



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3366266

26 Rutland Road, Maidenhead, SL6 4HY

- 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 Rees against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 25/00374.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion and creation of dormer, changes to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion and creation of dormer, changes to fenestration at 26 Rutland Road, Maidenhead, SL6 4HY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/00374 and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the original building.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's officer's report states that the appeal property comprises an end of terrace dwelling on Rutland Place. This is not the case. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located on Rutland Road.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling. The dwelling is set back from the road behind a garden and parking area and a driveway runs alongside the house to a detached single storey garage to the rear. The property has a generous rear garden which backs on to other rear gardens.
5. The appeal property is located in a predominantly residential area characterised by the presence of two storey detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings.

Dwellings tend to be set back from the road behind small front gardens and/or parking areas and have longer gardens to the rear.

6. This provides for a spacious environment with a strong sense of greenery. In addition, I observed during my site visit that many dwellings in the area appear tall, with rooms at second storey or roof level. I also noted the presence of dormers and roof lights during the course of my site visit - including to dwellings directly opposite the front of the appeal dwelling and directly to the rear of the appeal dwelling.
7. The proposal would introduce a dormer to the rear roof slope. This would be set below the ridge of the roof, above rear eaves level and set back from the gable ends of the host dwelling. I find that these factors would serve to ensure that the proposed dormer would appear subservient to the host dwelling and that it would appear neither bulky nor dominant in its surroundings.
8. Further to the above, due to its location on the rear roof slope in combination with the appeal property being set well back from the road, the proposal would not appear particularly prominent in its surroundings; and I find that the choice of matching materials and joinery details would ensure that it would blend in well with the host dwelling and its surroundings.
9. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Policy QP3 of the Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (2022); or to the Council's Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions against the tests set out in Paragraph 57 of the Framework. I find that a condition specifying materials is necessary in the interests of local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is successful.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR