



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/24/3345503

26 Sawyers Crescent, Maidenhead SL6 3ND

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms S. Yasmin against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 24/00645/FULL.
 - The development is for new boundary treatment with 1 no. entrance gate and 1 no. pedestrian gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The gates and fencing have been erected. This is, therefore, a retrospective proposal, and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No.26 is a semi-detached dwelling within a residential estate of similar 1960s properties. A large number of the properties along Sawyers Crescent and the surrounding roads utilise the frontage for parking. Generally, there is a mixture of open frontages or hedging to the front boundary. Other boundary treatments vary, but gates, fences and walls are low-level.
5. The boundary treatment to No.26 extending across the full width of the plot contrasts in height and form. While the dark grey colour relates to the dwelling which has been extended and altered, the materials emphasise the difference. The appearance of the wide metal gates, brick pillars and timber fencing with lattice trellis is at odds with the character of the area and creates a significant and dominant enclosure.
6. There is some hedging of a similar height, including that of the neighbouring property. However, this is variable and has a different visual presence, providing greenery within the urban environment, rather than just a physical barrier. The height of the boundary is significant, and notably taller than the 1m boundary that can be erected under permitted development rights. I did observe a few other taller fences, but these were side boundaries and had a

different context to the street scene of a continuous row of frontages, which the appeal property is part of.

7. In conclusion, I find that the boundary treatment is an unsympathetic and visually prominent form which is harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the development fails to accord with policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033, which promotes high-quality design and development to respect and enhance the local environment.
8. There are a number of other criteria within policy QP3 which are not directly relevant to this proposal and Principle 10.1 of the Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) referenced by the Council specifically relates to extensions rather than boundary treatments. However, there would be conflict with the general provisions of the SPD and the design guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework to promote high-quality and inclusive design to create beautiful places that function. Additionally, Principle 9.1 of the SPD expects boundary treatments to reflect the character of the surroundings.

Other Matters

9. The boundary structures are of a high quality and would have been a financial investment. I also understand the need to feel safe within your home and the benefits that the proposal may bring in terms of increased privacy and security for the occupiers of the property. While the boundary treatment may have been erected without the knowledge that planning permission was required, these considerations, nor any other personal circumstances, outweigh the adverse harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR