
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 March 2022

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/21/3289303

2A Martin Close, WINDSOR, SL4 5SP

- 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 Parsonage against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 21/02475, dated 4 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is Single storey front/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the wider area.

Procedural matter

3. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (LP) was adopted in February 2022, after the appeal had been submitted. I must determine the appeal on the basis of the policies within the most up to date local plan. Therefore, in the interests of fairness both parties were given the opportunity to comment on what, if any, implications the revised policy position could have on my determination of the appeal before me.

Reasons

4. The host property is an end of terrace property, which is infill development, within the Laing Estate, an area defined within the Windsor Neighbourhood Plan (NP) adopted in June 2021.
5. The front wall of the property is in line with the garaging of the rest of the terrace. This results in a subtle visual stop to the terrace when viewed from Martin Close. Nonetheless, the terrace of housing to which the host property is attached, is of a simple design. This terrace, in common with many of the properties in the wider area is characterised by flat roofed garages, which project at the front of the properties in a regular fashion providing a defined building line. Whilst there are sporadic individual examples of monopitch roofs within the streetscape, including at the host property, the predominant aesthetic is of strong horizontal lines derived from the garages and canopies over the front doors.

6. The proposed garage would sit on a spur of land which extends along Martin Close as it bends in the direction of Ruddlesway. Currently this land is viewed in the context of the footpath and designated local green space which runs to the side of the property. The subsequent development would project significantly beyond the line of the existing garages, at around 5m from the front of the house, which already lies proud of the rest of the terrace.
7. As such, this ground floor extension would be highly visible and due to its elongated nature appear incongruous within the wider street scene. This would be particularly evident when leaving Martin Close and when viewed from Willows Path which at the time of my site visit, in the middle of the afternoon, appeared to be well used.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and would therefore be contrary to Policies QP3 of the LP and DES.01 of the NP. These policies require development to be designed to respect and enhance the local character of an area.

Other matters

9. I am aware that the appellant wishes to provide additional storage for his property and garaging. I have no reason to doubt that once built there would be adequate room for additional cars to be parked on the property without resulting in pressure for on-street parking, or that the garage may be large enough to house a car. I note that no objections have been raised in relation to any impact on neighbouring living conditions.
10. I took the opportunity to visit the wider area and noted that there are some examples of staggered developments, including the extension opposite the appeal site. Nonetheless, I do not have the details of the policy context in which the developments took place. Moreover, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the particular site-specific circumstances of the case before me.

Conclusion

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

Louise Nurser

INSPECTOR