



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: 29th June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/23/3319379

11 Wavell Road, Maidenhead, Windsor and Maidenhead SL6 5AB

- 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 Holmden against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 22/03235, dated 1 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is a part single and part two storey wraparound extension (front/side/rear) with Juliet balcony to rear, alterations to existing front canopy and steps following demolition of an existing store and garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single and part two storey wraparound extension (front/side/rear) with Juliet balcony to rear, alterations to existing front canopy and steps following demolition of an existing store and garage at 11 Wavell Road, Maidenhead, Windsor and Maidenhead SL6 5AB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/03235, dated 1 December 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings: proposed ground floor, rear and side elevations, proposed first floor plan, proposed front and rear elevations, proposed side elevation and roof plan, received on 29 December 2022

Procedural 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 the description included on the planning application form.
3. The Council has advised that reference to a front gable in the Officer Report is an error. This should instead refer to a hipped roof gable, as shown on the

drawing titled 'side elevations and roof plan', received on 29 December 2022. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The proposed side extension would project slightly forward of the front elevation of the appeal dwelling, marginally breaching the largely uniform building line of properties on this side of Wavell Road. Given that this would only be a nominal forward projection and a good distance would be retained between the extension and the front boundary of the site, the appeal proposal would not appear overly dominant within the streetscene.
6. I recognise that, as the proposed side extension would not be set down from the existing roof ridge or set back from the front elevation, the proposals wouldn't appear as subordinate to the host property. Nonetheless, the hipped roof design of the forward and rear projections would reflect the existing roof form and would be set well down from the main roof ridge. This would limit the bulk of the appeal scheme and would ensure it would be visually discernible as an addition to the existing property. As such, this extension would sit comfortably within the context of the host dwelling.
7. The design of the proposed side extension differs to that of adjacent properties, including the adjoining neighbour at No. 9. However, Wavell Road is characterised by semi-detached homes of varying designs. Moreover, on my site visit, I observed that several of these properties include extensions which are very similar to the appeal proposal. As such, I am satisfied that the appeal scheme would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. For the reasons outlined above, the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or area. The proposals are therefore not in conflict with the requirements of Policy QP3 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) Local Plan 2013-2033 (2033) and Principles 10.1 and 10.2 of the RBWM Borough Wide Design Guide (2020), insofar as they seek to secure high quality design, which responds positively to the original building and is not overly prominent within the streetscene.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would indicate otherwise that the appeal should be dismissed. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is allowed. In addition to the standard time limit, a plans condition is imposed in the interest of certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR

