
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2023

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/23/3317148
41 Holmanleaze, Maidenhead SL6 8AW

- 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 M S Mureed against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 22/02811, dated 10 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a part single part two storey front/side/rear extension and new dropped kerb following demolition of existing shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner above from the Council's decision notice as it is more complete than that included on the planning application form.
3. The planning application sought consent for the extension of the appellant's dwelling, as well as the creation of a dropped kerb. The Council's reason for refusal relates only to the proposed extension. Therefore, the proposed dropped kerb has not been determinative in considering this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

5. Holmanleaze is a residential cul-de-sac. Whilst some properties have been extended, the street largely retains its character of semi-detached properties of simple design. The appeal scheme and adjoining semi-detached property retain their original form.
6. The appeal proposes an overly large crown roof extension, which would dominate and significantly increase the overall bulk of the existing dwelling. The pitch of the proposed side roof plane would be substantially steeper than the existing arrangement, which would unacceptably add to the overall mass of the roof.

7. The rear element of the proposed crown roof would be an overly-complicated and unusual design, in order to accommodate a chamfered corner at first-floor. Whilst I recognise that this arrangement would reduce any impact on the living conditions of the adjoining residents, it would give rise to a contrived and incongruous design at both first floor and roof level.
8. Overall, the significant mass and bulk of the appeal scheme, as I have described, would not appear subservient to the existing dwelling and would unacceptably undermine the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached houses. Additionally, it would be clearly visible from both Holmanleaze and Kennet Road to the rear of the appeal site. As such the scheme would unduly harm the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the area.
9. I have considered an existing extension to No 29 Holmanleaze highlighted by the appellant. Whilst I note that this scheme shares similarities with the appeal proposal, there are noteworthy differences. The neighbouring house includes a crown roof extension, but the side roof plane is the same pitch as would have been found on the original dwelling. The crown roof is therefore less bulky than the appeal proposal. Also, the extension is not chamfered so the form of the roof and extension is less complicated. In view of this, I consider the appeal proposal to be significantly different to the neighbours' home. In any event, each proposal must be considered on its own merits. Consequently, I have attached limited weight to this in support of allowing the appeal.
10. In conclusion, the proposals would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As a consequence, the development is contrary to Policy QP3 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) Local Plan 2013-2033 (2033) and Principle 10.1 of the RBWM Borough Wide Design Guide (2020). Taken together, these policies seek to secure high quality development through good design which responds to and enhances the host dwelling and area.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR