



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/24/3352119

31 St Andrews Close, Old Windsor, Windsor, Berkshire SL4 2QU

- 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 Jack Thomas against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref. is 24/01387/FULL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey wrap around (front/side/rear) extension following demolition of existing elements.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposed development on the appellant's application form was "removal of existing garage, erection of new single storey extension to the right hand side and rear of existing dwelling, remove existing porch and erect new porch to suit new extension." In the box heading above I have used the description of the proposal from the Decision Notice issued by the Council because it more accurately and succinctly describes what development is proposed in the planning application.
3. In the Main Issues section below I have identified as one of the issues in the appeal the extent to which there is sufficient information on which to consider the risk of flooding as a result of the proposal. The appellant indicates that since the Council issued its refusal of planning permission the appellant has sought and received a Flood Risk Assessment. This Flood Risk Assessment has not been tendered for public consultation or consultation with any statutory consultees. In those circumstances, it would cause substantial prejudice to one or more of those interested bodies/persons if I was to take it into account in the appeal process.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene and whether there is sufficient information on which to consider the risk of flooding as a result of the proposal.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling on the east side of St Andrews Close which is a cul-de-sac. Its semi-pair is to its north and this is no.30 St Andrews Close. This has, amongst other things, a single storey rear extension and a single storey side extension which is stepped back from the main front elevation of no.30 and from its front porch.
6. The development proposed would include the demolition of an outbuilding located to the rear and south side of the property and the demolition of a rear conservatory. There would be a single storey wraparound extension which would follow the building line of the existing front porch out to the common boundary with no.32 St Andrews Close (about 4.7m in width) and would extend along the boundary (about 13.9m with a blank facade) and wrap around the rear elevation. It would have a mono pitch wraparound roof with some rooflights. The development includes the refurbishment of the existing driveway to install a permeable resin-bound surface, allowing for the soakaway of surface water, and space allowing for a minimum of 2 cars. At the time of my site visit, some demolition had already taken place.
7. St Andrew's Close has a cohesive character created by a number of similar semi-detached dwellings. There are also a number of detached dwellings. On-road parking is available, however, many dwellings have on-site front forecourts on which to park. The Close has a generally open character with the front elevations of dwellings generally visible. Dwellings in this area do tend to have front porches which, generally speaking, have been retained as separate visual elements and which are strong contributors to the character of individual dwellings and to the rhythm of the streetscene as a whole.
8. The wraparound extension proposed here, in particular the front element and part of the side element, would unduly dominate the host dwelling. The lack of a 'step back' design for the extension from the main front elevation of no.31 would result in a prominent development which would draw the eye and fail to be in keeping with the form and appearance of many of the other dwellings on the Close. The loss of the visual separation of the front porch as a design feature in its own right would be unduly harmful to the character of the host dwelling and streetscene. The proposed design subsumes the porch into the wraparound extension and this would be detrimental to the character of the house.
9. The wraparound extension as a whole would not be subordinate to the host dwelling as it would result in an addition which would add notable bulk to it and it would not appear subservient.
10. I have taken into account the scale, character and appearance of other extensions both on St Andrews Close and in the immediate vicinity. In particular, I noted that no.20 St Andrews Close (at the end of the cul-de-sac) has an extension which has incorporated the front porch but I have considered the scheme before me on its own individual merits including its position in the streetscene, its relationship to nearby dwellings, its scale and its siting. I have concluded that it would be unduly harmful.

11. On this issue, I conclude that the proposal would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene. It would be contrary to policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (adopted 2022), and Principles 10.1 and Principle 10.3 of Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020).

Flood Risk

12. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 where there is a high risk of flooding. As indicated in the Procedural Matters paragraph above, on the information that I can properly take into account, the proposal fails to demonstrate that the development is located and designed (with or without mitigation measures) to ensure that flood risk from all sources of flooding is acceptable in planning terms. Sufficient details relating to flood mitigation and floor levels are not available to me for the reasons I have explained above. In their absence, there is a failure to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in additional flood risk.

13. On this issue I conclude that there is insufficient information on which to conclude that the proposal would not unacceptably increase flood risk on and/or off site. It would be contrary to policy NR1 of the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (adopted 2022).

Conclusion

14. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.
Inspector