



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/24/3352149

2 Aston Mead, Windsor SL4 5PW

- 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 Sheri Quadri against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref. is 24/01484/FULL.
 - The development sought is alteration to front boundary treatment to include raising of the existing wall and 2 new gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The development has already taken place, however, that has not affected the approach I have taken to making the decision in this appeal. In the box heading above I have used the description of the development from the Decision Notice issued by the Council because it more specifically describes what development has taken place.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling located on the west side of Windsor characterised by post war residential development. It is at the junction of Burnetts Road and Aston Mead and it faces Aston Mead. Its semi-pair is no.4 Aston Mead and they sit on the north side of the road. Burnetts Road is to the east. The appeal site has a small rear garden and a side garden to the east with a low brick wall and hedge around it.
5. The development which has taken place includes a fence and sliding gates. The fence and gates are made of metal slats spaced close enough to prevent them being climbed. They allow a limited view through to the forecourt and lower front elevation of the house. The fence sits on top of the original front wall. The height of the original wall is about 0.6m and the height of the new fence is about 0.6m on top of it. The gate is about 1.2m high.

6. The dwellings along Aston Mead are typically semi-detached. From my site visit I noted that there was a strong consistent dwelling-pair character part of which derives from a reasonably consistent front boundary treatment. This consists of a low or medium/low red brick wall, brick piers, leaving a gap for vehicles to access the front forecourts. Sliding gates and gates generally are not a prevalent aspect of front boundary treatment in the immediate area. Plots tend to have an open nature, allowing broad views of the dwelling frontages and thereby defining the streetscape and creating character. There is some greenery. Fencing and railings are not particularly strong or distinctive features.
7. The scale, design and materials of the gates and fencing that have been erected at the appeal site are not at all in keeping with the local context. The result is a development which draws the eye and is unduly prominent in the streetscene. They are at odds with the character of front boundary treatments in the immediate area. I have borne in mind that the rendered front wall fits in with the rendered frontage of the dwelling but the materials used in the gates and fence and the grey colour do not reflect the brick and green vegetation that is prevalent in the area. The result is a development which is unduly incongruous.
8. Against the harm I have identified above, I have weighed the benefit in improving the security of vehicles parked in the forecourt particularly in the light of a previous car theft and advice from the Police. However, whilst crime prevention is a material consideration to which I give weight, I find that it does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would unduly harm the character and appearance of the streetscene. It would be contrary to adopted policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (adopted 2022) and the Borough Wide Design Guide (2020).

Conclusion

10. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.
Inspector