



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2025

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3371355

28 Highclere, Sunninghill, Berkshire, SL5 0AA

- 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 K Bardle against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 25/00850.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a new raised roof to accommodate 2 No bedrooms and bathrooms, single-storey side extensions, and new porch/verandah to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was made in the name of Mrs K Bardle. The appeal was made in the name of Mr Martin Bardle. It has been confirmed that Mrs Bardle asked Mr Bardle to simply manage the appeal on her behalf. I have therefore recorded the appellant as Mrs K Bardle.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a gable-fronted bungalow, previously extended to the sides and rear, and set within a residential cul-de-sac comprising a mix of bungalows and chalet-style dwellings, many obviously altered beyond their original form. The proposal would effectively square the footprint of the existing building, with single-storey extensions to each side, and with a new roof over to create living accommodation at first-floor level.
5. The proposal would significantly remodel the appearance of the existing dwelling. Its low roof profile would be raised with a new ridge height and cross-winged gables added to each side. Notwithstanding, the overall scale and height of the building's envelope would remain reasonably modest and reflective of the mixed chalet-styled dwellings which have evolved elsewhere along Highclere over time.
6. In order to facilitate the first-floor accommodation, dormers are proposed front and rear to each side wing. Those to the rear would be out of sight from the public

domain. Those to the front would be clearly seen and would appear as an integral part of the dwelling's overall form and appearance.

7. The front dormers would span the majority width of the roof slopes to each new side projecting gable, with flat crown roofs connecting with the side roof slopes of the front facing gable. Rather than sitting within the roofscape as proportionate and subservient individual dormer window features to each side, I find they would instead appear as prominent wings in their own rights, each effectively competing for dominance with the main extended roof. I share the Council's view that they would appear both bulky and incongruous as part of an incoherent approach to the remodelled design and appearance of the property as a whole. In this regard the changes would fail to meet the objectives of guidance for roof alterations contained within the Council's *Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2020*, and would be harmful to the character and appearance of No 28 and the wider street scene.
8. My attention has been drawn to other dormer windows along Highclere, which are plentiful and mixed in size and appearance. However, I saw nothing comparable in terms of the scale and bulk of the combined alterations proposed at roof level in this case.
9. By failing to display a quality of design that would respect and respond to the local character and appearance of the area, there would be conflict with Policies QP1 and QP3 of the Council's Borough Local Plan adopted in 2022, and with Policies NP/DG1, NP/DG2 and NP/DG3 of the Ascot, Sunninghill & Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2026, adopted in 2014.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR