



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/20/3245285
23 Arthur Road, Windsor SL4 1RS

- 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 & Mrs Hall against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 19/02844, dated 10 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'loft conversion achieved by raising the ridge and rear flat roof dormer, 2no velux windows to front'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 'loft conversion achieved by raising the ridge and rear flat roof dormer, 2no velux windows to front' at 23 Arthur Road, Windsor SL4 1RS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/02844, dated 10 October 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: Location plan, block plan, proposed elevations (19-4738-04 Rev C), proposed floor plans (19-4738-03 Rev C), building regulations (19-4738-05).
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match the host building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is part of a row of terraced housing, located to the eastern end. To the front, the ridge line of the terrace is visible from public vantage points including the pavement opposite the site. However, the ridge is interrupted by parapet details, and large chimneys. This provides some mitigation for the proposal to raise and set back the ridge. Furthermore, the proposal maintains the existing roof slope and utilises matching materials helping it to assimilate with the context. Moreover, the proposal would be seen in the context of similar development that has already occurred along the

terrace including at 27 Arthur Road. The box dormer may also be evident from the front. However, it would not be prominent and again, seen in the context of examples which already exist, for example at no 29.

4. To the rear, there are public vantage points of the appeal site, including from the Alma Road car park and the elevated railway line. However, the rear of the terrace is characterised in part by a wide array of highly visible alterations and extensions. These include box dormers of various shapes and sizes, including ones very similar to the proposal. The development would be seen in the context of other examples of comparable roof extensions in terms of its form and mass. These now form a part of the character within this part of the Victorian and Edwardian Suburbs Townscape Assessment Area.
5. Furthermore, the proposal would be less prominent than many of these examples given its location to the east of the car park and the screening provided by the intervening trees. Additionally, the use of dark, recessive and matching roof slates would help the proposal to assimilate with its context. Whilst the proposed windows would only partially align with the existing fenestration below, of itself, this causes no significant harm.
6. The Council highlight that several examples of similar development to the terrace were approved by committee against the recommendations of its professional planning officers. Nonetheless, save for one example, the evidence indicates that they are lawful. I have assessed this case on its own merits, noting no identical development within the terrace, and recent refusals of similar schemes by the Council. However, the context is a significant consideration. Furthermore, I have had regard to the guidance within the Council's Guidance Note 1 House Extensions, dated July 1992. Whilst I note conflict with this advice, I consider that this is outweighed by the context provided by other existing roof alterations and extensions. Finally, the Council state that the host building is one of five uniform properties at the end of the row. However, the appeal site is not seen in this isolated context, but as part of the wider row. Furthermore, no 27 is part of this group and, as noted above, it has been extended similarly to the proposal before me.
7. Therefore, in conclusion I find that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would not conflict with 'saved' Policies DG1 and H14 of The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in June 2003), or Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The aims of these policies include the provision of development that is sympathetic to local character and appearance.
8. I have considered the suggested conditions by the Council, including the need for matching materials. I note that the appellant has proposed matching materials and, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition to require this would be reasonable and necessary. Furthermore, in order to define the terms of the permission, I have imposed the standard implementation and approved plans conditions.
9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR