

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2017

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 31 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/17/3175049

21a Nelson Road, Windsor, Berkshire, SL4 3RQ.

- 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 and Mrs C Hayhoe against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application ref: 16/03865, dated 29 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion following replacement of existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - a) The effect of the replacement roof and loft conversion upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.
 - b) The impact of the development on the living conditions of nearby residents.

Reasons

- a) *Effect upon character and appearance.*
3. No. 21a Nelson Road comprises a modern detached dwelling located within a mixed residential area consisting of a range of detached, semi-detached and terraced two storey dwellings together with chalet style properties and bungalows. The house is of modest proportions, being sited at the head of a cul-de-sac and adjacent to a narrow service road running between nos. 19a and 21a.
 4. No. 19a is a small chalet bungalow which is set back behind the rear elevation of the subject property, such that the flank elevation of no. 21a is highly visible in the street scene.
 5. I acknowledge that to some extent the dwelling is dwarfed by the bulk of nos. 21/23 next door. However, those properties and the similar pair at nos. 17/19
-

are of inter-war design incorporating tall pitched roofs with a front-facing gable end to each of the pairs.

6. Chapter 7 (Requiring good design) of the Framework¹ and "saved" Policy DG1 of the Local Plan² advise that all new development should seek to achieve a high standard of design that improves the character and quality of an area. The policy further advises at Criterion 3) that special attention should be given to the 'roofscape' of buildings. Similarly, "saved" Local Plan Policy H14 1) states that extensions should not have any adverse effect upon the character or appearance of the original property, nor adversely affect the street scene in general.
7. The proposed alterations would raise the ridge height to equate with that of no. 21, to which it is closely related in visual terms. However, the mansard roof design would be at odds with the established format of adjacent properties, as would the front-facing dormer and roof light.
8. Of particular concern is the bulky east-facing roof configuration. This would be exceedingly prominent in the street scene having regard to the relationship of no. 21a with the open vista that is created by the turning head of Nelson Road and the immediately adjacent service road. Both the front and flank elevations would be highly visible from the turning head.
9. The scheme before me proposes a substantial increase in the bulk of the roofscape. Its mansard design with large flat roof, together with the insertion of a front-facing dormer, would appear as a bulky addition out of keeping with and at odds with the modest credentials of the dwelling as originally constructed and visually intrusive in the street scene.
10. For these reasons I have found upon the first main issue that development as proposed would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area, contrary to national policy in the Framework as referred to above and "saved" Local Plan Policies DG1 and H14.

b) Impact upon living conditions.

11. During my site visit I paid particular attention to the relationship of the appeal property with the neighbouring dwellings on either side, together with those to the rear. No. 21a is set behind the building line of no. 21 and at an angle to it. The detached chalet bungalow to the southeast is set further back and is separated from the appeal site by the service road, which provides access to numerous garages.
12. There would be no window openings to the east flank elevation. Indeed, an existing landing window would be bricked up.
13. The two rear-facing dormer windows would serve a new bedroom at second floor level. They would be sited above the windows of the floor below, which also overlook the rear gardens of adjacent properties. However, given the distance between the new dormers and the rear elevations of the dwellings to the rear, some of which possess dormer windows themselves, I am satisfied that development as proposed would not bring about any loss of privacy.

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework.

² The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in June 2003).

14. In view of the relationship of the subject property to neighbouring dwellings, I am also satisfied that the proposal would not be intrusive in terms of its effect upon the residential amenities of occupiers of adjacent properties.
15. I have therefore found on the second main issue that development as proposed would not have a harmful impact upon the living conditions of nearby residents, as required by "saved" Policy H14 2) of the Local Plan.

Conclusion

16. Notwithstanding my finding upon the second main issue, my concerns as to the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area are paramount. Accordingly, and for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR