



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2022

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/21/3284812

16 Washington Drive, Windsor SL4 4NS

- 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 Mrs Odette Paesano against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 21/02034, dated 1 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Policies DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan adopted 2003 referred to in the Council's first reason for refusal have been superseded by Policies QP1 and QP3 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 2013 – 2033 (the Local Plan) which has been adopted since the Council made its determination. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the relevance of the new Plan policies.
3. The appeal site is located adjacent to an area of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The Council has raised concern that the proposed development works could encroach into the root protection area of some of the protected trees. This resulted in the Council imposing refusal reason two relating to the lack of adequate evidence that would indicate that the development would not detrimentally impact protected trees. An Arboricultural Method Statement, Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan in Accordance with BS 5837:2012 by SouthOaks Arboricultural Consultancy has been submitted by the appellant in support of the appeal. This report has addressed the Council's concerns. The Council have confirmed that they are no longer contesting the second reason for refusal. I, therefore, have not dealt with this matter within my decision letter.

Main Issue

4. The main issue raised in respect of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Boroughwide Design Guide (the Design Guide) adopted in June 2020 provides guidance for householder development. Principle 10.1 expects extensions to dwellings to be subordinate and respond positively to the form, scale and architectural style and materials of the original building and resists development that is over-dominant or out of keeping or that erodes the character of the street scene. The overarching aim of the Design Guide seeks to achieve high quality design and attractive places. The Design Guide is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which sets out that design guides and codes provide a local framework for creating beautiful and distinctive places with a consistent and high-quality standard of design.
6. The proposed front gable extension would project beyond the main frontage of the dwelling over two storeys. The side extension that would host the front gable would not have a set down from the main ridge line of the original dwelling. Taken together, the side extension with front projecting two-storey gable would add considerable built development to the original dwelling. Given the lack of step down from the existing ridge and the visual dominance of the projecting two-storey front gable, the proposal would not represent a subservient addition to the host dwelling. The proposal would substantially visually alter the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would not respond positively to the form and scale of the existing dwelling. Consequently, this visually unsympathetic addition would appear as a harmful addition to the host dwelling.
7. The appellant contends that the proposal would add visual interest to the property, more so than that of the subservient example extension highlighted at 2 Washington Drive. The gable projection would have a set down from the main ridge and it would not project further forward of the existing single-storey front porch and that of the adjacent property at 14 Washington Drive. I accept that the perception of spaciousness to side and around the dwelling would be retained. However, these matters do not overcome the visual harm that I have identified above or would justify the proposed development.
8. Other properties along Washington Drive host gable frontages. The proposal's design approach broadly reflects that of surrounding properties and there would be no loss of space between buildings. The dwellings along Washington Drive are staggered within the street scene and the staggered gable sides of dwellings are clearly visible as part of the character of the street scene, particularly when looking upward in the street toward the appeal property. In terms of the wider street scene the front projection of the proposal would not appear appreciably out of keeping.
9. Although I have not found harm to the character and appearance of the area, for those reasons set out further above, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policies QP1 and QP3 of the recently adopted Local Plan, principle 10.1 of the Design Guide and the Framework that, amongst other matters, seek development to positively contribute to the places in which they are located and to achieve high quality design.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR