
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: 09 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3368869

9 Lancaster Road, Maidenhead, Windsor and Maidenhead SL6 5EP

- 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 Mrs Amy Rodger and Mr Paul Rodger against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 25/00721/FULL.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion to include 1no rear dormer, 3no. rooflights to front and 1no. rooflight to side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion to include 1no rear dormer, 3no. rooflights to front and 1no. rooflight to side elevation at 9 Lancaster Road, Maidenhead, Windsor and Maidenhead SL6 5EP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00721/FULL, 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 numbers: 2025-01-6003/12, 2025-01-6003/13, 2025-01-6003/14, PP-13871905v1.

Appeal Procedure, Preliminary Matter & 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 description on the decision notice differs from the application form. However, I am satisfied that the latter sufficiently describes the development. In addition, the Council has raised no objections to the proposed rooflights, and I have no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focusses on the rear dormer and specifically its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which has been previously extended. The adjoining neighbour has started the construction of a rear dormer. The surrounding area is relatively uniform in terms of the semi-detached dwellings which are relatively unaltered and symmetrical. Any instances of extensions are to the rear and to the loft which are generally subservient. These

features in combination lend a pleasant consistency to the built form contributing positively to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The Council rely heavily on the Borough Wide Design Guide (DG) which focusses on quality in the design of new buildings and alterations thereto explaining, amongst other things, that dormers should reflect a subservient addition to the roof. Whilst the proposed dormer would cover a large amount of the roofscape, its overall scale and set in from the sides and the ridgeline reflect a subservient addition. A matter highlighted by the size and position of the proposed windows which follow a traditional reducing hierarchy upwards on the rear elevation.
6. A sufficient amount of existing roofline would remain exposed, which means the dormer would not be visually dominant and whilst the proposals would not reflect the prevailing plain local roofscapes, it would reinstate the symmetry and reintroduce the consistency of the two adjoined buildings. The material choice, whilst is not commonly seen within the street scene, would sit comfortably with its context and would not detract from the wider character, particularly given its limited public obviousness.
7. With these matters in mind, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policy QP3 of the Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2023, section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the DG which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Conditions

8. The standard time limit condition and reference to the approved plans are necessary for enforcement purposes. As the plans clearly illustrate the proposed materials, it is not necessary to impose a separate condition securing them. The Council has not recommended any additional conditions, and I have not considered any others to be required.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR