



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2025

by **O Tresise MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/24/3357253

11 Brompton Drive, Maidenhead, Windsor and Maidenhead SL6 6SP

- 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 David Ross against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 24/01893.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Single storey side extension, a change of use from public amenity space to private garden with replacement and relocation of the side boundary wall, and new dropped kerb'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the appeal was lodged, the National Planning Policy Framework has been revised. However, I am satisfied that there are no changes of any consequence for the main issue in this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a corner of Brompton Drive. With some exceptions, the houses in the area generally have open frontages, or their boundary treatments are set back from a highway. The overall spaciousness creates a consistent and pleasant visual break in this residential area, which positively contributes to its local distinctiveness. The appellant suggests that they own the grass area. However, the appeal proposal would materially change the use of the area regardless the ownership of the site. Furthermore, the area is described as 'public amenity space' in submitted information.
5. The proposed single storey side extension would be modest in scale, set back from its front elevation. Its roof form and matching building materials would help the resulting building integrate with the existing dwelling. However, the proposed boundary wall would further encroach into the open amenity area, and due to its prominent location when taken with the proposed new extension, would erode the prevailing open character of the area. Although the appellant has expressed a

willingness to provide some planting, no such details were shown on the drawing provided. Nevertheless, landscaping cannot be relied upon to screen the appeal proposal, and new planting may only help to soften the adverse effect, but it would not be adequate to mitigate the harmful effect on the open character of the area that I have identified.

6. A number of examples of existing single storey side extensions and boundary walls with proximity to a highway have been drawn to my attention in the wider area in Balmoral, Cherington Gate, Hemsdale and Ostler Gate. However, I do not find them directly comparable to the appeal proposal because they are not seen within the same context, or they have different siting with their surroundings. In addition, based on the submitted information, it appears that these extensions and their boundary treatments sit more comfortably with their surroundings, as the extensions generally align with their boundary walls. I note that one particular example showing the boundary wall projects beyond an extension, however, I do not know the exact circumstances under which they were constructed or their status regarding planning permission. In any case, its presence and the other examples are very much in a minority and should not be seen as setting a precedent for the erosion of the open character of this area of Brompton Drive. I have, therefore, considered the proposal on its own merits and for the reasons previously given, found it to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The proposed widening of the driveway would have little effect on the character and appearance of the area or highway safety in the location proposed and in the context of surroundings where off-street parking to frontages is a common feature. It would also have limited benefits in terms of reducing demand for on-street parking. There are also benefits for the appellant as the proposal would increase the internal accommodation available within the property and the private amenity space within its enclosed rear garden. However, those limited benefits taken individually and together, do not justify the harm that I have previously identified.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan (2013-2033) and the associated guidance in Borough Wide Design Guide (25 June 2020). The policy, among other things, seek to achieve high quality design that promotes local distinctiveness, and that new development should respect and enhance the local character of the area.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

O Tresa

INSPECTOR