



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2024

by L Francis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/24/3338563

39 Clifton Rise, Windsor SL4 5SX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Chris Rickerby (CDR Consultants Limited) against the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 23/02301/FULL.
 - The development proposed is for 3no. front rooflights, raising of the ridge and eaves, 1no. rear dormer and alterations to the external finish and fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 3no. front rooflights, raising of the ridge and eaves, 1no. rear dormer and alterations to the external finish and fenestration at 39 Clifton Rise, Windsor SL4 5SX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/02301/FULL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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 accordance with the following approved plans: LP-01 Rev A, ELV-02 Rev B, GA-02 Rev B, SE-01 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council issued a statement of case which provides clarity in terms of the reasons why the Council would have refused planning permission had it been able to do so. The main issue below is therefore taken from the statement of case and draft reason for refusal.
3. The Council has amended the description of development from that contained on the planning application form. The appellant has used this updated description on their appeal form and I have used it on the banner heading above as it describes the proposal in more detail than the original.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Clifton Rise is located within the Laing Estate, which forms a distinctive character area as defined by the Windsor Neighbourhood Plan 2021 (WNP). The features of the area include largely two storey brick built, mid-20th Century houses with pitched, tiled roofs and very open front boundary treatments which lend the area a spacious character. The houses on Clifton Rise are mostly semi-detached, with the occasional link-detached house. The appeal site at No. 39 is a link-detached dwelling, its ground floor garage adjoining the garage of No. 41.
6. The land rises to the west along Clifton Rise, which has the effect of staggering the roof ridges, reducing the perception of uniformity in the roofscape. The ridge height of the appeal property's roof is also somewhat shorter than its neighbours either side due to the difference in style of the appeal property compared to the neighbouring semi-detached dwellings.
7. The proposal seeks to raise the ridge height, set it further back and extend the depth of the pitched roof to replace the flat roof at the rear. The front roof slope would remain at the existing pitch, with rooflights added, along with a dormer to the rear. The proposals also include partly rendering the rear and side elevations.
8. There would be an increase in bulk at roof level and to the side elevations as a result of the proposed roof extension. This would be most apparent in some close-up oblique views from the street. It would be significantly less discernible in longer views of the street scene from the east and west, largely due to the staggered rooflines.
9. The Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2020 (BWDG), in Principle 10.1, advises that extensions will be expected to be subordinate and developments that are over-dominant or out of keeping will be resisted. The design guidance for the Laing Estate referenced in WNP Policy DES.01 emphasises the importance of maintaining building lines, spatial separation and the restriction of dormers to rear roof slopes. I note the views of interested parties regarding the proposal's effect on the streetscape. Whilst there would be a clear increase in bulk to the rear, the form of the extension and its detailed design would still be in keeping with the character of the wider estate. The space to either side separating the appeal property from its neighbours would not change and there would be a minimal effect upon the building's overall relationship to the street scene and surrounding dwellings.
10. The rear dormer itself would be appropriate in terms of its detailed design, being located within the roof slope, set down from the ridge height, in line with the guidance contained in the BWDG. The two windows would align with the fenestration on the rear elevation and their size would be subservient to the windows below. The proposed render finish to the rear and side elevations would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
11. In conclusion, the appeal proposal would accord with the aims of BLP Policy QP3 and WNP Policy DES.01. Taken together, these policies seek to ensure new development contributes towards achieving sustainable high-quality design in the Borough through, amongst other things, respecting local character and taking account of design guidance.

Other Matters

12. The proposed roof extension would not extend any further than the existing rear building line and would also be in line with neighbouring properties. As such, the proposal would not harm the outlook or light to any neighbouring residential windows. The proposed dormer windows, given their position and distance relative to neighbouring gardens and residential windows, would not be harmful to the privacy of neighbouring residents. The proposal would be in line with the aims of BLP Policy QP3.1(m) which states that new development should have no unacceptable effect on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjoining properties.

Conditions

13. The Council has provided some suggested conditions which I have considered against advice in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. I have attached the standard time limit condition (1) and a plans condition (2) in the interests of certainty. In the interests of ensuring the proposal would not result in harm to the appearance of the area, condition 3 is necessary to require the materials to be used would match those of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

L Francis

INSPECTOR