
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2023

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/22/3313926

1 Kentons Lane, Windsor SL4 4JH

- 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 Ms Michelle Downey against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01373, dated 29 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of x2 rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of x2 rear dormers at 1 Kentons Lane, Windsor SL4 4JH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/01373, dated 29 April 2022 subject to the conditions set out below:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved plans: 017.1000 Rev:01 and 017.2010 Rev:P3.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used as proposed to be utilised under application reference 22/00064/CPD.

Procedural Matter

2. As highlighted by both parties a hip to gable extension and single storey side and rear extensions have been approved under application references 22/0064/CPD and 22/00073/PDXL respectively. These had not been constructed at the time of my site visit. However it is not in dispute that these can be built and I note that the Council is content that the proposal, the subject of this appeal, wholly centres upon the construction of x2 rear dormers. I have amended the description of development to this, as the application form refers to dormer in the singular; and have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow located within a residential area comprising a variety of dwelling types with some loft conversions and dormer extensions apparent within the rear garden scene. As explained above, the proposed dormers would be part of a wider scheme to convert the existing side hips on the roof to gable ends, as well as a substantial single storey flat roof extension to the rear which would be contemporary in its appearance.
5. In 2020 the Council adopted a Borough-wide Design Guide (DG), Principle 10.5 of which states that roof alterations should be sympathetic and subservient to the design of the main building and not undermine the visual amenities of an area when viewed from streets and public open spaces; and all types of dormers must be set back from the side and ridgeline of the roof and not occupy more than half the width and depth of the roof slope. The proposed 2nd dormers would occupy more than half the width and depth of the rear roof slope although they would be set back from the sides and ridgeline of the roof.
6. Whilst in themselves the dormers collectively would be quite substantial, nonetheless I consider they need to be read in the context of the other alterations that are due to be carried out to the property; and the provision of simple fenestration to match the ground floor rear elevation as to be extended would largely form part of a coherent whole. I accept that the dormers are deep, but ultimately views of these would be limited, including from other dormers that have been constructed on dwellings that front St. Andrew's Crescent.
7. I consider that notwithstanding their overall presence within the roof space of the host dwelling, as to be extended, the dormers would not amount to poor design. Whilst it could be argued that they are not subservient, I consider them to be sympathetic and would not undermine the visual amenities of the area due to an absence of viewpoints within the public realm. I therefore find the proposal complies with Policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033 which requires all new development to contribute towards achieving sustainable high quality design in the Borough where it achieves a number of design principles, including respecting local character of the environment, paying regard to urban grain layouts, rhythm, density, height, skylines, scale, bulk and massing.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
9. Other than the standard time limit condition, the Council recommends that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and that materials match the existing building. As it is proposed to change the roof material, I consider it necessary to amend the reference to matching the proposed roof material pursuant to 22/00064/CPD, so as to allow consistency in the finish of the proposed works to the dwelling as a whole.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR