
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2020

by Adrian Hunter BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/19/3241519

114-116 St Leonards Road, Windsor SL4 3DG

- 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 Golddust Limited against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 19/01025, dated 9 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the creation of a barrel roof extension and dormers to serve the creation of a two bed flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The decision notice refers to policies SP2 and SP3 of the emerging Borough Local Plan. Emerging policies SP2 and SP3 have now been amended and renumbered to Policy QP1 and Policy QP3 respectively. As this emerging policy does not form part of the development plan for the Borough and may be subject to further change before it is adopted, I have afforded it limited weight in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a brick built, detached building with a slate tiled mansard roof. The property was originally a purpose-built office building, however, it has now been converted into residential use. The building fronts onto St. Leonards Road. Surrounding land uses comprise a mix of residential, offices and other non-residential uses. To the south is a row of two-storey Victorian terrace properties, with traditional slate tiled pitched roofs. To the north is a three storey, relatively modern office development, constructed from brick and render, with two front gables. On the eastern side of the road, opposite the appeal site, lies a more recent residential scheme, which is a mix of three and four storeys in height.
5. The relationship between the appeal building and the adjoining row of terrace properties comprises a blank elevation, with the appeal property currently

being taller than the neighbouring Victorian buildings. As a result, the existing building is already a relatively prominent feature within the street scene. The proposed roof extension would extend across the full width of the building. It would increase the height of the building, to the point that it would substantially extend above the Victorian properties. The resultant building would also be taller than the existing office development to the north. The extension would therefore be visible as a prominent, and overly dominant form of development.

6. The proposed dormer windows and the curved roof profile of the addition would emphasise the prominence of the building in the street scene. It would increase the bulk of the building. The roof extension with its curved form and metallic finish with large dormers and windows in the sides, would appear incongruous with the design of the existing building and those surrounding it. It would therefore appear as a bulky, obtrusive and overly dominant form of development that would be prominent in the street scene.
7. The proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal conflicts with Saved Policies DG1 and H11 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan; together with Policies QP1 and QP3 of the emerging Borough Local Plan Submission Version and Paragraph 130 of The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework). These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that the design of new development is compatible with established street façades, with regards to scale, height and materials, with special attention to be given to the roofscape of buildings.

Other Matters

8. It is common ground between the parties that at this moment in time, the Council are unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land. On the basis of the information before me, I see no reason to disagree with this position and I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.
9. Paragraph 11 of the Framework states that where the most important policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in The Framework taken as whole, or where specific policies in The Framework, indicate that development should be restricted.
10. The proposed development would contribute a single dwelling towards the existing housing stock within the Borough. Whilst this is considered to be a benefit, given the limited scale of the contribution, I find that the adverse impact of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area, significantly and demonstrably outweighs this limited benefit.

Conclusion

11. Taking all matters into account, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole. There are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh the conflict. As such, the appeal should be dismissed.

Adrian Hunter

INSPECTOR