



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/22/3301858

Two Ways, Avenue Road, Maidenhead SL6 1UG

- 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 & Mrs Holmes against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 22/00974, dated 8 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as, 'detached carport with a room above served by front dormer windows'.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The site lies at the corner of two residential roads. The area surrounding the site is primarily characterised by large, detached houses on generous plots that give the area an attractive spacious feel. While there are garages on some of the neighbouring properties, these are generally set back from the street or away from a corner location such that the spacious character of the area is retained. The area of the site in front of the dwelling is largely undeveloped such that it provides a pleasant, open aspect to the corner location.
4. The proposed car port would be located near the boundary of the site at the corner of the two roads. As such, it would be in a prominent location. Given the height of the proposed car port and the additional massing of the proposed dormer windows, the proposal would project above the boundary wall. While there is some vegetation at the boundary, the permanence and level of screening it provides could not be guaranteed. Therefore, the proposal would appear prominent from a number of directions. As such, the spacious character of the surrounding area, particularly at this corner location, would be harmfully diminished by the proposal.
5. The site benefits from planning permission for a carport on a similar footprint as the proposed scheme. There is a realistic prospect that the permission would be implemented should this appeal fail. Accordingly, I attribute it significant weight as a fall-back position.

6. The proposal would be around 400mm taller than the fall-back scheme. The fall-back scheme does not include dormer windows. As such, the proposal would have a greater height and massing than the fall-back scheme.
7. The dormer windows would be primarily viewed from the east and in front of the site. The added massing of the dormer windows would result in the car port having a more prominent appearance than the fall-back scheme in these views. Given the greater height of the proposal, it would appear more prominent in the street scene from a number of views. As such, the proposal would result in greater harm to the spacious character of the area than the fall-back scheme and has therefore not altered my overall decision.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033 which seeks, among other things, development that respects and enhances the local character of the environment, paying particular regard to height, scale, bulk and massing.

Other Matters

9. During my site visit, I observed the first-floor extension over the car port and garage at the property known as Navarac. That scheme was set a substantial distance away from the street and was not in a corner location. In addition, the evidence indicates that the car port and garage were part of the existing buildings on the site and that the scheme constituted a first floor extension among other elements. As such, since the appeal scheme would be sited near to the front boundary and there is not an existing car port or garage, the scheme at Navarac is not directly comparable to this appeal and has not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR