



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2023

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/TO355/D/23/3317484

27 Cavendish Meads, Ascot SL5 9TB

- 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 Carrie Piggott against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 22/03182, dated 25 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "Part garage conversion, first floor extension over garage and single storey rear extension".
-

Preliminary matter

1. In the decision below I have taken the description of development used on both the Council's decision notice and the appeal form. This is because it is a more accurate description of the proposal than that given on the application form.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part garage conversion, part first floor, part two storey front/side extension, single storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration, at 27 Cavendish Meads, Ascot SL5 9TB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/03182, dated 25 November 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 101, 102 B, 2016-039-201, 2016-039-202, 2016-039-203.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the materials specified on the application form and shown on drawing 102 B.
 - 4) Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, the first floor windows in the side elevation facing towards 25 Cavendish Meads shall be installed with obscured glass and with any opening being at a minimum height of 1.7m above internal floor level. The windows shall thereafter be retained in accordance with these details.

Main issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality.

Reasons

4. The appeal concerns a two storey detached dwelling. This has a single storey forward projection above which a first floor extension would be built. The visual impact of this addition would be mitigated by it being adjacent to the gable of the neighbouring dwelling at no. 25 and it would not rise above the ridge of the main roof of the host dwelling. In any event, it would fairly closely reflect a number of two storey forward projections at other dwellings nearby and therefore not be excessive in size and bulk.
5. There would also be a set back front addition to the side of this. This part of the development would rise to first floor level but not project above the top of the main roof while having a particularly modest depth and width. The pitch of the roof would reflect those of the first floor addition and the main roof of the existing property. The host dwelling has a fairly basic design, with the main part having a simple rectangular plan form and gable ends, with a flat roof garage projection. In this context, rather than appearing overly complex, this element would add visual interest by introducing additional articulation, enhancing the appearance of the dwelling and street.
6. The double storey projection would have no windows at ground floor level to the front or at the upper floor to the side facing towards no. 29. At the front this is already the case in relation to the existing garage, which would remain in this part. The upper floor of this elevation would have a window and the walls at upper and ground floor levels would have different materials in the form of brick and tile hanging, giving an attractive contrast. The elevation facing no. 29 would also have these materials and a garage door and window at ground floor level.
7. As a result, these parts would also add visual interest, while not appearing unduly harsh or stark, with no unacceptable absence of fenestration. This would not therefore comprise poor design. Furthermore, the proximity and position of the other side of the projection in relation to the adjacent dwelling means that this flank would not be easily seen from the street, while significantly restricting views of the somewhat unattractive blank gable at no. 25.
8. The set back addition and limited presence of windows are features found at other two storey front projections in the vicinity. The dwelling at the appeal site is one of three neighbouring properties with a single storey front projection. Nevertheless, rather than unduly contrasting with the dwellings to either side, the extended property would reflect the diversity of design found nearby in the street.
9. This includes not just dwellings with single storey front garages and those with two storey features extending forwards but also others with flat street facing elevations where there is an absence of such projections. The Council indicates that extensions at other properties were approved under different policies and guidelines. Nevertheless, these are a noticeable part of the built environment and I am not persuaded that they should be disregarded in this case.
10. In the above circumstances, the enlargement of the dwelling at the front would not appear overly dominant either in relation to the host dwelling or the streetscene. It would be appropriate in relation to matters such as its design, height, scale and bulk, as well as being sympathetic to the host dwelling and

wider context despite being fairly prominent in views from the street. For these reasons, it is concluded that the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality would not be harmed.

11. Borough Local Plan 2013-2033, Policy QP 3 and Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2026, Policy NP/DG3 would be complied with. Taken together and among other things, these seek high quality design that respects and enhances the local environment with regard to rhythm, height, scale, massing and bulk, while development should respond to and integrate with local surroundings.
12. Principle 10.1 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, Borough Wide Design Guide, 2020, indicates that extensions are expected to be subordinate and developments that are over dominant will be resisted. Although not subordinate to the host dwelling given its height and forward projection, the front enlargement would not appear overly dominant for the reasons given, with there being no detrimental impact. As a result, the development should not be rejected for this reason. Moreover, it would accord with the advice in the SPD that extensions should respond positively to the style, form and scale of the original building.
13. The Parish Council has raised concerns due to the loss of a car parking space from the conversion of part of the garage. However, the Council points out that public transport is available nearby and raises no objections to the availability of two spaces within the site. I have no technical evidence that would justify taking a different view and noted the availability of on-street parking at my site visit.
14. This is a case where there would be no harmful impact and the scheme would comply with the development plan. As a result and taking account of all other matters raised, the appeal is successful.
15. A condition specifying the approved plans is needed to provide certainty. Another requiring the facing materials to accord with those specified in the application and approved drawings is justified to protect the appearance of the locality. To protect the privacy of the adjacent occupiers the new first floor windows in the side facing no. 25 Cavendish Meads should be glazed with obscured glass and have a restricted opening.

M Evans

INSPECTOR