



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3368953

Vignobles, Old Mill Lane, Bray, Maidenhead, Windsor and Maidenhead SL6 2BG

- 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 Luke Tapping against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 24/02775.
 - The development proposed is described as “alterations to front porch, new entrance with toilet, conversion of integral garage into utility room, alterations to rear single-storey roof to form a balcony, demolition of main roof and dormers, new roof raising the ridge by 310mm, new solar panels, alterations to external finishes and fenestration, new chimney, new rear two storey extension”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure, Preliminary Matters & Main Issue

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.
3. The above description is from the application form. The garage was omitted from the scheme prior to determination, and I have therefore not referred to it. Doing so does not affect the substance of the appeal not the cases of either main party in relation thereto. The main issue in regard to which is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a detached bungalow set within a large plot and appears to be largely unaltered. The neighbouring buildings consist primarily of uniform bungalows and one and half storey buildings with a consistent and matching material palette and natural window hierarchy. Any extensions to the dwellings are clearly subservient and sympathetic to the original form. These elements together contribute positively to a strong sense of consistency to the area.
5. The accumulation of works to the building would result in a raising of and a fundamental change to the roofline. Whilst the Council have no objection to the raising of the roof, the overall scale in combination with the changes would subsume the original building and its consistent features. Moreover, and although nearby buildings have different roof styles, each one retains a simplicity of only one style. This proposal mixes several on one building, which would appear disjointed and out of place. The chimney would be large and imposing despite being to the rear. The scale and placement of the windows would also highlight the incongruity

of the overall design with its lack of natural window hierarchy whereby the scale of the windows on the upper floors would be larger than the ground floor not following the more traditional pattern within the street. The materials proposed would differ to the prevailing buildings along this street however the choices are consistent with the semi-rural context and resultantly they would sit comfortably and would not unacceptably harm the character of the area in isolation.

6. The proposal however, and as a whole for the above reasons, would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, there would be conflict with Policy QP3 of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Borough Local Plan (2023), the relevant guidance in the DG and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.
7. The Borough Wide Design Guide (DG) focuses on design quality to new buildings and extensions. Principles 10.1 and 10.5 are relevant for this proposal. Based on my assessment of the merits of the appeal scheme, in it not being sympathetic and subservient, it would not sit squarely with the DG.

Other Matters

8. Concerns the appellant has with the Council during the handling and consideration of the appeal scheme prior to and during the planning application process are for the main parties to establish and resolve outside of appeal proceedings.
9. I am unaware of the planning status of the other examples of similar development in the other locations provided. Nor the finer details such as the circumstances which prevailed at the time or matters taken into account. They do not result in a sufficiently significant material consideration which would lead me to recommending the appeal be allowed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan and I have been given no compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR