



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2023

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/23/3323842
124 Springfield Road Windsor Berkshire SL4 3PU

- 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 G Bhullar against the decision of The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 22/03226, dated 1 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is Changes to existing roof to enlarge habitable accommodation within the roof space and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. Springfield Road is a mid-twentieth century suburban street accessed off Imperial Road, populated, in the vicinity of the appeal site, with a mixture of single and two-storey dwellings that mostly retain the character of their original steep-pitched, plain clay tile roof forms. The appeal Site, No.124 Springfield Road (No.124) is a single storey detached dwelling that has been enlarged into its roof void with a rear dormer extension and rooflights in front-facing roof slopes, works which have not affected the simplicity of geometry embodied in the original form of the host dwelling in so far as this is apparent in the street.
4. The appellant intends to enlarge the roof accommodation with side extensions to the roof space over the front gabled wing such that the existing valley intersection with the main roof surfaces is moved forward and the flank walls of the roof volume thereby generated appear as a vertical tiled surface under a full width crown roof. The design seeks to provide accommodation which would be equivalent to the addition of a front dormer but is merged into the roof form with a forward-facing sloping roof surface and integral windows.
5. The appellant asserts that the disposition of the host building, and its neighbours means the alterations would not be prominent in the street scene. However, whilst this would be the case for direct frontal views and the

additions could appear as consistent¹ in terms of materials used, the resultant rhomboid-shaped tiled flanks would be prominent in oblique views such that the resultant roof geometry would obtrusively differ from what is currently found. It would introduce an alien visual element, particularly in the approach views which would be experienced by passers-by, alongside their experience of the neighbouring dwellings. My observations direct that this would unacceptably detract from the generally settled visual character of this part of Springfield Road appearing as a prominent inconsistency in the street scene. I acknowledge that the appellant has pointed to works and approvals to other dwellings nearby; however, it is the design of the works proposed to which my reasoning attends and not the principle of alteration and extension.

6. The proposal would conflict with Principle 7.7 of the Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Wide Design Guide (BWDG) which requires that development should not introduce roof forms which diverge from prevailing character, as supported by Policy QP3 of the Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2022 (BLP) and also with Policy DES01 of the Windsor Neighbourhood Plan 2021 (WNP) that requires proposals to demonstrate they take into account relevant design guidance. I therefore conclude the proposal would conflict with the development plan in relation to its objectives for high quality design and with the development taken as a whole. In consequence, taking into account all matters raised, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

¹ Subject to the materials used being of similar colour, texture and tile gauge.