



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2021

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/21/3276982

14 Crescent Drive, Maidenhead, SL6 6AQ

- 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 Ms Jo Croom against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 21/00234, dated 7 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is for a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension at 14 Crescent Drive, Maidenhead, SL6 6AQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00234, dated 7 January 2021 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DPA 220-01 Rev P2, DPA 220-02 Rev P2; DPA 220-08 Rev P3; and DPA 220-09 Rev P3.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issues

The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:

- the character and appearance of the area.
- the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance of the area

2. Crescent Drive is a residential cul-de-sac comprising a mixture of detached and semi-detached properties which are varied in both their appearance and the spacing between properties. The appeal property is located at the end of Crescent Drive in a corner location adjacent to the semi-detached pair of houses at 10 and 12 Crescent Drive. The appeal property sits within an irregularly formed plot which is loosely wedge shaped as it tapers along the

shared boundary with No 12 and towards Yew Tree Close. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a gable ended roof and a single storey front projection. The windows to the front are generally consistent with one another. However, there is more variation in window design to the side and rear of the existing house.

3. A two-storey gable ended side extension is proposed, which would also incorporate a single storey front section to match the building line of the existing front projection. The proposed development would extend toward the shared boundary with No 12 and windows of varying design are proposed.
4. At its closest points from the boundary with No 12, the single storey aspects of the proposed development would allow spacing between the properties which is not dissimilar to the existing street layout. In addition, the wedge-shaped plot and the splayed arrangement between the appeal property and No 12 ensures the spacing increases significantly as the boundary extends away from the front of the dwellings. The two-storey aspect of the appeal is setback further behind the single storey section therefore allowing more spacing between the extension and the boundary. Consequently, the retained spacing would accord with the character of the area and would not be cramped.
5. In comparison to the existing property, the proposed development would introduce windows on the front and side elevations of different types and dimensions. The smaller design of the first-floor front window results from the incorporation of a deeper pitched roof at ground floor level to address the setback of the proposed development at first floor level and the existing single storey front projection. Notwithstanding the Council's concerns about the effect of the proposed development on the design of the existing house, both the proposed extension itself and the roof of the proposed single-storey element would be subordinate to the main house. Given that the house is not replicated along the mixed streetscene and it already has windows of differing dimensions, I consider they would not have a harmful effect on the existing house. In this instance, I find that the design of the proposed development would not be discordant.
6. My attention was drawn to an appeal at 42 The Crescent¹, but it is not clear that this appeal relates directly to the appeal before me. As such, it has no bearing on this appeal decision.
7. I conclude the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Local Plan Policies DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 2003 (the Local Plan) and the Borough Wide Design Guide 2020, all of which seek to ensure satisfactory design which does not harm the character or appearance of the area.

Living conditions of neighbouring residents

8. No 12 has a driveway to the front and is orientated so the windowless flank wall of the house at No 12 faces the existing garden of the appeal property. The front windows of the proposed development would face onto No 12's driveway and its windowless flank elevation. Furthermore, the proposed windows to the proposed side elevation would be located a considerable

¹ APP/T0355/D/21/3271821

distance from the rear garden of No 12. Given this layout, I find that there would be no adverse harm in terms of privacy or outlook.

9. Located beyond the ends of the rear gardens to Nos 10 and 12, 5 Yew Tree Close is sited a considerable distance from the proposed development. Overlooking of the house and garden at No 5 is already possible from the first floor windows of Nos 10 and 12 which are closer to No 5 than the appeal property. While the proposed first floor flank window is larger than those at Nos 10 and 12, given its siting, this matter does not result in unacceptable harm.
10. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect upon the living conditions of neighbouring residents with regard to outlook and privacy. The proposal therefore accords with the aims of Policy H14 of the Local Plan and the Borough Wide Design Guide which seek to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Conditions

11. I have attached conditions on the time limit for development and plans in the interests of certainty. The materials condition is also necessary to ensure that the development is in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR