



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/24/3342464

69 Cannon Court Road, Maidenhead, Windsor and Maidenhead SL6 7QP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ben Franklin against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 24/00306.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two-storey wrap around extension (rear/side/front) and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing elements.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Policy QP3 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (2022) (LP) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the framework') seek to achieve high quality development which respects and enhances local character.
4. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Wide Design Guide (2020) (SPD) sets out the Council's approach to securing high quality design. Section 10 sets out principles for household development, stating that extensions should 'be subordinate and respond positively to the form, scale and architectural style and materials of the original building' (Principle 10.1).
5. Cannon Court is characterised by a mixture of traditional detached, semi-detached and terraced houses, many of which have been extended. The appeal property sits at the end of a line of modest semi-detached homes and adjacent to a larger semi-detached Victorian villa. Whilst the property includes a front boundary hedge, it is visible within the streetscene.
6. The proposed extensions would include materials, a hipped roof design and fenestration which respond to the existing property. It would wrap around the rear and side elevations of the appellant's home and would be predominantly two-storey in form.

7. The proposed side extension would be overly wide in comparison to the host dwelling. As such, it would fail to comply with the SPD guidance that extensions should be no wider than half the width of the existing dwelling (Paragraph 10.8). I recognise that the proposed hipped roof design, the ridge line being set below the existing and the front elevation being set back at first floor level would reduce the bulk and mass of the proposed side extension to a certain extent. However, given the excessive width of the structure that I have described, overall, the side extension would appear overly dominant and would unacceptably imbalance the pair of semi-detached houses.
8. I note that the rear extension has been reduced in depth and the roof design has been amended during the course of the planning application in an attempt to overcome the Council's concerns. However, cumulatively the proposed side and rear extensions would give rise to an unacceptably bulky structure which would subsume and dominate the host dwelling. Overall, the appeal proposals would not appear as subservient to the existing house. The scheme would therefore be at odds with, and harmful to, the character and appearance of the site and area.
9. The appellant refers to nearby properties in support of the appeal. The appeal proposal sits adjacent to, No.71 Cannon Court Road. This is a large semi-detached home, which includes a two-storey side extension, as well as a rear dormer roof extension. I recognise that the side extension to No.71 is similar to the appeal scheme in that it is set down and set back from the host dwelling. However, it is significantly different in circumstances to the appeal extension as it is less than half the width of the host dwelling. Also, the appeal property is viewed more in the context of the attached house, No.67, and other nearby semi-detached houses of a similar scale and design to the appeal house, rather than this larger villa.
10. The appellant also refers to the extension to No.45 in support of the proposals. Again, whilst there are similarities to the appeal proposal, it fundamentally differs as the side extension is significantly narrower than the host dwelling. As such, unlike the appeal proposal, this extension sits comfortably within the context of the original house and street scene. I therefore attribute limited weight to both examples in considering the appeal.
11. In conclusion, the appeal proposals would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. It would therefore be contrary to LP Policy QP3, the guidance within the SPD and the provisions of the framework.

Other Matters

12. I have considered a number of matters outlined by the appellant. I recognise that the proposals would secure additional accommodation to meet the appellant's family needs. I also acknowledge that the proposals represent an efficient use of land, that there would be no harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and that the scheme would be constructed to a good standard of thermal efficiency. However, none of these matters, when considered individually or together, would outweigh the significant harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the site and area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR