



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **SE Hughes BA (Hons) PGDip MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/25/3371915

2 Frodsham Way, Owlsmoor, Sandhurst, Berkshire GU47 0TX

- 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 Ms Alana Merrells against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00213/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the single storey front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey residential dwelling positioned at the end of a short terrace of 6 dwellings (No 2 to 12 Frodsham Way). All of the properties in the terrace have a simple single storey front projection with a lean-to roof, as do those in a neighbouring terrace to the west (No 2 to 8 Rockwood Avenue). Except for the appeal property's small porch, there has been very little in the way of physical alterations to these properties. Consequently, the repeated pattern of their front projections results in a consistent and attractive form of residential development which makes a positive contribution to the character of the area.
4. The appeal proposal would replace the property's porch with an extension of approximately 4 times its size which would encompass the entire width of the front projection. As a result, it would have more impact than the porch, protruding significantly beyond the building line of No 4 and 6 Frodsham Way, disrupting the established rhythm of the development in the street. Furthermore, the flat roof would be at odds with the lean-to roof which would further accentuate its incongruous front projection.
5. It is suggested that screening from a neighbour's high-level boundary wall would reduce the visual impact of the proposal, however this would not counter its overtly forward projection when viewed from the opposite side of the street or whilst approaching the development from the east.
6. Although other properties within the terrace have low front boundary walls, or are located closer to the footpath, they still maintain the repeated rhythm of the front projection.

7. Even though the extension would be constructed of matching brickwork and the placement of its openings would align with the host property, these design details would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have found above.
8. Consequently, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy LP 28 and Policy LP 50 of the Bracknell Forest Local Plan 2020-2037 which require a high standard of design that responds to the character of the local area. For the same reason the proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. In support of the appeal, my attention was drawn to other properties in the surrounding area that have been extended to the front in a similar manner to that proposed. However, with the exception of 5 Frodsham Way, they are located in different streets, as such, the context would differ to that of the scheme before me. Furthermore, No 5 is of a different style to the appeal property, therefore these developments do not lead me to a different view in this case.
10. The evidence refers to potential alternative development options in the form of a rear extension, alterations to the roof and front boundary treatments that could be erected by exercising the appellant's permitted development rights. However, these developments are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. Furthermore, I have not been provided with any details of the developments so I cannot be sure that they would represent a realistic or probable alternative. I have therefore given these potential alternative development options little weight.
11. I appreciate that there has been no objection from neighbours regarding the proposal and that it would not be detrimental to the living conditions of neighbouring residents or highway safety and parking. However, the appeal proposal's compliance with the development plan in these respects is a neutral consideration.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

SE Hughes

INSPECTOR