



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/22/3313963

57 The Avenue, Wraysbury, Staines, Windsor and Maidenhead TW19 5EZ

- 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 James McCauley against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 22/02314, dated 20 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension, cladding and render, front dormer window, part conversion of car port to habitable accommodation, extension to car port and alterations to hardstanding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor front extension, cladding and render, front dormer window, part conversion of car port to habitable accommodation, extension to car port and alterations to hardstanding at 57 The Avenue, Wraysbury, Staines, Windsor and Maidenhead TW19 5EZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/02314, dated 20 August 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan at 1:1250 scale, and drawing nos. 01A, 02B, 03, 04e, 05A, and 06.

Procedural Matters and Background

2. On the basis of my site visit, the property immediately to the south of the appeal site appears to be 55A The Avenue, rather than '57A' as depicted on the drawings. I have therefore referred to it as 'No 55A' in my decision.
3. The appeal site has a fairly lengthy planning history, as summarised in the Council's delegated report, and which I have taken into account in my decision. Of particular note, an appeal was allowed in January 2022 in so far as it related to extensions and alterations to the house; but dismissed in respect of the conversion of, and extension to, the car port (Ref: APP/T0355/D/21/3277543) ('previous appeal').
4. As in the previous appeal, this scheme would involve the extension of the car port, which I refer to hereafter as the outbuilding, to form a home office, with WC, storage and parking. However, unlike it, in this case the outbuilding would

be raised in order to accommodate a void beneath, in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment by STM Environmental ('FRA').

5. In the scheme before me, the proposed alterations to the house are identical to the previous appeal. The Council consequently raises no objection to that element of the scheme. I have no reason to disagree with that assessment, and I have framed the main issue accordingly.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension and alterations to the outbuilding on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The Avenue comprises a mix of bungalows and two storey houses, with a varied form, style and appearance. Other than the host, which is set much further back from the road compared to its neighbours, they are arranged in a loose building line, but some with single storey structures, such as garages, to the front of the house.
8. As a result of this scheme, and in contrast to the previous appeal, the outbuilding's height would be increased by around 1 metre. However, it would have a hipped roof with a shallow pitch which would slope away from the road, and its car port would be open to the front and rear. These characteristics would limit its mass and bulk. That would be assisted by its mainly timber finish, giving it a less substantial, and more subordinate, appearance compared to the masonry or render typical of nearby houses. It would be significantly smaller in height and scale compared to the house on this plot.
9. Whilst the outbuilding would extend across much of the width of the plot, its position relative to the road would not change, and it would continue to be sited only marginally forward of the house at No 55A. In that position it would be further back from the road compared to some garages such as at 47 and 49 The Avenue.
10. Although the outbuilding would be taller than in the previous appeal, its footprint would be the same, and I have no cogent reason to disagree with that Inspector that, due to its set back and its part open-sided construction, it would not be so intrusive in the streetscene as to justify withholding permission. It would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
11. Accordingly, it would not conflict with that part of Policy QP3 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (2022) which requires high quality design which respects local character, paying particular regard to matters such as urban grain, layout, height, scale, bulk, massing, proportions and materials. Neither would it conflict with the similar advice in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Wide Design Guide 2020 Supplementary Planning Document.

Other matters

12. The area is at high risk of flooding. However, the drawings depict a void beneath the outbuilding's finished floor level, with honeycomb brick panels; and impermeable paving would be replaced with permeable hardstanding.

Consequently, I have no persuasive reason to disagree with the findings in the FRA, and the Council's conclusion, that the scheme would not result in an increased flood risk on site or to surrounding properties in the area.

Conditions and Conclusion

13. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition stating that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
14. The Council has also suggested a condition requiring that the external surfaces of the development match those used in the existing building. However, the drawings show that the walls of the existing house would be rendered, and that the house extension and the outbuilding would be clad in timber. My second condition refers to those drawings, and that suggested condition is thus inappropriate.
15. For the above reasons, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR