



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C.** Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3362429

21 Linchfield Road, Datchet, Slough SL3 9NA

- 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 Mrs A Dhaliwal against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application ref. is 24/02615/FULL.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the existing roof to include raising of the ridge, 1no. rear dormer to accommodate a loft conversion and increasing the height of 1no. existing chimney.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In the box heading above I have used the description of the proposal taken from the Decision Notice because it is more comprehensive than that entered on the Application Form. The latter was "Proposed roof extension, loft conversion with works for greater safety, health and comfort."

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, and whether there is sufficient information to exclude the possibility of a protected species being present on site and impacted.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a two storey detached dwelling with rear extension, located on the west side of Linchfield Road in Datchet. No.19 is to its south and is two storey with a single storey garage. No 23 is a single storey dwelling and is located to the north of the appeal site. The Council's Townscape Assessment identifies the area as post-1960s suburbs.
5. The proposal seeks to alter the roof by raising its ridges and inserting a dormer structure at the rear to accommodate a loft conversion. One chimney would also be increased in height. The

proposed raising of the ridge and roof alterations would necessitate a sizeable flat roof section for the dormer room. This creates a flat section of roof which would be noticeably higher than the apex of the existing roof when viewed from the front or side.

6. The rear dormer roof slope would be excessively wide and dominant giving the dwelling a very top heavy massing and a disproportionate appearance. On its northern side it would also sit very awkwardly with the two storey side/rear extension with a hipped roof. The resulting various roof shapes would give the dwelling an incoherent appearance, each not relating well to each other.
7. The resulting development would be conspicuous from the road particularly looking south over the single storey property which is 23 Linchfield Road. The plot would look overdeveloped. There is some uniformity with the appeal site and the housing to the south of the appeal site and as a result the proposal would disrupt this rhythm. Overall, the design is poor and conflicts with national and local principles of high quality design.
8. The appellant suggests that the flat roofed section would match the existing adjacent dwelling and is a widely accepted quality design. I do not agree with either of those contentions and in any event the former would not necessarily warrant accepting that solution as high quality design on the appeal dwelling. I do not consider works done at no.20 Linchfield Road to aid the appellant's arguments as those are not in my view sympathetic to that property and in any event the built forms of the appeal property and no.20 are not identical having had differently shaped extensions.
9. On this issue I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and would be contrary to policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan (2013-2023), policy DAT2 of the Datchet Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2033 and the Borough Wide Design Guide (2020).

Potential for Protected Species

10. The appeal property is within 200m of a watercourse and the proposal involves extensive work to the roof including the roof void. This raises a reasonable possibility of there being bats nesting or roosting in the roof area and so, in order to avoid the potential for harm to this protected species, a preliminary bat survey would be appropriate. As there is no bat survey before me, I am not able to rule out the possibility of bats being disturbed by the proposal and for that reason I cannot rule out the possibility of unacceptable harm to this protected species. Attaching a planning condition to a potential planning permission to require a bat survey to be produced prior to commencement of development does not provide a solution as the results may show the presence of bats but permission would have been granted.
11. Consequently, I conclude that there is insufficient information on which to conclude that harm to bats would be avoided and this would be in conflict with policy NR2 of the Council's Borough Local Plan (adopted 2022).

Conclusion

12. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.
Inspector