



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/25/3371136

13 Hendons Way, Holyport, Maidenhead, Windsor and Maidenhead, SL6 2LF

- 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 Kristian Jaggs against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 25/00745.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double storey extension to the rear and side.
-

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 host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey, detached property within a suburban, residential cul-de-sac location of intermingled bungalows and chalet-style dwellings. The existing dwelling has a single-storey rear extension across its width, with a lightweight garage/car port projecting to its side in a deeply recessed position and abutting a garage attached to the side of the neighbouring bungalow at No 14. The proposal would include a first-floor extension to the rear over the majority part of the existing single-storey element, with a subservient crown roof over and rear facing dormer. A deeper side return wing is then proposed across the remainder width and which would project the height of the existing roof sideways over the car port and up to the shared side boundary with No 14.
4. Despite many properties along Hendons Way displaying obvious extensions and alterations to their original form over time, I was struck during my visit by the retained cohesion of the street scene, where dwellings sit comfortable on their plots and complementary to their surroundings. This is derived from a variety of factors including a largely consistent materials palette, especially at roof level, uniform front building lines, gaps between dwellings where they are typically set away from their side boundaries at first-floor level to varying degrees, and the consistent low eaves heights. The chalet-style of No 13, with its low eaves height to the front and space to its sides, is reflective of the building typology of the area and contributes positively to its coherence.

5. Whilst the extension to the rear of No 13 would introduce a large extent of crown roof, such a design approach is not alien to Hendons Way. Large extensions to some of the original chalet-style dwellings, including those with crown roofs and full two-storey eaves heights, have taken place in the immediate area, as can be seen on some from the road in oblique views between the gaps of dwellings, or else as I observed from the rear garden of the appeal property, along with those evidenced by the appellant. This part of the proposal would be largely out of sight from the public domain and would not be out of keeping within the rear garden context of its setting. Whilst the roof of the proposed rear dormer would extend up to the ridge height of the rear extension, this would still be below the main ridge line of the dwelling. Moreover, the dormer would otherwise be well proportioned and appropriately contained within the new rear roof slope.
6. The Council's *Borough Wide Design Guide* was adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in 2020. It recognises that house extensions can have a profound effect on the appearance of an area with the potential, amongst other things, to erode gaps that are important components of a street scene and which contribute to visual amenity and character. It further advises that extensions also need to respect the main building they relate to in terms of style, form, and detailing, and that they need to be subordinate.
7. Despite the deeply recessed position of the two-storey side return, the first-floor element over the existing garage would be clearly visible along Hendons Way. Its presence would erode an important gap at first-floor level between the flank elevation of the dwelling and the plot's side boundary. This would be out of keeping with the local established and characteristic pattern of development, and one which has been successfully retained, despite the many changes that have occurred to a number of other properties over time.
8. In addition, when seen head-on, the side element would feature a two-storey façade with an equivalent eaves height which would be uncharacteristic within the street scene. When also taken with a disjointed roof form that would display an awkward marriage with the existing, and the introduction of a further uncharacteristic eaves line at one-and-a-half storey height to the side, I find this part of the extension overall would appear poorly conceived and inharmonious.
9. I am mindful of the appellant's suggested alterations which have been put forward as part of the appeal submissions. Whilst they would introduce a degree of subservience to the roof of the side addition, they would not address my concerns relating to the spatial setting of the proposal or its failed integration with the style and form of the original dwelling.
10. Notwithstanding some support offered by a neighbour and the absence of any other neighbour objections, it is my impression overall that, due to the appearance and position of the side return element, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of No 13 and the wider street scene. As such, there would be conflict with Policy QP3 of the Council's Borough Local Plan adopted in 2022 and the aims of the SPD as far as they both seek to ensure development displays a high quality of design that, amongst other things, respects and enhances the local character of the environment.

Conclusion

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

John D Allan

INSPECTOR