

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2021

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/21/3275134
37 Princess Avenue, Windsor SL4 3LU

- 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 Malkit Purewal against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 20/03491, dated 22 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension and alterations to first floor side fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling which sits at the end of a cul-de-sac, side on to the main highway of Princess Avenue. Several such cul-de-sacs are present along Princess Avenue with the end houses sitting side on to the highway behind substantial side gardens. Although some of the houses further along Princess Avenue sit closer to the highway, the arrangement I have explained contributes to a welcome feeling of spaciousness along this particular part of the street scene.
 4. The proposed extension would be about as wide as the host dwelling. Although it would be single storey with a pitched roof, it would be a substantial structure with a large footprint. As a result, it would be viewed as a disproportionate addition to the host dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed extension would occupy a large proportion of the garden area to the side of the dwelling, significantly reducing the feeling of spaciousness. It would be readily visible above the existing boundary hedge and the resulting harm would be widely visible within the street scene. Although additional planting has been
-

suggested, I am not satisfied that this would successfully overcome the visual harm identified.

5. The appellant argues that a detached single storey outbuilding could be built within the garden of the appeal property under the provisions of permitted development. Whilst no precise details of such a building have been provided, the appellant accepts that it could not be as tall as the proposed extension. On this basis, it would not have a comparable impact. Furthermore, there is no suggestion that there is a reasonable prospect of such a building actually being built.
6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed single storey extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and it would harmfully reduce the spacious character of the street scene within which it sits. In such terms, the proposal conflicts with saved policies DG1 and H14 of the adopted Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan and policies QP1 and QP3 of the emerging Borough Local Plan, which collectively promote high quality design which respects and responds to local context.
7. The arguments advanced on behalf of the appellant do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR