



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2024

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/23/3332916

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 Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 23/01758, dated 18 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and a new refuse store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant states that the description of the development has not changed from that in the application form, but in the appeal form it is different. However, that amended description is consistent with the appellant's statement and the Council's decision. Thus, whilst I have had regard to the additional information in the application form, including the reference to a Certificate of Lawfulness for a side and rear extension, in my banner I have used the more succinct description in the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The host sits at the end of a short terrace which is orientated perpendicular to the road, facing another terrace across gardens and a footpath. The terrace is two storeys high, finished in red brick with evenly spaced pillars defining the boundary of each house, and displays regular fenestration. The front face of Nos 11 and 16 are stepped slightly forward compared to the rest, thus 'bookending' the row.
5. Whilst No 11 sits on a much larger, wedge-shaped plot compared to the rest of the properties in this row, as the terraced building displays a very consistent and coherent form, style and appearance, it, and the broadly similar terrace opposite, form a well-balanced composition in the 'streetscene'.

6. Compared to a previous scheme on the site, which was dismissed at appeal (Ref: APP/T0355/D/22/3313680) ('dismissed appeal'), this extension would be flush with the host's front wall rather than stepped forward, and the first part of its ridge would be set down. However, that set down would be very slight, and the scheme would still roughly double the width of the host's principal elevation. As a result, this scheme would still have a very significant bulk, and it would not appear subordinate to the host.
7. Additionally, as pointed out by interested parties, the proportions of its front facing windows would not respect the windows in the rest of the building. As a consequence of that, and the scheme's scale and bulk, the resultant dwelling would significantly disrupt the rhythm and harmonious appearance of this terrace.
8. The appellant has referred me to approved extensions in the area, some of which are highlighted on the plan at Appendix A of his statement. Although some of those are very close to this plot, and he considers that they could be considered an 'overdevelopment', that specific matter was not raised by the Council as a concern in this scheme, nor indeed by the Inspector in the dismissed appeal.
9. Having regard to the side extensions at 2 and 6 to 10 (evens) Briar Dene, these are on detached houses where the streetscene is very different to here. Additionally, from what I observed on my visit, compared to this scheme, those extensions are generally not so disproportionately wide across their front face at first floor relative to the original house as would be the case here. The extensions to the end of the terraced houses opposite this site at 45 Cranbrook Drive and 10 Mallow Park are stepped back from their respective host, and are less wide across the front compared to this proposal.
10. For the above reasons, notwithstanding the amendments compared to the dismissed appeal, and the proposed use of matching materials, the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy QP 3 of the Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (2022). Amongst other things, and in general terms, this requires high quality design which respects and enhances local character, paying particular regard to matters such as urban grain, layout, rhythm, height, scale, bulk, massing and proportions.
11. It would also conflict with Principles 10.1 and 10.3 of the Council's Borough Wide Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020) which state that extensions are expected to be sympathetic and subordinate, and should respond positively to the form, scale and architectural style of the original building, avoiding an over-dominant appearance.

Other matters

12. In his Personal Statement the appellant sets out why the extension is needed to provide additional accommodation for his family, and space to work from home.
13. He also describes his grievances with the application process, including his concern that the Council did not work proactively to find an agreeable solution, contrary to the stance in the National Planning Policy Framework. However, I have dealt with the scheme before me on its planning merits.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The benefits would be largely private, relating to the enjoyment of this house by its current occupants. Therefore, I find no public benefits that outweigh the harm that I have identified. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR