



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3368410

4 Holly Drive, Maidenhead SL6 8SE

- 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 Naseem Subhani against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00506.
 - The development proposed is for three front roof lights, rear orangery, first floor side/rear extension, three rear dormers and alterations to the fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an extended two storey semi-detached house with an existing two storey side extension built off of the rear half of the original flank elevation. A full depth two storey side extension and 3no dormers are proposed across the extended roof slope in combination with a loft conversion.
4. The proposed dormers would only be visible from the rear garden scene, however, as was found by my colleague in the determination of the previous appeal¹, the consistency in the design and form of the roofscape of the two pairs of semi-detached dwellings (Nos 1 & 2 and 3 & 4), with no other dormer windows, remains to be one of the more prevailing regularities in the cul-de-sac, which contributes positively to the area's character and appearance.
5. I note that the proposal before me is quite significantly different to the previous one; nonetheless, the 3no dormers would still dominate the roof slope, as proposed to be extended, and would appear incongruent when viewed against the fenestration on the rear elevation below.
6. I acknowledge that no one objected to the proposal, and I have also had regard to the other examples that the appellant has provided, where houses have been

¹ APP/T0355/D/24/3354777

extended at roof level in a multitude of ways. However, respectively, each case must be assessed on its own merits.

7. Overall, the proposed dormers would still add substantial bulk to the rear roof slope of 4 Holly Drive, and I can therefore only conclude that, due to their siting, scale and design, they would dominate the extended roofscape in a manner that would be incongruous to the character of the area. Consequently, I find that the proposal is contrary to Policy QP3 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan (2022), which requires new development to contribute towards achieving sustainable high quality design in the Borough, and that which respects and enhances the local character of the environment, paying particular regard to, amongst other things, rhythm, density, height, skylines, scale, bulk and massing.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR