



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4th March 2024

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 8th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/24/3336911

24 Highway Road, Maidenhead SL6 5AE

- 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 Johnny Santonocito against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref. 23/02337, dated 22 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension linking converted garage to the main dwelling, first floor front/side extension with supporting column and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension linking converted garage to the main dwelling, first floor front/side extension with supporting column and alterations to fenestration at 24 Highway Road, Maidenhead SL6 5AE in accordance with the terms of the planning application Ref. 23/02337, dated 22 September 2023 and 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 plans: PL-02 (Existing Floor Plans), PL-03 (Existing House Elevations), PL-01 (Proposed Block and Location Plan), PL-05 (Proposed Elevations) & PL-04 (Proposed Floor Plans).

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development on the Planning Form stated *"two storey rear extension, conversion of garage to kitchen and first floor front extension to incorporate the entrance porch"*. However, in the box heading I have used the description taken from the Council's Decision Notice as I consider that to be more accurate and specific.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of no.26 Highway Road with regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a residential house situated on the north side of Highway Road in the urban area of Maidenhead. No.26 is to its west and this is a bungalow. No.22 is to its east and this is a two storey dwelling.
5. The property in question is a detached two storey residential dwelling situated at Highway road, within the urban area of Maidenhead. The appeal site rises from the road in a northerly direction towards the rear garden.
6. The proposal consists of a rear two storey extension linking the converted garage to main dwelling, a first floor front and side extension with a supporting column and alterations to fenestration. The existing lean-to at the rear of the rear elevation of the property would be demolished.
7. Turning first to the proposed first floor front/side extension with changes to external materials of the elevations. This part of the proposal would be set back from the front elevation by approximately 0.4m and set down below the main ridge height by approximately 0.4m. This element would be of an appropriate scale and subservient nature. It would also include a hipped roof form, which due to similar angles and eaves levels, would be sympathetic in relation to the host property. The streetscene would change slightly but the proposed south (front) elevation would be visually attractive.
8. In relation to the proposed two storey rear extension, its roof ridge would not exceed the apex of the main roof of the dwelling, it would have a hip at the rear and it would not be a significantly deep extension. Overall it would not be an overly dominant addition even when viewed from the side at no.26 Highway Road. The streetscene would be similar to the existing streetscene.
9. The formal incorporation of the former garage into the main dwelling would be a sensible and logical use of built development. The rooflines, slopes and direction of gables at the rear would be diverse but the proposed development would not make the coherence or appearance of the dwelling any worse than existing. The hip on the two storey rear extension would be at a similar angle to the main roof helping to provide balance and integration. The proposed new fenestration would not be too numerous, fussy or unnecessarily large in size.
10. On this issue, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the area and would not be contrary to policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan (adopted 2022) or the guidance contained in the Borough Wide Design Guide (2020).

Living Conditions of Occupants of 26 Highway Road

11. No.26 Highway Road is a bungalow with longer flank elevations than its front elevation. It has a rear garden. In the flank elevation facing the appeal site it has about two openings and a conservatory. However, the conservatory has a

brick wall along its entire length (eastern elevation). There is a high close-boarded fence on the common boundary. In respect of potential overlooking from the resulting development at the appeal site, there would be two windows in the first floor of the western elevation facing the flank of the bungalow at no.26 Highway Road and there would be two windows at first floor level in the northern (rear) elevation.

12. However, given the close proximity of the fence to the flank of the bungalow and the siting of the proposed development and position of the windows, I do not consider that there would be any meaningful views into the rooms of the bungalow, including via the conservatory's glazed roof. The rear garden of the bungalow would continue to be screened by the built form of the bungalow, even though views from the new rear windows would be from a shorter distance than the current arrangement.
13. On this issue, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of 26 Highway Road by reason of loss of privacy. There would be no conflict with policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan or the guidance contained in the Borough Wide Design Guide.

Conditions

14. I have considered planning conditions in the light of advice in PPG. I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be built in strict accordance with the approved plans in order to avoid any uncertainty and to achieve good planning. In order to ensure that the host dwelling and surrounding area has its character and appearance preserved I have imposed a condition which requires external facing materials to match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

15. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I allow the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR