
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/19/3228121

1 Elm Road, Windsor SL4 3NB

- 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 J Blight against the decision of Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 19/00503, dated 20 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the extension of approved rear dormer and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension of approved rear dormer and side extension at 1 Elm Road, Windsor SL4 3NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00503, dated 20 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Refs blight/18/12/18/fpp Location Plan and Block Plans; blight/18/12/18/fpp Block Plan and Illustrations; blight/18/12/18/fpp Proposed Elevations; blight/18/12/18/fpp Proposed Floor Plans all dated 12 February 2019.
 - 3) 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.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises an end terraced dwelling with associated private rear garden. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with rows of terraced properties along Elm Road. To the side of the site is an open grassed access strip and beyond this is a public house. To the rear of the appeal site is a large building forming army barracks.
5. The proposed development would introduce an L-shaped rear dormer to the roof of the property, a side extension at first floor level and a single storey side and rear wrap around extension. It would also include two front rooflights and alterations to the fenestration. The appeal site has an extant permission for a smaller L-shaped dormer and for the single storey extension.
6. The proposed development would enclose the existing outrigger which is an original feature of the property and which is replicated along the adjoining terraced properties. However, I have had regard to the approved single storey extension which would substantially obscure the lower part of the outrigger leaving only a small amount visible and which would therefore significantly alter the character of the dwelling and this feature. Accordingly, I find that the first-floor extension would not be unduly harmful to the appearance of the property or surrounding area. Furthermore, whilst the side and rear of the appeal site is partially visible from the public realm as a result of the open access to the side, the loss of the outrigger would not be particularly apparent from Elm Road.
7. The originally permitted dormer would extend only part way along the roof of the existing property. However, the proposed dormer would extend out level with the rear elevation. Whilst this would increase the projection and overall scale of the dormer extension, it would retain a set back position from the side elevation of the dwelling. This would result in a staggered arrangement at roof level, which would reduce the overall bulk and dominance of the proposed dormer. I find that the proposal would represent a reasonably limited increase over and above that previously approved and would therefore not be harmful to the visual character of the dwelling or area.
8. I have given the fall-back position of the previously approved extensions significant weight as it has not been indicated that it would be unlikely that these would be implemented in due course. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would not represent a substantial increase over and above the approved scheme. The proposed first floor extension would sit in line with the existing side elevation and the set in of the dormer would retain a degree of subservience to the main property.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. It would therefore comply with saved Policies DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (2003). Collectively these seek to ensure that extensions should not have any adverse effect upon the character or appearance of the original property, neighbouring properties or the street

scene in general and special attention should be given to the roofscape of buildings, amongst other things. It would also comply with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which aims to ensure development is well-designed.

10. The Council have referred to emerging Policies SP2 and SP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013 - 2033 Submission Version which require all new development to contribute to the places in which they are located and be of a high-quality design, amongst other things. This emerging local plan has not yet been adopted and I have not been provided with details of its current status or whether there are unresolved objections to the aforementioned policies. As such I give these limited weight at this stage, nevertheless the proposed development would comply with their overall aims.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building is necessary in the interests of the visual character of the area. The Council have suggested no other conditions and I consider none to be necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR