
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2017

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/17/3169058

42 Castleview Road, Slough SL3 7NQ

- 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 & Mrs Kenth against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/11209/006, dated 28 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear/first floor side extension and rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal, specifically the proposed first floor side extension and rear dormer, upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

First floor side extension

3. The appeal proposal relates to a two storey semi-detached house with a hipped roof, it is located within a residential street largely comprising of houses of a similar scale and form, albeit many have been extended and altered over time. I noted that within the street there have been some hip to gable roof extensions within the street, but these are very much in the minority, such that I consider they do not make up the prevailing pattern of development in the locality. In any event, each case must be assessed on its own merits.
4. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document adopted January 2010 (SPD) where concerning two storey/first floor side extensions highlights that such proposals should be set of the side boundary by a minimum of 1m. This is in order to maintain a visual gap between buildings, thereby reducing the 'terracing' effect on the street scene.
5. I note that, on the whole, the character of development within Castleview Road is of a quite spacious nature. In paragraph 5.4, the SPD goes on to state that in cases where a two storey/first floor extension exists that is built up to the boundary, planning applications for similar extensions on the neighbouring

property will not normally be permitted unless there is a minimum 2m gap at first floor level between the two extended properties. However, that is not the case here as no40 adjacent has not been extended at first floor level.

Nonetheless, these standards exist so as to protect the visual amenities of the built environment of the Borough, and I cannot see any flexibility in the wording of the SPD, notwithstanding whether or not a building to building gap of at least 2m can be retained.

6. The proposal would give rise to the existing visual gap being eroded at first floor level, and this erosion of spaciousness would be further accentuated by the gable ended roof form which would contrast quite significantly with the hipped roof form of the host dwelling as originally constructed. Consequently, whilst I am aware that there are other gable roof extensions within the wider street, where they are viewed against an unaltered hipped roof on the other side of an adjoining semi-detached house, I find demonstrates the incongruity and conflict between two divergent roof forms.
7. I sympathise with the appellants view that the proposal should not simply be denied on the off-chance that the existing or future occupants of the neighbouring property might seek to exercise their rights to develop their dwelling to the side at first floor level. However, I find the proposal contrary to Policy EX11 of the SPD for the reasons cited above, as well as Policy EX14 which highlights that roofs must respect the original form of the house. I consider that the first floor side extension, combined with the gable ended roof design, would give rise to demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene through an erosion of its spacious character.
8. The proposal conflicts with Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy (2006 – 2026) Development Plan Document, December 2008 (DPD) and Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004 (LP). These require all development in the Borough to improve the quality of the environment in a manner that respects its location and surroundings, and where concerning proposals for extensions to existing buildings, require proposals to be compatible with the scale, materials, form, design, architectural style and proportions of the original structure. This is in addition to the conflict with one of the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (the "Framework") which states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design.

Dormer Extension

9. With respect to the proposed dormer extension on the rear roof slope, I note that application number P/11209/004 granted a Lawful Development Certificate for a proposed loft conversion with rear dormer and hip to gable roof extension, in August 2016. Whilst no dimensions have been provided for this element within drawing AG/AC/10/16D it appears to be of very similar proportions to that which could be erected utilising permitted development rights.
10. I acknowledge that it does not comply with the strict letter of the SPD, however, there is a high likelihood that the appellants would implement this. The rear roof slope of the dwelling is, in reality, only visible from private vantage points, and therefore I consider, on balance, that the proposed dormer

would not give rise to material harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Therefore this aspect of the proposal does not conflict with the policies cited above.

Conclusion

11. However, having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR