



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/24/3339103

55 Queens Road, Windsor SL4 3BQ

- 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 & Mrs Ken Urquhart against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 23/02432, dated 3 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is to enlarge existing rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the Inner Windsor Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Inner Windsor Conservation Area is formed primarily of Georgian and Victorian residential properties. The appeal property is part of a terrace (Nos. 53-61 odds) at the western end of Queens Road which is orientated at a right angle to the rest of the road. Nonetheless, the properties along Queens Road have a uniformity in form and appearance which contributes towards the significance of the Conservation Area.
4. There is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. This is echoed in Policy HE 1 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan (2013 -2033) (BLP).
5. The mid-terrace property currently has two pitched roof dormers to the rear, with one extending partly along the outrigger. Creating an infill between the two, the resultant large, boxy form would encompass the majority of the main roof slope. This is contrary to the advice for roof alterations in the Borough Wide Design Guide (BWDG) (principle 10.5).
6. Whilst there are no dormers to the other properties in the appeal terrace, they are a notable feature in the surrounding area. My attention has been drawn to a number of linked double dormers to other properties nearby. This includes properties where the rear roof is visually prominent in the street scene compared to the more concealed location of the appeal property. The detailed background to these additions is not before me, and while they extend across

most of the roof, their designs are somewhat different and do not incorporate alterations to the outrigger.

7. The proposed changes would facilitate improved accessibility within the roof space. The appellant explains that they originally sought a double-pitched design and that this current scheme has also been revised. Nonetheless, by conjoining the existing dormers, the profile and massing of the small traditional form of the existing dormer and the roof would be lost, creating an unusual and incongruous triple-pitched design. Furthermore, whilst finishing the infill in hung tiles matches the roof and existing dormers, the resultant wide expanse of a solid wall to the face of the proposed central section would further emphasise its inappropriate design. The proposal would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property, eroding the regularity and historical integrity of the terrace.
8. Due to the property's location and other intervening buildings, complete views of the rear roof are not seen from the public domain. However, the lack of visibility does not allow for poorly designed development, and the disproportionate form would undermine the composition and appearance of the property, which contributes to the character of the Conservation Area.
9. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Inner Windsor Conservation Area. The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial and while there would be some economic and social benefits these are limited, and the development is primarily for the private benefit of the occupiers. As such, the public benefits do not outweigh the identified harm to the Conservation Area, which, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, is to be given great weight (paragraph 205).
10. I therefore conclude that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to BLP policies HE1, policy HER.01 of the Windsor Neighbourhood Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (section 16) which seek to protect the historic environment. There would also be conflict with BLP policy QP3 and the BWDG which promote high-quality design, and, amongst other things, to ensure that extensions both individually and cumulatively do not have a profound effect on the appearance of an area, and that roof alterations are sympathetic and subservient to the design of the main building.

Other Matters

11. I understand the appellant's frustration with what they consider to be inconsistencies in decisions since they originally sought an alteration to the roof in 2017. It is not for me to review the Council's approach to other applications, and each proposal is to be considered on its own merits. Nonetheless, whilst there are no objections from neighbours, in this case, for the reasons set out, I concur with the Council that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. However, this is not outweighed by the

public benefits of the appeal scheme. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR