



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2025

by **G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8TH August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/24/3355179

42 Welley Road, Wraysbury, Staines-upon-Thames TW19 5DJ

- 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 Pardeep Randhawa against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 24/01726.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey, part first floor rear extension and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the host property and area, (ii) whether flood risk would be appropriately mitigated, and (iii) the effect on protected bat species.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dormer bungalow that is set within a linear row of mostly dormer bungalows of different designs fronting Welley Road. The rear facing elevation of the appeal property is visible from the nearby road of Waylands, in a vista that includes a number of bungalows with sizeable box-like rear dormers. In those views the appeal property's relatively tall steeply pitched roof is more or less symmetrical with the attached property at Number 40, where they form a visually distinctive and well-balanced pair of dwellings in the roofscape.
4. The proposed extension would project out over the existing single storey rear wing by a considerable distance beyond the host dwelling's rear roof slope, and much further than the rear dormers of the nearby properties. In combination with the depth of its rearward projection, the height and width of the proposed extension would add considerable bulk and mass in an elevated position that would be visible from Waylands and nearby properties.
5. In those views the proposed extension would not appear subservient to the host dwelling. The long flank walls and the relatively shallow pitch to its hipped roof form and high eaves level would be inconsistent with the proportions of the host property's roof form. Even when seen in the context of the existing sizeable rear box dormers of a number of nearby properties in the roofscape, the proposed

extension's scale and form would lead to it being a visually dominant and discordant addition that would be out of keeping with the scale and proportions of the host property, and those within the row. Sympathetic facing materials would not overcome the visual harm caused by the appeal proposal.

6. Therefore, the proposed extension would not be consistent with Principle 10.1 of the Council's Design Guide¹ which advises that extensions will be expected to be subordinate to the host building and to respect its style and form, and that developments that are over-dominant or out of keeping will be resisted.
7. For these reasons, I conclude on this main issue that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area. It would therefore conflict with Policy QP3 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead - Borough Local Plan 2013-2033, Adopted February 2022 ("the BLP"), insofar as it requires development to be of high quality design and to respect the local character of the environment, paying particular regard to scale, bulk, massing and proportions. Whilst the Council referenced Policy DG3 of the Horton and Wraysbury Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033 in the reason for refusal, that policy is not before me in evidence and thus not available to me.
8. There would also be conflict with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") insofar as it requires planning decisions to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment.

Flooding

9. The evidence indicates that the appeal site is located within Flood Zone 2 as shown on the Environment Agency's (EA) Flood Zone Map, and at a medium probability of flooding.
10. The absence of a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is contrary to footnotes 62 and 63 of the Framework, which require a site-specific FRA for all development in Flood Zones 2 and 3, including householder development, in order to demonstrate compliance with Framework paragraph 181. Amongst others, this paragraph requires it to be demonstrated that development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and is, amongst others, appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment.
11. The Council refers to the EA's standing advice. EA guidance titled 'Preparing a flood risk assessment: standing advice' states under the heading 'Advice for minor extensions' that a FRA should include the estimated flood level for the development, details of the finished floor levels and details of flood resistance and resilience plans. It also advises that the development will also need to include extra flood resistance and resilience measures if floor levels cannot be raised above the estimated flood level.
12. The submitted drawings show that the south facing wall of the ground floor wing would be extended closer to the common boundary with the attached property resulting in a very small increase in the footprint of the building. However, in the absence of a FRA, I am unable to determine whether the proposed development

¹ Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, June 2020.

would be consistent with EA standing advice for flood risk assessments, including any requirement for extra flood resistance and resilience measures. Consequently, in the absence of a site-specific FRA it has not been demonstrated that the appeal proposal would meet the requirements of EA Standing Advice for minor extensions and Framework paragraph 181.

13. I therefore conclude on this main issue that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would adequately mitigate flood risk, contrary to BLP Policy NR1 insofar as it requires an appropriate FRA to demonstrate that development is designed to ensure that flood risk is acceptable in planning terms, and that it meets the requirements of Framework paragraph 181 set out above.

Protected bat species

14. Guidance from Natural England (NE) titled 'Bats: advice for making planning decisions' states that a protected species survey should be requested where buildings are likely to contain roosts, including when they are near habitat that could be important for commuting and foraging. The appeal site is not far from water and woodland and there are historical bat records in the wider area. The proposed development would involve significant alterations to the buildings rear roof slope.
15. However, when assessed against NE's guidance the appeal building's roof does not appear to have uneven tiles or noticeable cracks, and the floor plans indicate that it does not have a large roof space for flying. There appeared to be no hanging tiles or timber cladding on south facing walls. When added to the Council ecologist's advice that bats are unlikely to be present at the appeal site, these site-specific factors are strong indicators that the appeal proposal is not likely to negatively affect bats or their roosts.
16. Consequently, I conclude on this main issue that the appeal proposal is unlikely to harm bat species and therefore it would be consistent with BLP Policy NR2 insofar as it requires development proposals to, amongst others, avoid impacts on protected species and species of principle importance², and Framework paragraph 192 insofar as it seeks the protection of priority species.

Other Matters

17. The planning system is mainly concerned with the development of land in the public interest. The requirement for additional living space to meet the personal accommodation needs of the appellant and family are insufficient in this instance to outweigh the proposal's harmful effects on the character and appearance of the host property and area, and on flood risk, which are matters of significant weight in the public interest. Furthermore, the appeal proposal's harmful effects would likely remain long after the appellant's personal requirements cease to apply.
18. The Council's finding of an absence of harm in all other respects, including to any listed building or conservation area, is a neutral factor that does not weigh in favour or against the proposal, or alter my conclusions on the main issues.

² Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposal would result in harmful effects and policy conflicts that would bring it into conflict with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to outweigh the conflict with the development plan. Consequently, the proposed development is not acceptable, and the appeal is dismissed.

G Sylvester

INSPECTOR