



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0335/D/25/3365330

1 Longbourn, Windsor, Berkshire SL4 3TN

- 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 Samuel Wiggins against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref. is 24/0310
 - The development proposed is a side and rear ground floor extension; second floor loft conversion and conversion of existing garage into a part habitable and part storage area..
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the terrace of Nos. 1-6 Longbourn is a building of a high design quality due to its combination of visual coherence and attention to detail, the former including a strong element of symmetry.
4. On that basis I consider the officer's report to be somewhat accommodating as regards the absence of any objection to the proposed single storey side/rear extension, albeit there is already the example of the Council exercising its discretion in terms of alterations to the terrace by its decision not to enforce against the slate clad dormer (Case reference 24/50017/ENF).
5. However, the effect of the roof alteration would be rather more than just an 'add on' to the host dwelling as it would undermine the design integrity of the terrace as a whole. The existing pitched slate roof of the lower element on No. 1 is a key element of the built form, providing it with an essential visual continuity that is part of its character. However, the proposed flat roof and 'dormer' would be wholly out of keeping with the symmetry and balance of the terrace, which was clearly fundamental to the design of the original building of six dwellings.
6. Even allowing for the significant length of the terrace, the partial loss of this symmetry and balance created by the matching original design at both ends of the row would draw the eye and be perceived negatively from the approach road and

the green space that provide the context for the western part of Longbourn's 'street scene'.

7. I acknowledge that as an individual entity the alterations are not without merit, but I consider this proposal to be an example of where the relevance of context carries greater weight. Moreover, the fact that the appeal scheme would satisfy some of the objectives and principles of Policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 adopted in February 2022 and the Council's Borough wide Design Guide SPD does not alter the fact that when read with the host dwelling and the terrace as a whole it would fail to meet others.
8. These include design principles b & e of the policy and principles 10.1.1; 10.4.2 & 10.5.1 of the SPD. In my view there would be additional conflict with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework revised December 2024.
9. For these reasons the appeal fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR