
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by M Clowes BA (hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3373013

11 Huntsmans Meadow, Ascot, Windsor and Maidenhead SL5 7PF

- 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 Andy Weston against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 25/00762.
 - The development proposed is renovation and extension of existing single-storey dwelling to include replacement of the existing conservatory with a garden facing office, partial increase to two storeys, replacement roof structure, recladding and installation of new windows and doors.
-

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the area; and
 - ii) protected species.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow located on a residential cul-de-sac within Huntsmans Meadow. Nearby dwellings mostly feature dual pitched roofs with roof tiles, regular window fenestration, and facing materials including brickwork and hanging tiles which are often red or brown in colour. Overall, the consistent design and materials of the dwellings on Huntsmans Meadow gives the area a strong visual harmony. Where the design and materials deviate from the norm in the area, this tends to be subtle. Despite being the only bungalow within the cul-de-sac, given that it has a dual-pitched roof and similar materials to the other dwellings nearby, it contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The Borough Wide Design Guide (2020), states that development will be expected to draw upon the arrangement, form and architectural detailing of existing buildings,

amongst other things, to ensure that it produces a high-quality design that respects local character.

6. I acknowledge that the appeal site is not a designated heritage asset, nor located within a protected area and that an upward extension would not appear inappropriate in the context of the spacious grounds and two-storey dwellings nearby. However, the design of the proposal with its mono-pitched roof form would result in a building type that would unacceptably contrast with the consistent form of the dwellings in the area. Taken together, the irregularly sized and positioned fenestration pattern with the dark stained timber, zinc/steel roof and aluminium framed windows and doors would emphasise the proposal's incongruous design, detracting from the traditional materials of most of the dwellings on Huntsmans Meadow. The appeal site's position at the end of the cul-de-sac does not justify the proposal which I observed would be conspicuously harmful from the road and adjacent dwellings. Concerns I note that are shared by interested parties. In this regard the proposal would fail to comply with the Design Guide.
7. I have been referred to several other developments on Huntsmans Meadow. The development at No 40 was a prior approval application, not a full planning application. In any case, its design seems to be more subtle and in keeping with the area. The examples at No 4 and No 7 also appear to be of a more traditional design in comparison to the appeal proposal. The other developments referred to are some distance away from the appeal site and are therefore in a different local context. Consequently, none of the examples referred to are directly comparable with the appeal proposal and they do not form a precedent which justifies it. In any event, it is the specific combination of the scale, design and materials of the proposal that are considered harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. In summary, I conclude that the proposal would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy QP 3 of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Borough Local Plan (2022) (LP) and Policies NP/DG1, NP/DG2 and NP/DG3 of the Ascot, Sunninghill & Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan (2014) (NP). Amongst other matters, these policies require developments to achieve sympathetic and high-quality design which respects and enhances the character of the local townscape, including materials which complement the existing palette in the area. It would also fail to comply with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) with regard to achieving high quality development that is sympathetic to local character.

Protected Species

9. The proposal includes alterations to the existing dwelling, in an area where there are trees and woodland which could support birds and bats. The appellant has therefore submitted a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA) with the appeal. The PBRA found no signs of roosting bats or birds at the property and concludes that the building had a low potential for roosting bats. It does however recommend that a further emergence survey is undertaken, as well as measures in relation to biodiversity mitigation and enhancements.
10. I am aware that the Council has not had the opportunity to comment on the survey, given that the appeal has followed the householder appeal procedure. However, the PBRA was completed by qualified ecology professionals and was prepared to the standards set out in the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environment

Management's Code of Professional Conduct. Based on the evidence available to me, I am satisfied that the proposal is unlikely to adversely affect a protected species, subject to appropriate conditions. If I had recommended that the appeal should be allowed and in the interests of ensuring the Council had the opportunity to comment, I would have explored the mitigation measures referred to in the PBRA with the Council. However, as my recommendation is that the appeal should be dismissed, this has not been necessary.

11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to protected species. It would comply with Policy NR2 of the LP and Policy NP/EN4 of the NP, which amongst other matters, state that development proposals should avoid impacts on habitats of protected species of principal importance.

Other Matters

12. Reference is made to the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Framework is clear that this presumption, does not change the statutory status of the development plan, as the starting point for decision-making. Where a proposal conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not usually be granted unless material considerations indicate that the plan should not be followed. I have found that the proposal conflicts with development plan policy. I recognise that the proposal would reduce the long-term energy consumption and maintenance costs of the building, provide increased living accommodation for the appellant's family and temporary benefits to the economy from the employment of local tradespeople during construction. However, such benefits would be limited by the scale of the development.
13. Finally, the absence of concerns in terms of other matters including residential amenity and parking are neutral factors which do not weigh in favour of allowing the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The proposed development would not be harmful to protected species. However, the absence of harm is neutral in the planning balance and the benefits do not outweigh the harm identified in respect of the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which would alter this conclusion. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Clowes

INSPECTOR