



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025 by A Chan Markovitz BA (Hons)

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3375021

Oakdale, Charters Road, Sunningdale SL5 9QD

- 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 G Grynwald against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 25/01049/FULL.
 - The development proposed is "Roof alterations to include raising of the ridge, 4no. front and 2no. rear dormers to accommodate a loft conversion and alterations to fenestration".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof alterations to include raising of the ridge, 4no. front and 2no. rear dormers to accommodate a loft conversion and alterations to fenestration at Oakdale, Charters Road, Sunningdale SL5 9QD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01049/FULL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development hereby permitted shall commence until the trees defined as T1, T2 and T3 on the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Tree Preservation Order 36 of 1995 have first been protected by fencing, the location and type to be in accordance with the British Standard BS 5837: 2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations. The fencing shall be erected before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development hereby permitted, and shall be retained and maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed within any fenced area, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered in any way at any time while the fencing is in place.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with plan nos Block Plan 52481, Plans & Elevations 52481 (Proposed Ground Floor, Proposed Front Elevation, Proposed Rear Elevation), Plans & Elevations 52481 (Roof Plan, Proposed Second Floor, Proposed Elevation SW, Proposed Elevation NE) and the materials specified thereon, except in respect of the external roofing materials to be installed on the external surfaces of the roof.
 - 4) No external roofing materials shall be installed on the external surfaces of the roof of the development hereby permitted unless in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

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 Matter

3. The description of development as detailed on the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. I have adopted the description as detailed on the Council's decision notice, which details the proposal accurately and concisely.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The surrounding area generally consists of two-storey and three-storey detached properties of a range of styles and with a diversity of roof forms. Many properties, including the appeal site, lie within large plots bounded by walls, fences or hedges, and are set back from the highway behind gated driveways. Tall hedges and trees are visible on the highway and within the front and rear gardens of many properties in the area. Cumulatively, this gives the area a spacious and pleasant feel and a varied and verdant character and appearance.
6. The host dwelling is a large, single-storey detached house with a tall roof, situated at the end of a cul-de-sac. It has some similarities with the neighbouring single-storey properties on the street, but it is distinguished by its U-shape, front gabled oriel windows, and the gable end window above the front door which appears to extend almost to the ridge.
7. The proposed development would preserve the diverse character and appearance of the surrounding area and the distinctive character and appearance of the host dwelling. Whilst the proposal would steepen the pitch and add volume to the roof, the ridge would only be raised slightly and the dormer windows, due to their set down from the ridge and set in from the sides, would appear subservient to the property. The proposal would therefore be proportionate to the host dwelling, appearing as a minor addition relative to its existing size and scale.
8. Furthermore, the appeal site is substantially screened from visibility as it is bounded by tall hedges and trees, beyond which are the rear gardens of properties on neighbouring roads. Even if vegetation was removed, the location of the host dwelling at the end of a cul-de-sac and to the rear of other properties would mean that the proposal would only be visible in small glimpses from a significant distance.
9. For these reasons, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would comply with Policy QP3 of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (2022), Policies DG1 and DG3 of the Ascot, Sunninghill & Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2026 (2014), and the guidance contained within the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Borough Wide Design Guide (2020). Together these seek to ensure that development respects its surroundings, particularly in terms of style, form and materials, and does not result in

unacceptable harm to the character and distinctiveness of the built environment. The proposal would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that development is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, a condition to ensure that the development accords with the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty.
11. A separate condition to require matching materials is not necessary as materials are specified on the plans. However, although the application form states that matching tiles will be used on the roof, the plans specify slate. It is therefore unclear what material is to be used. Consequently, a condition to secure details of the external roofing materials is necessary to ensure that the development complements the dark red brick elevations of the host dwelling, preserving its character and appearance.
12. There are three protected Oak trees on the appeal site, two at the front and one at the rear. They are visible in small glimpses from the highway and the rear gardens of neighbouring properties and contribute positively to the leafy character and appearance of the area. The appeal proposal would not directly affect the trees, however there is a risk of harm to the trees as a result of construction activities such as storage of materials and movement of machinery. Damage to the trees or their roots is likely to result in a reduction in their amenity value in the short term and potential long-term risks to their health and longevity, harming the character and appearance of the area.
13. A condition is therefore necessary to ensure appropriate protection for the trees during construction, such protection to accord with the relevant British Standard for trees in relation to construction. As damage could occur at any stage of site preparation or construction, the protection will need to be installed before any element of the development commences. Therefore, it must be secured through a pre-commencement condition. The appellant has agreed to the condition.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

A Chan Markovitz

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 allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR

