



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: 09 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/24/3343711

16 Cawcott Drive, Windsor, Windsor and Maidenhead SL4 5PU

- 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 Mr Kulvinder Sidhu against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 24/00379/FULL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and part rear and single front extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Planning permission has recently been granted by the Council to extend the appeal property (Ref 23/02855/FULL). The appeal proposal is similar to the approved scheme, with the key difference being that the first-floor rear projection would be deeper. I have there focused my attention on this element of the proposal in my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The proposed two-storey rear projection would be overly deep and extend a good way into the appellant's garden. I acknowledge that it would be set down below the main ridge line, would include a hipped roof and would be set away from the boundary with No.18 Cawcott Drive. Nevertheless, it would give rise to a substantial structure which, due to its significant bulk, would dominate the host dwelling. It would not appear subordinate to the house and therefore would be at odds with, and harmful to, the character and appearance of the property and area.
5. The appellant refers to the extant planning consent as a fallback position in support of the proposals. Both parties agree that the first-floor rear projection on the appeal scheme would be around 1 metre deeper than the previously approved development. As such, the appeal scheme would be notably deeper and bulkier than the fallback scheme. It would therefore have a greater effect

on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area than the previously approved development.

6. I note that the appellant considers that the appeal scheme represents a more logical and coherent design than the fallback development. The proposed first-floor rear projection would sit flush with the single storey rear projection, rather than being set back with a parapet wall. However, this parapet detail would sit comfortably in the context of the existing dwelling and would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or area. I therefore attribute little weight to this matter in support of allowing the appeal.
7. Taking all the above into account, I am satisfied that the fallback development would overall be significantly less harmful to the character and appearance of the property and area than the appeal proposal. As such, I attach limited weight to the fallback development in support of allowing the appeal.
8. The appellant refers to an extension to No.32 Cawcott Drive in support of the appeal proposals. However, the circumstances of that development vary from the appeal proposal. Whilst the proposed rear two-storey extension would be a similar depth to that development, it would be wider. As such, the proposed rear extension would be bulkier than the extension to No.32. In any event, each proposal must be considered on its own merits. I therefore attach limited weight to this development in making my decision.
9. In conclusion, the appeal proposals would be contrary to Policy QP3 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (2022), Policy DES.01 of the Windsor Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2034 Referendum Version (2021), Principle 10.1 of the Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Taken together, these seek to achieve high quality development which respects and enhances local character. Household development should be subordinate and respond positively to the form and scale of the original building.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR