appeal proposal in terms of its particular merits.

### **Conclusion**

13. I therefore find that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Peter Mark Sturgess*

INSPECTOR