
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025 by A Khan BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3368798

29 Horton Road, Datchet, Slough SL3 9EN

- 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 Sumik Vohra against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 25/00769.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension with ancillary accommodation.
-

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. The proposal originally included the installation of a swimming pool below ground level. During the course of the appeal, the appellant confirmed that this element is no longer being pursued and submitted an amended plan omitting the pool. Externally the massing and appearance of the building would remain the same as originally proposed, however internally the ground floor of the extension is now intended to provide a playroom and sensory room.
4. While the appeal process is not intended to be an opportunity to evolve a scheme, the amendment would not make a substantial difference or fundamental change to the application and would not result in any prejudice to parties involved in the appeal. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the amended plan.
5. Given the change in the scheme, the Council's description of development is more accurate than that set out on the application form, and I have therefore used it in the header above.

Main Issue

6. The Council refused the scheme for two reasons. The first reason related to the implications for flood resilience and mitigation resulting from installation of a pool in an area at high risk of flooding. As the scheme has been amended to remove the pool, this reason has been satisfactorily addressed and I do not need to consider it further.

7. The proposal includes provision for accommodation for a full-time carer and private space for a family member with a disability. Therefore, the Public Sector Equality Duty set out under s149 of the Equality Act 2010 (PSED) is engaged.
8. Therefore, the main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene; and the occupiers' personal circumstances and the need for the proposed development.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

9. The appeal site is located within a predominantly residential street characterised by two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings of traditional form, generally set back behind modest front gardens. The rhythm of spacing between houses contributes to a sense of openness, with gaps allowing views through to rear gardens and mature vegetation. While some properties have been extended, the prevailing character remains one of balanced proportions and separation, set within a semi-suburban environment that transitions towards more open land and the Queen Mother Reservoir at the village edge.
10. The appeal property has been previously enlarged, creating slight asymmetry around a feature two-storey bay window with projecting gable above. The proposed two-storey side extension would add further bulk and massing on one side, would not be set back from the principal elevation nor set down from the main ridgeline. This would create a continuous and elongated frontage which lacks articulation and would give the dwelling a distinctly unbalanced appearance. The single window and wide garage door proposed in the front elevation would provide little relief.
11. Consequently, the proposed extension would read as a dominant continuation of the existing frontage and would have an incongruous appearance in the street scene. Therefore, it would not respect or enhance the local character of the environment.
12. The appeal site is large, and therefore could potentially accommodate additional development, however in the form proposed the additional bulk and massing would be harmful for the reasons above. I also recognise that the gap between dwellings would be only marginally reduced. Nevertheless, this would not outweigh the harm caused by the design of the proposed extension. A condition for sympathetic materials to the host property and treatment to the garage door would not adequately mitigate this harm.
13. Vegetation would only provide partial screening from public view, whilst the main gates provide a direct view into the property, particularly to the area of the proposed extension. Additionally, vegetation could be removed at any time, so cannot be relied on as mitigation in this case.
14. The appellant has made reference to the larger office development at 18 Horton Road. Whilst larger in scale than the appeal property, the building use and context is different, and therefore not directly comparable to the appeal scheme before me. There are other large dwellings in the area, however I saw that these had considerable articulation and detailing which provided relief from their overall massing. While the site may be wide enough to theoretically accommodate two dwellings of the size of the smaller neighbouring properties, that is not what is

proposed here. Where there are pairs of dwellings in the area, characteristic features such as bay windows and gable features create articulation, and they therefore have a different appearance to the appeal scheme. Therefore, I afford these other examples limited weight and they do not justify the harm I have identified.

15. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033 and Policy DAT2 of the Datchet Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2033 which require high quality design that respects and enhances the local character of the environment. It would also conflict with the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to achieve high quality design.

Personal circumstances

16. I have found that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and street scene and as a result would conflict with policies of the development plan. I attach substantial weight to this finding, which weighs against the appeal.
17. The proposal would provide additional accommodation designed to accommodate a carer along with private space for a disabled member of the family. It has not however been demonstrated that other options have been considered to provide this accommodation within what is already a substantial dwelling, elsewhere on the large plot, or through a different design. There may therefore be alternatives that could provide the same benefits without the harm identified above. Therefore, I attach modest weight to the benefits the proposed development would afford the family and the person with a protected characteristic.
18. I have had due regard to the PSED, however the harm to the character and appearance of the area from the proposal would outweigh its benefits in terms of eliminating discrimination against persons with the protected characteristic of disability, advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others. I conclude that it is proportionate and necessary to dismiss the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

A Khan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

20. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR