

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

**by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT MCIHT**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 25 March 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/19/3236958**  
**359 Goodman Park, Slough SL2 5NW**

- 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 Waseem Ali against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
  - The application Ref P/14707/006, dated 7 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2019.
  - The development proposed is construction of a first floor side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
  - the character and appearance of the area; and
  - The living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to outlook and privacy.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

3. Goodman Park is an expansive estate which comprises of mainly terraced houses in groups. The appeal site is an end of terrace property, set back from the highway with a large amount of parking to the front of the property. The property benefits from an existing ground floor extension. The appeal proposal is for the construction of a first floor extension.
4. The appeal site is in close proximity to two other groups of terraces, Nos.361-373 and Nos.375-387a Goodman Park. These run at a similar alignment to the terrace the appeal property is on, but they are offset. It was evident from my site visit that No.387 Goodman Park benefits from a two storey extension which now comprises of a separate self-contained unit. The appeal site is separated from No.361 via a footpath and soft landscaping.
5. When the appeal site is viewed from Goodman Park, there is a clear visual separation between the site and the neighbouring properties. The appeal proposal with its first floor extension would reduce this gap between the properties and remove the open visual gap between them. This would be more prevalent due to the existing two storey extension at No.387 Goodman Park which has already reduced this visual gap. The addition of a second storey at

the appeal site would therefore result in an overly built and terracing effect to this part of the estate, which would harm the character and appearance of the area.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to an appeal decision at No.295 Goodman Park<sup>1</sup>, for a first-floor extension on an end of terrace house. In that case the inspector found that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. I do not find that the two cases are directly comparable. No.295 Goodman Park is situated perpendicularly to the main street, and as such the first-floor extension did not lead to a terracing effect which reduced the visual gap between properties. In any event, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
7. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such there is conflict with Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 (CS) and Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Slough Local Plan 2004 (LP). Together these policies seek, amongst other things, that development is of a high-quality design. I also find conflict with Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD), which seeks, amongst other things that development does not erode the character of the surrounding area. The Council's reason for refusal also makes reference to the Framework. Whilst I have not been directed to specific areas of conflict, I find that it would fail to accord with its objectives towards good design.

#### *Living Conditions*

8. The appeal site sits forward of the neighbouring property of No.361 by approximately 11 metres, and as such the outlook from this property is currently dominated by the flank wall of the appeal site. The provision of a second storey in this location would further erode the outlook from this property. Due to its scale it would be overbearing and create a sense of enclosure for occupiers of this dwelling. As such I consider that the proposal would harm the living conditions of occupiers of No.361 in respect of their outlook.
9. The Council have indicated that the proposal would also harm the outlook of occupiers of No.387a. However, given the larger separation distance between this property and the appeal site I find that the proposal would not unduly harm the outlook from this property.
10. The Council have also raised concerns that the provision of an additional window at the front of the property of the first floor would cause harm to the living conditions of No.387a in regard to overlooking and a loss of privacy. The positioning of this window would mean that it would face the existing first floor window of No.387a. However, this window would be centrally located within the extension and does not look directly at the neighbouring dwelling. Given that it would be viewed at a diagonal angle, and the separation distance between the two properties I do not find that the proposal would impact the privacy of No.387a.
11. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No.361 with particular regard to outlook. As such

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/J0350/17/3183656

there is conflict with Core Policy 8 of the CS and Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the LP. Together these policies seek, amongst other things that development is of a high-quality design which respects the amenities of adjoining occupiers. I also find conflict with the SPD, which seeks, amongst other things that development does not impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. The Council's reason for refusal also makes reference to the Framework. Whilst I have not been directed to specific areas of conflict, I find that it would fail to accord with its objectives towards good design and the provision of high standards of amenity.

## **Conclusions**

12. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

*S Shapland*

INSPECTOR