



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2025

by **G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23RD July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3362009

76 Sheephouse Road, Maidenhead, Windsor and Maidenhead SL6 8HP

- 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 and Mrs McMullen against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 24/02930.
 - The development proposed is new front canopy, part single part two storey side/rear extension, rear balcony, privacy screen and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing element.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new front canopy, part single part two storey side/rear extension, rear balcony, privacy screen and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing element at 76 Sheephouse Road, Maidenhead, Windsor and Maidenhead SL6 8HP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02930, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 24A035/PL01; 24A035/PL02; 24A035/PL10 Rev A; 24A035/PL11 Rev C; 24A035/PL12; and 24A035/PL20 Rev B.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) No further window(s) shall be inserted at first floor level within the extension hereby permitted facing 78 Sheephouse Road, as identified on 24A035/PL01.
 - 5) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and subsequently maintained entirely in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by aegaea (Issue 1), dated 6 March 2025.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development from the application form only referred to single storey extensions. However, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development partly comprises a two-storey extension which was not referred to in the original description of development. Based on the evidence before me, the Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I. Given that the description of development from the application form is inaccurate I have used that from the Council's Decision Notice in the banner heading and my formal

decision. This was also used by the appellant within their evidence for this appeal. Consequently, the main parties would not be prejudiced by this approach.

3. Construction work was underway but was incomplete when I visited the site. It was not evident that the works undertaken had been done in accordance with the plans submitted with this appeal and as such, I have determined the appeal based upon the plans before me.
4. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was submitted alongside the appeal which was not before the Council when it determined the application. Whilst this is new information, given that the FRA does not materially change the nature of the proposal that was before the Council, I sought the Council's views on this matter. The Council concluded that the FRA accords with the Environment Agency's (EA) Standing Advice and recommended a condition if the appeal were to be allowed.

Main Issues

5. The main issues relevant to this appeal are the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and whether the proposal would result in an increase in flood risk.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal building is a two-storey detached dwelling with a hipped roof with chimneys either side of it. It has a two-storey front gable which also has a hipped roof as well as a single storey garage, although the single storey garage had been demolished at my site visit.
7. The houses in the area vary considerably in scale and appearance with a mix of styles and materials. The dwellings are generally set back a consistent distance from the roadside behind gardens and driveways which themselves are bound by low level boundary treatment which again varies in styles and materials. The buildings are generally set within large plots, with clear boundaries between them.
8. The proposed extension would significantly widen the property. It would however, replicate the form of the hipped roof and introduce a second two storey front gable addition on the opposite side of the house to the existing. The single storey additions to the rear would also extend the depth of the property by a considerable amount but given the scale and siting of this, it would generally be screened by the host dwelling. As the extension would significantly increase the dwelling's scale and align with the front elevation, it would not necessarily appear subordinate to it. As a result, there would be some conflict with Principles 10.1 and 10.5 of the Borough Wide Design Guide (DG).
9. However, by extending the existing hipped roof the design of the roof extension would be sympathetic to the host property as per Principle 10.5 of the DG. Additionally, the proposed two storey front gable and the style of openings would create a balanced and symmetrical design when viewing the extended dwelling as a whole and the use of similar materials would complement this. Overall, the design would respond positively to the form, architectural style and materials of the original building which Principle 10.1 the DG expects extensions to do.

10. Given the variation in the scale of properties nearby, the considerably sized extended dwelling would not appear out of character. The clear gaps retained around the property would also support the sympathetic design of the scheme in this context. As noted, the rear additions would generally be screened by the house and thus would not significantly affect the dwelling's appearance in the street scene. Additionally, the scheme would generally retain the existing building line as well as the low-level boundary wall along the roadside. As a result, the extended dwelling would not appear prominent in the street scene. Therefore, whilst the proposal would create a significantly larger dwelling, the siting, scale, bulk and design would respect the local character.
11. Whilst the scheme would partly conflict with the DG, it is only guidance and for the reasons given above, the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Policy SP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (LP), which expects development, amongst other matters, to contribute to sustainable high-quality design.

Flooding

12. The appeal site lies partly within Flood Zone 2 and 3. Policy NR1 of the LP states that proposals will only be supported where an appropriate Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been carried out, and it has been demonstrated that development is located and designed to ensure that flood risk is acceptable in planning terms.
13. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that an FRA should be credible and fit for purpose, and appropriate to the scale, nature and location of the development. It also advises that proposals which would not significantly increase the number of people present in an area at risk of flooding, like the appeal proposal, would generally need a less detailed assessment than others.
14. The application was supported by an FRA, but the Council identified concerns with the details that were missing from it, in particular the estimated flood levels. The FRA submitted with this appeal identified the flood level and determined that the existing floor level of the house was only slightly below the flood depths that may occur.
15. The EA's Standing Advice for minor extensions, such as this, is that floor levels should be no lower than existing. The updated FRA identifies that this would be the case. However, this finished floor level is 150mm above ground level and thus below the 600mm from the EA's Standing Advice. However, flood resilience and resistance measures have been recommended in the FRA. A condition has been suggested to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the FRA and if the scheme incorporates these resilience and resistance measures the development would generally accord with the EA's Standing Advice for minor extensions.
16. Consequently, subject to this condition, the development would not increase flood risk elsewhere and would be acceptable in planning terms. Therefore, the proposal would accord with Policy NR1 of the LP insofar as it expects proposals to demonstrate that development is located and designed to ensure that flood risk is acceptable in planning terms.

Conditions

17. Further to the statutory commencement condition, a condition requiring the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary in the interests of certainty.
18. Condition 3 is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
19. Condition 4 is necessary in the interests of the living conditions of the occupiers of 78 Sheephouse Road with regard to overlooking and privacy.
20. Condition 5 is necessary in the interests of ensuring the development would not increase flood risk elsewhere.

Conclusion

21. The proposed development would accord with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Sibley

INSPECTOR