



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2025

by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3359729

6 Australia Avenue, Maidenhead, SL6 7DJ

- 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 Mohammad Rashid against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council.
 - The application reference is 24/02567.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension with side/rear dormer and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description as I feel it describes the proposal more concisely.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and adjoining semi-detached property.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with the proposal seeking permission for a first-floor rear extension with a side/rear dormer as well as associated alterations to the fenestration of the host dwelling. At the time of my site visit I noted that the host dwelling benefits from existing extensions which create a living area and kitchen to the rear of the property. The proposal which is before me seeks to construct a first-floor extension over the existing living area footprint. The adjacent semi-detached dwelling has, comparatively, limited alteration or extension to the rear with the exception of a conservatory.
5. I note, from the appellant's grounds of appeal, and the relevant planning history in the Council's delegated report, that a first-floor rear extension and alterations to fenestration were approved under reference 23/01989/FULL, however, neither party have submitted a full copy of the approved plans from this application. I can see the appellant's drawings do include what is stated to be the approved elevations from the previously approved application. The Council do not challenge the elevations as being incorrect within the drawings stating, within their report, that a similar first floor extension has been recently approved. I have, therefore, taken the reference to the approved elevations within the plans before me as read and acknowledge the presence of the existing planning permission.

6. The proposed first floor rear extension would be set above the existing single storey rear extension and would be set down from the ridge of the main dwelling and has been designed to appear subservient to the host dwelling. This would be broadly consistent with the existing planning permission, and, at the time of my site visit, I noted that similar extensions appear to have been carried out within the surrounding area which are visible from within the appeal site. The proposal, being to the rear of the appeal site, would not be readily visible from the public domain and in isolation the single storey rear extension itself would be acceptable in the context of the host dwelling and the adjoining semi-detached property.
7. The proposal that is before me does, however, now propose a side/rear dormer which would have a flat roof and would appear to wrap around the side and rear roof elevation of the rear extension. The scale, form and design of the dormer would dominate the roof slope and would negatively impact upon both the character and appearance of the host dwelling itself. The dormer would constitute an overly bulky addition to the proposals and would occupy more than half of the width of the proposed roof slope of the first-floor rear extension. It would, therefore, visually dominate the roofscape as a result of its top-heavy design and cumulative impact with the first-floor rear extension as an addition to the dwelling.
8. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Wide Design Guide 2020 (the design guide) is clear that changes to roofscapes can have a detrimental impact on character. I acknowledge that the proposal would not be visible with the street scene, however, in this case I find the proposal to be unacceptable in the context of the host dwelling and adjoining semi-detached property themselves. The design guide is clear that additions should respect the main building as well as be subordinate. I do not find that the proposal is consistent with the overarching objectives of the design guide and that the awkwardness of the proposed dormer is exacerbated by, for example, the fenestration not lining up with the fenestration of the first-floor rear extension itself.
9. I note that the appellant outlines that the previously approved plans show the rear extension with a gable end compared to the proposed plans showing the gable end moved 1 metre towards the front of the building with a half hip roof (stated to make the proposal match the existing hip end). Whilst this is acknowledged I do not find that this results in the side view appearing smaller and in keeping with the host dwelling in a manner which would, overall, make the proposal acceptable in relation to the now proposed dormer element. I acknowledge that the proposal would utilise materials to match the existing roof, however, this does not overcome the concern with bulk, scale, massing, and design of the dormer which I find would result in detrimental impact to the roof scape of the host dwelling. I do not find that the new proposal result reduces the bulk and scale. Whilst the gable end may have been moved, by a metre, the proposal then results in a wraparound dormer which, comparatively, adds bulk and scale to the overall proposal as a significant change to the roof scape combined with the first-floor rear extension proposed.
10. Overall, I find that the proposal would fail to contribute positively to the character of the area and would be an unsympathetic development which would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, as well as unbalancing the adjoining semi-detached property, due to the proposed alterations at roof level combined with the first floor rear extension (the latter I acknowledge to have already been approved in principle via a previous planning permission).

11. The proposal would be contrary to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2022 Policy QP3 which requires that new development will be expected to contribute towards achieving sustainable high-quality design in the Borough in a manner which respects and enhances the local character with regard to scale, bulk, massing, and proportions. The proposal would also be contrary to the overarching objectives of the design guide, as outlined above, with specific regard to extensions and alterations needing to be subservient and appropriate to the host dwelling.

Other Matters

12. I note that the appellant states that no planning officer contacted anyone at any time and that they are unsure if a site visit has been undertaken by the Council. I have no evidence before me to suggest that the planning officer rushed to get a decision out. It is not within the scope of this appeal to consider the handling of the application and indeed this appeal is not accompanied by an application for costs. I can, however, confirm that in the consideration of this appeal I have been to site, and I have considered the proposal on its own merits against the Local Plan as is the starting point for determination of such proposals. I acknowledge that no one objected to the proposal, however a lack of objection is a neutral consideration.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, and into taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR