

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2023

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/22/3313680

11 Mallow Park, Maidenhead SL6 6SQ

- 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 Mr Anthony against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02528, dated 14 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is for a minor side extension beyond approved ground floor extension (22/01796/CPD), first floor side extension and minor extension to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to an end of terrace house that is stepped forward from its immediate neighbour, mirroring that of 16 Mallow Park at the opposite end of the row. The plot is wedge shaped, being widest at its front and tapering to the rear adjacent to a parking court.
4. There exists a high conifer hedge behind a brick wall providing a privacy screen to the side of the house and which prevents any views into no 11's private amenity space and beyond (to the east). Furthermore, conifer hedging within one of the rear gardens of a property fronting Briar Dene would largely prevent views of the extension from Ostler Gate to the rear.
5. However, the extensions would almost double the width of the principal elevation of the host dwelling. Whilst this would be stepped down to its northern end, where accommodating a WC at ground floor level and part of the proposed bedroom no 4 at first floor level, the bulk of the extension would maintain the existing ridge height and by virtue of its forward siting as a whole, the proposal would fail to appear subservient in form to the host dwelling. This conflicts with both principles 10.1 and 10.3 of the Council's Borough-wide Design Guide, a material consideration in the determination of this appeal.

6. I note references to the extensions that have been built on to boundaries opposite the appeal site and whilst it is not for me to comment on the appropriateness of these, or otherwise, I noted that they were subordinate in form with stepped down ridge lines and stepped back narrower front elevations.
7. All in all I consider that whilst there may not be any overdevelopment of the appeal plot per se, I consider that the proposed extensions would not appear subservient to the host dwelling and would fail to respond positively to the visual amenities of the locality.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033 (adopted February 2022) which requires new development to contribute towards achieving sustainable high quality design that respects and enhances the local character of the environment, paying particular regard to scale, bulk, massing and proportions. For the reasons previously cited, the scheme would also run counter to the advice as set out within the Borough-wide Design Guide.

Conclusion

9. Having regard the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR