



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 04 December 2020

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/20/3257534

44 Rushington Avenue, Maidenhead SL6 1BZ

- 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 J Sawyer against the decision Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00887, dated 07 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 08 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor front extension with undercroft, two storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing entrance canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first-floor front extension with undercroft, two storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing entrance canopy at 44 Rushington Avenue, Maidenhead SL6 1BZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00887, dated 07 April 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development given on the application form was "*Extension and re-modelling of existing dwelling*". This description was amended following submission of the application and the new description better reflects the development proposed. As such, I have referred to the amended description for the purposes of this appeal.
3. The Council's delegated report concludes that the relevant policies of the emerging Borough Local Plan (BLP) should attract only limited weight given the stage of preparation of the plan. Whilst the plan has progressed to examination again in December 2020, the stage of preparation has not so advanced to justify attributing additional weight to the emerging policies. Moreover, there is little information before me regarding any unresolved objections and the timescale for adoption. For these reasons, I attribute little weight to the relevant policies of the BLP.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a detached residential dwelling ('the host dwelling'), situated in Rushington Avenue, a predominantly residential street. The host dwelling is finished in render and yellow brick. Its main roof is a simple pitch, which runs parallel with the street so that its sloping element fronts the street. The host dwelling has an existing single-storey flat-roofed extension to the side and a two-storey flat-roofed extension to the rear. The host dwelling has a different appearance, roof form and materials than the vernacular and appears out of place with the broad sense of uniformity in Rushington Avenue.
6. The proposed front extension would introduce an under-crofted front-facing gable, which would better reflect the architectural features of dwellings in the area. In this respect, the proposal would improve the design of the host dwelling.
7. The proposed rear extension would not be visible in the wider streetscene. Glimpsed views of the side elevation would be possible from the street and, to a more limited degree, from the alleyway opposite the site, through the gap with the neighbouring dwelling. However, the proposed rear extension would not be prominent as it would be viewed in the existing context of flat-roof side and rear extensions and it would have a small inset.
8. The host dwelling features a mix of both flat and sloping roof types. The proposed rear extension would infill the gap between the existing single storey and two storey extensions. Its design would prevent a massive and bulky appearance by utilising variation in the height of the flat roof and contrasting materials to create separate elements, rather than continuing the roofline of the existing rear extension. Whilst the proposed rear extension would project above the existing eaves height, its design responds to the existing two-storey rear extension which also projects above the eaves height of the main dwelling. The proposed rear extension would thus create design cohesion with the existing extensions and as such, the small projection above the eaves of the dwelling is justified in design terms and would respect the existing roof forms of the host dwelling.
9. Whilst the combination of different roof heights and utilisation of the existing mix of roof types may appear complicated on-plan, the individual elements would appear well designed when viewed discretely from each elevation.
10. For these reasons, I conclude the proposal would respect and enhance the character of the host dwelling and surrounding area, in accordance with policies DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (adopted 2003) and the design guidance of the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, design which is in keeping with the character of the area.

Conditions

11. I have imposed the standard 3-year time limit and approved plans conditions to ensure the development takes place in a timely manner in accordance with the details of the proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposal accords with the relevant policies of the Development Plan and that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 20 FFRA SL01 Version A, 20 FFRA PE01 and 20 FFRA SP02.