

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2019

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/19/3231985

4 Kimber Close, Windsor, SL4 4BJ

- 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 Mark Rossiter against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
 - The application Ref 19/00774, dated 19 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension and alterations to form pitch roof over garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor front extension and alterations to form pitch roof over garage at 4 Kimber Close, Windsor, SL4 4BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00774, dated 19 March 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: MPBP.19.4KC.02, MPBP.19.4KC.04 & MPBP.19.4KC.06.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a 1970's detached two storey dwelling and a forward projecting flat roof garage, with a mid-suburban sized garden, and a set in a cul-de-sac development. The detached and semi-detached properties found in Kimber Close are broadly similar. At the entrance to the road and alongside the appeal property is an older property (Silwood), more spacious and with more extravagant elevations and landscape. The character is of an established
-

residential good quality area and the scene is pleasing given combined spaciousness, landscape and dwellings' appearance. The proposal is as described above.

4. The Council is not concerned with the first floor front extension in its own right but rather with the impact to character and appearance stemming from the new roof planned for over the garage. In a street of flat roofed garages it is concerned that the new roof would disrupt the design of properties in Kimber Close and with its height, depth and wrap around design would appear bulky and unduly prominent.
5. I would agree with the Council that the first floor extension would be visually benign and in fact I could see it as a reasonable and positive update of an unremarkable existing elevation. In many ways I would put the pitching of the garage and side return roof into the same category. There would be some increase in bulk but in a relatively subtle form with a hipped arrangement to the front and a modest mono-pitch to the side as the wrap-around. The scheme would hardly be visible from the south, the entrance to the cul-de-sac, because of the siting of Silwood and its extensive landscape. Looking from the north the appeal property is the 'end of the row' and not disrupting 'flow'. In this direction the works would be seen against the back drop of the bulkier and well landscaped older home, within a front garden set-back which would continue to be generous, and all at a height well below the main property massing and very clearly of a subservient nature to this. Seen from front-on the dwelling's composition, with the first floor extension and the garage works combined, would be balanced, logical and appropriate.
6. I appreciate that other garages on the 1970's homes in Kimber Close are flat roofed but to my mind such form, while to a degree characteristic, provides little in the way of aesthetic merit. I do not see the need to set in stone the style of garages on the whole of this road; compatibility does not mean absolute replication is necessary. The appeal scheme, both with its garage changes and first floor works, will lead to a variation in frontage design but not such that it would be jarring on the eye or detract from the sense of place or streetscene.
7. The Royal Borough Local Plan Policy DG1 and the submission version Borough Local Plan Policy SP3 are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, they seek good quality development; compatibility with the established streetscene; and respect for townscapes, local character and an area's built form. I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with these policies.

Conditions

8. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this latter condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.
9. The Appellant has put forward the prospect of conditions relating to a lowered pitched roof and new planting but I am of the opinion that such requirements would not be necessary.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR