



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2024 by S Indermaur

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/24/3350133

14 Eton Road, Datchet, Slough SL3 9AY

- 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 Vikas Kakkar against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 24/01291.
 - The development proposed is described as 'roof alteration and raising of the ridge with 1no. front and 1no. rear inset dormer with terrace to create accommodation within the roof space, part single, part two storey side/rear extensions and alterations to the external finish following demolition of existing single storey element.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. Some of the above works have planning permission and whilst they also form part of the scheme before me, the Council's objections appear to focus on the proposed roof, as will my recommendation. I have no reason to disagree with their findings on the remainder of the proposed development as it is listed above. With this and the above in mind, the main issue is the effect of the proposed roof changes on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a large detached two storey villa style dwelling with a decorative iron balustrade atop a shallow pitched roof. It is individual in the street scene which also contains other detached buildings reflective of the Victorian and Edwardian type. Development is mostly street frontage with a set back from the road edge. Amongst other things, prominent bay windows are present and repeat locally and whilst varied, traditional period architecture appears consistent in the street scene and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. It is unclear if the balustrade is an original feature of the existing building but its loss by virtue of the proposed new roof scape would see the removal of an attractive feature which lends some grandness to the otherwise diminutive roof

and, together, they add to the architectural qualities of the building as a whole. The proposed new roof itself would also span wide across the extended building and its steep pitch and strong vertical emphasis would appear disproportionate to the smaller scale of the building. These elements would combine to make the building stand out unacceptably in the street scene and reduce the quality of the period detailing therein. The visual effect of the changes would be exacerbated by the heavily trafficked nature of the road on which the building sits.

6. The adverse effect this would have on the character and appearance of the area would lead to conflict with Policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2022, Policy DAT2 of the Datchet Neighbourhood Plan 2023, the guidance set out in the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Borough Wide Design Guide 2020 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Together and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development is of a high-quality design and respects local character, is subordinate and responds positively to form and is visually attractive overall.

Conclusion and Recommendation

7. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission otherwise. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

8. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR