



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/21/3276912

54 White Horse Road, Windsor SL4 4PQ

- 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 Tom Carter against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 21/00872, dated 19 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension and part garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the determination of the planning application, the Council has confirmed a new Local Plan has been adopted, the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033 (adopted February 2022) (the BLP) and the Windsor Neighbourhood Plan has been made (June 2021) (the WNP). The Council has provided relevant copies of the new plans and policies and the appellant has had the opportunity to comment. The appeal has been determined on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, with particular regard to its scale and design.

Reasons

4. No. 54 White Horse Road is a relatively simple two-storey dwelling attached on one side to a garage belonging to the neighbouring property, No. 56 White Horse Road. The appeal property has a tiled pitched roof with a central gable running front to back. No. 54 also has a flat roofed garage to its other side and a single storey flat roofed extension on its rear elevation.
5. The appeal property and No. 56 have a generous set back from the road, with No. 54 having a relatively long front garden. No.'s 58 and 60 White Horse Road are orientated to be side-on to the road and this positioning creates the effect of a small courtyard, with both of these properties facing the front garden of No. 54. This arrangement is unlike most of the other housing along White Horse Road that tends to be close to the road and orientated to face it. These

four properties are very similar in appearance with relatively unaltered front elevations.

6. Although only single storey, the proposed front extension would be relatively high and extend across the front elevation of the main dwelling and across most of the front of the side garage. The proposal features a central flat roof with a raised dome above and a complicated largely hipped roof design, as a result a number of different roof planes would be visible from the road.
7. The proposed extension would be considerably wider than the main two-storey part of the existing property, and would project significantly forward from its front elevation. Despite the appeal property's position and generous plot size, the proposed extension would therefore appear as a bulky and dominating feature. The hipped roof, combined with the visible raised flat roof of the existing side garage, would also create an overly contrived and incongruous roof design which would be wholly at odds with the form and appearance of the appeal property. Notwithstanding that most of the roof structure would be much lower than the dome, the large scale of the proposed extension and its inappropriate roof design would not be sympathetic to the simple design and form of the host property and the surrounding built form.
8. Even with the different arrangement of those close by dwellings and the appeal property's generous set back, its bulk and incongruous roof form would still be visible from White Horse Road. The discordant appearance of this proposed extension, particularly against the simple and relatively unaltered properties close-by, would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. I note that there are other extensions to the front of properties in the immediate area, however, these are mainly designed in a lean-to form, and they are generally much smaller in scale than the appeal proposal. Whilst the proposal would include pitched roofs with a similar angle to the existing pitched roof, similar fenestration and external materials to match the host building, this would not off-set the identified harm to the character and appearance of the host building or the area. In coming to this view, I have also taken into account that the appellant has indicated that the roof lantern could be changed and that a flat or pitched roof design would not be a viable alternative.
10. In view of the above, I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, with particular regard to its scale and design. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy QP3 of the BLP, Policy DES.01 of the WNP, the Borough Wide Design Guide dated 2020, and paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which amongst other things, collectively seek high quality design that respects the host building and the character and appearance of the area.

Other matters

11. I note the appellant's comment about the lack of engagement from the Local Planning Authority during their consideration of the planning application, however that is a matter between the respective parties and not a consideration for this appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no other considerations which indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR