



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/24/3338735 8 College Crescent, Windsor SL4 3PG

- 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 Peter Kellard against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 23/00645, dated 13 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension following demolition of existing Garage and Conservatory. Two storey rear extension plus loft extension created by raising roof height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on: - i) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property (No.10).

Reasons

3. The detached house is part of a row of four properties of the same design on the north-eastern side of College Crescent. The form and spacing between them have a notable rhythm, and due to the curve in the road and the separation the roofscape and massing of these properties are visible in views along College Crescent.
4. The proposal incorporates several elements which would significantly alter the form and appearance of the property. The proposed rear addition would have a higher ridge line, and combined with the side extension and dormer, would create an irregular and contrived roof form with several flat roof elements. Despite being set back, the higher roof would be evident, disrupting the form and homogeneity of the properties, and contrasting with the simplicity of the existing pitched gable roof.
5. I have been directed to two detached properties of the same design further along the road (Nos. 34 and 36) which have been extended to the side over the garage. I also observed other extensions and dormer windows in the locality. While individual aspects may be appropriate, and the materials are to match, in combination, the scale and design of the proposed development would result in

a discordant and incongruous form. This would both, consume the existing property, and be out of keeping with the street scene of inter-war properties.

6. Overall, I find that the development would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal, therefore, conflicts with policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan (BLP) and policy DES.01 of the Windsor Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) which support high-quality design with particular regard to respecting and enhancing the local environment including rhythm, height, scale, bulk, massing, and the contour and profiles of the existing roofscape. In that regard, there would also be a conflict with the design aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework, Section 12 promoting well-designed places.

Relationship with No.10

7. The neighbouring property has a first-floor window in its flank elevation facing towards the appeal property. The Council advise that this serves a bedroom and is the only window to that room. The arrangement is the result of a rear extension undertaken to No.10 in the 1980s. While the window is at odds with the obscurely glazed or landing windows to the flank elevations of the other properties, it is an established window serving a habitable room. The proposed side extension would bring the flank substantially closer. This proximity would undoubtedly restrict the light and outlook to that window to the detriment of the occupiers' living conditions.
8. Therefore, there would be a conflict with BLP policy QP3 criterion (m), which seeks to ensure that development has no unacceptable effect on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjoining properties including through light and sunlight.

Other Matters

9. The appellant is critical of the Council's approach and delays in the planning process. A costs application has not been made and, in my view, the reasons for refusal are complete and specific to the development with reference to policy and the Framework. It is also apparent that the appellant sought to address the objections and have amended the scheme, nonetheless, for the reasons set out, I share the Council's concerns. The appellant's desire to enhance their property is not unreasonable, although the alterations are extensive, and there are no other matters which indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out, and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR