



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2025

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/24/3353662

17 Ellison Close, Windsor SL4 4BZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr K Poudel against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 24/01170.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front infill extension and pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in December 2024 but its contents do not alter the assessment of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The proposed development includes the erection of a single storey front extension to a 2-storey end of terrace dwelling which has already been altered. The proposed extension would be of a modest size and infill gaps between single storey additions which project from the front elevations of the property and 18 Ellison Close. As identified by the council, the appeal scheme would be particularly prominent within the streetscene because the property is situated at the head of a cul-de-sac.
5. With the exception of 28 Ellison Close, the projecting flat roof front additions are a characteristic of the dwellings fronting the road, together with areas of mainly light coloured boarding or render between the first and ground floor windows. By reason of the dwelling's form and design, there is a rhythm to the appearance of the streetscene assisted by the setting back of the terraces of dwellings from footways to the rear of front gardens.
6. The proposed infilling of the gap between the front additions would result in an unsympathetic form of development which would not respond positively to the rhythm, character and appearance of the streetscene along Ellison Close. This

loss of the characteristic rhythm of development, in particular the 6 dwellings which form the terrace within which the property is situated, would be accentuated by the proposed pitched roof. This roof would extend from the sill of the first floor opening to the eaves of the proposed extension thereby resulting in the loss of the existing uPVC boarding between the first and ground floor windows. Accordingly, the appeal scheme would not visually improve the appearance of the property and the terrace and thereby adversely affect the streetscene.

7. Reference is made by the appellant to planning permission (Ref 05/00691) being granted for the infill extension at No. 28 which was the only front extension observed during the site visit. However, this is a historical scheme dating from 2005 and is of a different design to the proposed development, in particular the pitch of the roof is shallower and the front elevation is set slightly rearward of the front elevations of the adjacent side additions. For these reasons, and because it is an uncharacteristic form of development along Ellison Close, this other scheme is given only limited weight in the determination of this appeal.
8. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 and Policy DES.01 of the Windsor Neighbourhood Plan. Amongst other matters, these policies seek a high quality of design which respects and enhances the local character of the environment, paying particular regard to urban grain, layouts, rhythm, scale, bulk, massing and materials. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR