
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by Alex Hutson MATP CMLI MArborA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/17/3166709

44 St Georges Crescent, Cippenham, Slough, Berkshire SL1 5PA

- 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 Mrs Salinder Cheema against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/06631/001, dated 24 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 44 St Georges Crescent, Cippenham, Slough, Berkshire SL1 5PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/06631/001 dated 24 August 2016, and the plans titled: Site Location Plan; and CHA01 1.

Preliminary matters

2. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the Council's decision notice as this provides a more concise description than that provided on the application form.
3. The single storey rear extension has already been built. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main issues

4. The main issue is the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 42 St Georges Crescent with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling located within a wider residential area. It has an existing full width single storey rear extension approximately 4.25 metres in depth. This aligns with and reflects the width and depth of a single storey rear extension at the adjoining property, 42 St Georges Crescent. The single storey rear extension the subject of this appeal extends approximately 2.99 metres (m) beyond the depth of the full width extension and along the shared boundary with No 42. It maintains the same height as the full width extension, which, according to the evidence, is approximately 2.8m.
-

6. The guidance of the Slough Borough Council Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD) advises that for semi-detached houses, single storey rear extensions should be of a maximum depth of 4.25m. Thus, there is conflict with the SPD in this regard. However, the SPD acknowledges that each planning application should be judged on its own merits.
7. In this particular case and as set out above, No 42 already has a single storey rear extension approximately 4.25m in depth. The overall depth of the single storey rear extension at the appeal property therefore has limited relevance in terms of the impact on outlook for the occupiers of No 42. Any assessment in this regard should therefore be limited to the single storey rear extension the subject of this appeal.
8. I observed that some rear facing patio doors which are likely to serve a habitable room within the single storey rear extension at No 42 are set in from the shared boundary and therefore a generous distance away from the flank wall of the single storey rear extension. In addition, the single storey rear extension extends only a modest amount beyond the rear elevation of No 42 and therefore along only a small proportion of the overall length of the shared boundary. Moreover, it does not exceed the recommended height for such development as set out within the SPD.
9. Having regard to these factors, I do not consider that the modest size and scale of the single storey rear extension results in an overbearing form of development for the occupiers of No 42, including in any views from the rear patio doors or from within the rear garden of this property. Consequently, I do not consider that any significant harm has arisen to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 42 with regard to outlook. Thus, the enjoyment of their home and garden has not been detrimentally affected.
10. The single storey rear extension therefore complies with saved Policies EN1-Standard of Design, EN2- Extensions and H15- Residential Extensions, of the Local Plan for Slough 2004; and Core Policy 8- Sustainability and the Environment, of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008. These policies require, amongst other things, development to respect and not result in significant adverse impacts on the amenities of adjoining occupiers and to be compatible in its relationship to nearby properties. These policies are consistent with the broad aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing occupants of land and buildings.
11. Whilst exceeding the recommended depth for single storey rear extensions as set out within the SPD, in this instance, the single storey rear extensions would comply with the overall aims of the SPD, which seek to ensure that any impact of new extensions on the amenity of neighbouring residents is acceptable.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the planning conditions suggested by the Council. However, as the single storey rear extension has been constructed in accordance with the submitted plans, I do not consider a separate plans condition is necessary. For the same reason, I do not consider that a time limit implementation condition is necessary. Finally, as the materials used in the

external surfaces of the single storey rear extension appear to match those of the appeal property and that this is annotated on the submitted plans, I do not consider a materials condition is necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Alex Hutson

INSPECTOR