



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2025

by **Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3359968

9 Highfield Road, Windsor SL4 4DN

- 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 Victor Nweke against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 24/02766.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "Construction of two storey front extension and new pitched roof to existing garage".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, streetscene and locality.
 - The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling at 8 Highfield Road, with regard to whether the development would appear overbearing.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a two storey detached dwelling located within a cul de sac. The property would be extended forwards 6m at two storey height towards the street across its full width with the same ridge and eaves level as those of the existing main roof. The assertiveness of the addition would be further emphasised by its front gable. The footprint of the new two storey part would be a particularly high proportion of that of the existing property at this height. Moreover, beyond this there would be single storey parts to each side. This includes the existing garage which would link to the host property with a pitched roof added.
4. Although size in itself is not evidence of harm, the proposal would constitute a disproportionate enlargement, overwhelming the existing gable ended property. The result would be an unacceptably elongated property projecting towards the street. The unduly deep sides would be readily apparent from the street, illustrating the overly dominant, bulky and intrusive nature of the enlarged dwelling.

5. The juxtaposition with the significantly more modest depth, scale and bulk of the property at 8 Highfield Road would provide a jarring and discordant contrast. The poorly proportioned dwelling would also be unduly at odds with the general rhythm of other properties in the vicinity, which tend to be appreciably more restrained in their depths. In consequence, the extended property would be unduly prominent in the streetscene.
6. It is acknowledged that the host dwelling and others nearby are, in themselves, of no particular architectural merit. There is also some variation in dwelling sizes and their distance from the pavement in Highfield Road where the properties are arranged around a turning head. However, despite these matters, in the above circumstances the development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, streetscene and locality.
7. There would be conflict with Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, Local Plan 2013-2033, Policy QP 3, which, among other things, seeks high quality design that respects and enhances the local environment with regard to layouts, rhythm, bulk and massing.
8. The most relevant Principle in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), Borough Wide Design Guide, 2020, is 10.2 as it specifically concerns front extensions. This indicates that even if set back adequately from the street, the scale of the extension should not appear harmful. Such development should also not be prominent in the streetscene. Given the above findings the development would therefore be at odds with the SPD.
9. The host dwelling projects beyond the front elevation of the adjacent property at 8 Highfield Road by 1.2m, as shown in the amended site plan provided with the appeal. An annotated plan indicates that from a position 0.9m back from the centre of the adjacent ground floor window the two storey part of the development would reduce the angle of view by about 14 degrees.
10. However, the existing ground floor window is fairly large and wide with the existing outlook across the frontage at the appeal site, where there is a fairly low flat roofed garage, being particularly open. There would be only a fairly limited gap from the side boundary to the extension, with the distance to the affected opening also being relatively modest.
11. In consequence, the vertically rising full two storey flank wall of the extension, with a pitched roof above, would be in unduly close proximity to the window. In these circumstances, rather than giving rise to a suitably small reduction in outlook, the development would be visually intrusive with an unpleasantly oppressive sense of enclosure. Moreover, when looking out of the window occupiers may also be closer to it or further away from the centre, towards the end furthest from the appeal site, than shown in the submitted drawing. From these positions there would be an even more intrusive reduction in outlook.
12. As a result of the above factors, the proposed enlargement would appear overbearing and the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling would be harmed. The development plan policies referred to in the Council's second reason for refusal only concern specific matters that do not include overbearing effects. Nevertheless, the scheme would be contrary to SPD Principle 10.1, which indicates that extensions should not result in a material loss of amenity to neighbouring properties by being overbearing.

13. The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that decisions should ensure that developments satisfy a number of considerations. These include adding to the overall quality of the area, being visually attractive and creating a high standard of amenity for existing users, which would not be achieved in this case.
14. The improved living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling would be achieved at the unacceptable expense of those of the adjacent occupiers and the quality of the built environment. Moreover, the harm that would arise in relation to these fundamental planning considerations is sufficient to justify rejecting the development. Therefore, regardless of whether a bat survey should be provided and taking account of all other matters raised, it is determined that the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR