



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/25/3363377

36 Mallow Park, Maidenhead SL6 6SQ

- 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 and Mrs Dominic and Helen Young against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application ref. is 24/02583/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a part single part two storey front extension with canopy, single storey side /rear extension and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single part two storey front extension with canopy, single storey side /rear extension and alterations to fenestration at 36 Mallow Park, Maidenhead SL6 6SQ in accordance with the terms of planning application ref. 24/02583/FUL dated 23 October 2024 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 23224-03, 23224-04, 23224-05, 23224-06, 23224-07, 23224-08.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey detached dwelling located on the corner of Cranbrook Drive and Mallow Park and it is within a residential development known as the Cranbrook Estate. Its main/front elevation faces east onto Mallow Park. There are flats opposite in two storey buildings. No.36 Mallow Park has a rear garden which is concealed from Cranbrook Drive by a brick wall and vegetation. No.35 Mallow Park is the neighbouring property to the south and it is also two storey. 35 and 36 have recessed single storey flat roofed linked garages. The character of the estate is one of general uniformity but there are differing house types and sizes.

4. The proposed development includes a part single, part two storey front extension with canopy, single storey side/rear extension and alterations to fenestration. The proposed extensions would match the house in terms of materials. The front extension would extend beyond the existing front elevation by about 2.3m (not including the canopy) at ground and first floor levels. The proposed first floor element would have an overall width when measured along the front elevation of about 7.5m and the ground floor element an overall width of about 12.8m. It would have a hipped roof.
5. The proposed side/rear single storey extension would infill a corner at the rear of the house which is formed by the existing north-end two storey extension to the main house being narrower than the main house. The proposed infill would be modest in size and would have a mono-pitched roof which would neatly reflect the pitched gable end roof of the existing extension and the pitch of the main roof. Views of this north end of the appeal dwelling can be seen from Cranbrook Drive and would not jar with the streetscene or character of the area.
6. The proposed front extension would not break the main street building line southwards on Mallow Park. It would not detract from the appearance of no.35 Mallow Park or unduly interfere with the rhythm of the street. Neither would it look overdeveloped for its plot as the existing dwelling is set back from the front boundary by between about 9.6m and 5.7m, and its width is not increased by this proposal. Whilst it is a corner plot, it would not appear too bulky or too prominent from either Cranbrook Drive or Mallow Park.
7. In terms of its impact on the host dwelling, I do not consider its roofscapes would be unduly jarring. The ridgeline of the proposed extension would be set down from the ridgeline of the main dwelling by about 0.45m. The hipped roof would reduce the bulk and mass of the roof and the eaves height would mirror the eaves height of the host dwelling. Overall the scale would be proportionate and the design sympathetic to the existing dwelling.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene and would not be in conflict with policy QP3 of the Borough Local Plan (adopted 2022) or the guidance contained in the Borough Wide Design Guide (2020).

Conditions

9. A number of conditions were put forward in the event that the appeal might be successful. I have considered those in line with Planning Practice Guidance. For the avoidance of doubt there is a condition tying the development to the approved plans, and in order to protect the character and appearance of the area there is a condition which requires the external surfaces of the development to match the existing development.

Conclusion

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

Megan Thomas K.C.
Inspector