



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2019

by Matthew Woodward BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday, 26 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/19/3228813

1 - 2 The Drive, Slough, SL3 7DB

- 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 Khan against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/07663/025, dated 21 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the 'erection of a first-floor rear extension and internal alterations to the existing flats at first-floor level (resubmission).'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - The character and appearance of the area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of No 1a The Drive, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site lies in a mainly residential area characterised by two-storey properties. The appeal building, comprising a number of flats, is situated along a shared access which is accessed off the main street (The Drive). The side of the appeal building faces The Drive and is set slightly behind a boundary wall.
4. I have been made aware of a broadly similar proposal on the appeal site which was refused by the Council and subsequently dismissed on appeal¹ (the previous proposal). In comparison with the previous proposal, the current scheme reduces the rear projection of the proposed first-floor rear extension and comprises a different roof form.
5. Due to the position and height of the proposed extension alongside The Drive, it would extend the existing side, featureless wall associated with the appeal building, and would appear as an incongruous addition to the street. In addition, the rear elevation of the first-floor of the appeal building is eminently visible along The Drive due to its closeness and position relative to the street.

¹ Appeal reference – APP/J0350/W/18/3197084

6. The series of shallow pitched roofs associated with the proposal would also be visible from the street, and the resultant roofscape would contrast with the steep roof pitches associated with the appeal building. When viewed in context of the existing roof form associated with the appeal building, it would result in a fussy and uncharacteristic design. In combination, the presence of the additional rear projection in close proximity to the street, and design of the proposed extension relative to the existing building, would be detrimental to the appearance of the street.
7. For the foregoing reasons the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with saved Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Slough Local Plan 2004 (the Local Plan) and Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 (the Core Strategy), and the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (the SPD) which require, *inter alia*, development to be of high quality design, have no significant adverse impact on the street scene, and have a roof form which reflects the original house. The development would fail to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, contrary to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living conditions

8. The dwelling and part of the garden area associated with No 1a The Drive (1a) lie adjacent to both the two-storey appeal building, and a single-storey element which projects to the rear of the appeal building. The appellant acknowledges that the extension would increase the sense of enclosure, although they consider that this would be minimal, and would not be materially harmful to living conditions. Even though an element of overbearing and enclosure results from the existing built form associated with the appeal building, the additional flank wall would be significantly higher than the existing, and would increase the sense of enclosure for users of the garden area associated with 1a, to the detriment of the enjoyment of the garden for its occupants.
9. The appeal Inspector in respect of the previous proposal found that it would affect the ground floor room of 1a nearest to the appeal property due to the location of the rear facing window. Whilst the proposed extension would not project as far to the rear, it would nevertheless be a jarring intrusion into the outlook from this rear window.
10. I agree with the appellant that the proposal would not be detrimental to the users of the rooms in the roof space of 1a which are served by rear facing rooflights. Furthermore, views to the south and west of the rear of 1a would be unaffected by the proposal, nor would the development significantly affect the living conditions of the occupants of any other properties. Be that as it may, from the aforementioned ground floor rear facing window and rear garden of 1a, the extension would appear oppressive and overpowering.
11. In conclusion, the development would harm the living conditions of the occupants of No 1a The Drive due to the overbearing and enclosing effect of the proposed extension. The development would be contrary to Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy, and Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan and the SPD which require, amongst other matters, that there is no significant adverse effect on the amenity of adjoining occupiers, that development respects its location and surroundings and results in extensions that are not over dominant

or overbearing. The development would fail to achieve a high standard of amenity for existing users, contrary to paragraph 129 of the Framework.

Other Matter

12. It has been put to me by the appellant that the development would improve the living standards for occupiers of the existing flats associated with the appeal building. This carries limited weight in favour of the appeal scheme but does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

13. I therefore conclude that, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Matthew Woodward

INSPECTOR