



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2024

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/23/3333199

39 Green Lane, Windsor, Windsor and Maidenhead SL4 3RZ

- 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 Hugo Isaac against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 23/01358, dated 1 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable and raising the ridge to accommodate habitable accommodation within the roofspace, one rear dormer, new monopitch roof to the west elevation and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Having regard to paragraph 1.2 of the appellant's statement, I have taken the description of the proposal in my banner above from the appeal form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The houses on Green Lane are arranged in rows, set back either side of the highway. Notwithstanding some extensions and alterations, the host sits amongst a run of detached houses from 27 to 43 (odds), which are two storeys high, with principally hipped roofs, a red brick finish, and a broadly similar form and fenestration. Opposite the site, and elsewhere on Green Lane, the proportions and style of the houses differ, but this group has a fairly cohesive and well-balanced appearance in the streetscene.
5. The appellant states that ridge heights in this part of Green Lane vary by 300 to 500mm. Be that as it may, considered together, the proposed hip to gable extensions and the raised ridge would markedly increase the roof level bulk of the host. The resultant dwelling's form and mass would be at odds with its neighbours either side, and it would have a domineering impact in this part of the streetscene.

6. That impact would include in views approaching along Green Lane from either direction, where the proposed gabled form and raised ridge would result in an awkward visual relationship with its immediate neighbours.
7. I observed that No 45 close to this site has a higher ridge compared to the adjacent houses, along with a crown roof. However, its sloping roof form to each side ensures that it respects its neighbours and assimilates better into the streetscene than would be the case here. Beyond No 27 there are a number of dwellings which have been altered from a hip to a gable, and some of which have had their ridge raised. However, they are some distance from this site and on a section of Green Lane where the properties' appearance is not as consistent as here.
8. I observed that, compared to their front elevations, the rear faces of the dwellings in this group are less cohesive. However, the host's existing rear extensions are set down below its ridge and their combined bulk is further limited by their two distinct parts. They also broadly reflect the form of No 37.
9. In contrast, the proposed rear extension would not be set down from the raised ridge. As a result of that, and its large crown roof, it would have a substantial bulk, and it would not appear subordinate to the host, nor achieve a more aesthetically pleasing appearance. As the rear of No 39 is not visible from public vantage points, this adds limited harm to that which I have found as a result of the adverse impact on the streetscene. The use of matching facing materials and render would be appropriate, but the scheme as a whole would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host and the area.
10. It would thus conflict with Policy QP 3 of the Council's Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (2022). Amongst other things this requires high quality design which respects and enhances local character, paying particular regard to matters including rhythm, height, scale, bulk, massing and proportions.
11. It would also conflict with the advice at Principles 10.1 and 10.5 of the Council's Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020) that roof extensions should appear subservient to the main building and not undermine the visual amenities of the area; and that extensions more generally should be subordinate, respond positively to the form, scale and style of the original building, and avoid an over-dominant appearance.

Other matters

12. Following the recent conversion of a bedroom to a study to facilitate homeworking, the appellant requires a new bedroom. The proposal would provide that, and would also allow more natural light into the house.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The scheme's benefits are predominantly private, relating to the enjoyment of the house by its occupants. There are no public benefits that outweigh the harm that I have found. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR