



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2025

by **Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3360635

2 Dedworth Drive, Windsor, SL4 5NQ

- 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 Ms Narinder Kaur against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 24/01437.
 - The development proposed is new two storey rear extension and rear dormer loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the new two storey rear extension.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the rear dormer loft conversion and planning permission is granted for rear dormer loft conversion at 2 Dedworth Drive, Windsor, SL4 5NQ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01437, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: L01A, EX01, EX02, EX03, GA01, GA02 and GA03.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Application for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Ms Narinder Kaur against the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead and this is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

4. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents.

Reasons

5. 2 Dedworth Drive is a two storey mid terrace house located on the north side of the street in an established residential area. The immediate vicinity is characterised by brick built two storey terraced and semi-detached houses mainly with hipped roofs.
6. The policies relevant in this case include QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (adopted 2022) (the local plan) and DES.01 of the Windsor Neighbourhood Plan which relate to the character and design of new development. Also relevant is the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, the *Borough Wide Design Guide* (June 2020) (the SPD), which contains detailed advice on extensions and dormer windows in Principles 10.1 and 10.4.

Character and appearance

7. The proposed rear dormer would be approximately 5m wide, extending across much, but not all, of the width of the existing roof. It would be set back from the sides, ridge and eaves of the roof. Although it would appear large and somewhat dominant in the context of the relatively modest size of the house, it would not appear out of place in the context of the large flat roofed rear dormers on the properties on either side. It would not be visible from the street.
8. The proposed two storey rear extension would project approximately 5.4m into the rear garden with a height of approximately 5m to the existing eaves, with a flat roof. It would be adjacent to the boundary with No. 2A to the east and set away from the boundary with No. 4 to the west.
9. I consider that this two storey element would appear bulky and out of proportion with the existing house, and that the boxy appearance resulting from the flat roof would not amount to a sensitive design in keeping with the architectural character of the house. I have taken account of the large flat roofed extensions at Nos. 6 and 8. I have no information before me as to when these extensions were constructed, or under what circumstances, and I consider that they do not make a positive contribution to the appearance of the properties or the area and are not good examples to follow.
10. I consider the proposed extension in itself to be of a poor quality design, and that the cumulative effect of it and the dormer above would not be well integrated with the scale, form and design of the host building.
11. I conclude that the proposed rear dormer would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and that it is consistent with policies QP3 of the local plan and DES.01 of the Neighbourhood Plan and Principle 10.4 of the SPD. However, I conclude that the proposed two storey rear extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, contrary to policies QP3 of the local plan and DES.01 of the Neighbourhood Plan and Principle 10.4 of the SPD.

Living conditions

12. I consider that the additional windows in the proposed dormer would not result in an increase in overlooking or loss of privacy compared with the views already present from existing first floor windows and neighbouring dormers.
13. The rear windows of No. 2 and its neighbours face north and for much of the year they experience no direct sunlight, though some may be experienced in the early

morning at No. 4 and in the evening at No 2A. There are windows serving habitable rooms at ground and first floor level in close proximity to the common boundaries. The proposed extension would fail to comply with the 45 degree and 60 degree angles referred to in the SPD in the context of ensuring adequate light into habitable rooms. Although there are fences along the boundaries to both neighbours casting shadow, I consider that the solid brick walls, particularly at first floor level, would result in an unacceptable further reduction in light to these windows, especially in view of their north facing orientation. The extension would have a dominating appearance and introduce a sense of enclosure, particularly at No. 2A which has a very small garden and is somewhat dominated by the proximity of 1 Loring Road to the east.

14. I conclude that the proposed rear dormer would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos. 2A and 4. However, I conclude that the proposed two storey extension would harm their living conditions, contrary to local plan policy QP3 and the SPD.

Conclusions – split decision

15. I have found the proposed dormer window to be acceptable but that the proposed two storey extension would have an adverse effect on both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring houses.
16. The appellant has indicated a willingness to accept a split decision. I consider that the two elements are clearly severable, both physically and functionally, and therefore the appeal is allowed in respect of the rear dormer window and dismissed in respect of the two storey rear extension.
17. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed in respect of the rear dormer window and refused in respect of the two storey rear extension.

Conditions

18. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the NPPF. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR