
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2025 by Mr F Bradford BA (Hons) MRTPI

Decision by E Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3364865

99 Montagu Road, Datchet, Slough, Windsor and Maidenhead SL3 9DX

- 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 Gurinderjit Bhangu against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 25/00386.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension along with garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. Any alleged discrepancies on the submitted plans showing the existing dwelling has not hindered my ability to assess the proposal based on the proposed design and my observations on site. Therefore, I shall proceed on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is its effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 99 Montagu Road is a two-storey detached dwelling sited on a corner plot. It sits as part of a development which has dwellings of the same architectural style and massing.
6. The proposed development would introduce a substantial bulk above the existing garage. However, due to the cumulative effect of the mass' relationship to the host dwelling, its setback from the front elevation at first floor, and its set down from the existing roof ridge, the proposed development would appear subordinate to the host dwelling.
7. Notwithstanding this, there is a notable absence of visible extensions to dwellings within the cul-de-sac in which the host dwelling is located. This results in an established uniformity within this particular cul-de-sac arising from both

architectural features of dwellings and their scale, which positively contributes to the character and appearance of Montagu Road.

8. Whilst the proposed development would in itself be subordinate, it would however result in the overall enlargement of the appeal dwelling. This enlargement would mean its scale and bulk would be visibly at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of dwellings within the development. This effect would be exacerbated by the prominence of the host dwelling on this corner plot location. The proposed development would degrade the host dwelling's contribution to the identified uniformity of dwellings within the development and would therefore cause harm to character and appearance of the area.
9. For these reasons, I find harm to the character and appearance of Montagu Road. As such, I find conflict with the Borough Local Plan (2013-2033) of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead with particular regard to policy QP3 (Character and Design of New Development) which, amongst other things, aims to ensure that new development will be of high quality design in that it respects and enhances the local character of the environment paying regard to bulk, massing and proportions.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has brought my attention to similar extensions at 63, 65, 67, 71 and 73 Montagu Road. Whilst I acknowledge these extensions, I do not find that they offer a comparative basis to the proposed development. This is because they are not located within the same cul-de-sac as the appeal dwelling and are therefore not comparable in terms of their context to the appeal dwelling as described above. I therefore find that the presence of these extensions would not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
11. The appellant states that there is no material harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. This is not contested by the Council. However, this is a neutral factor which would not weigh in favour of the proposed development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Finlay Bradford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

E Grierson

INSPECTOR