



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020

by Rachael Pipkin, BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/20/3247187

1 Bunten Meade, Slough, SL1 2YJ

- 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 S Singh against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: P/05454/007 dated 12 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'first floor side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of occupants of 292 – 298 Cippenham Lane with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Number 1 Bunten Meade (No. 1) is a modest two-storey property forming the end of a short terrace of houses. It has been previously extended to the rear and side with a large single storey pitched roof extension. The surrounding area is characterised by short terraces of two and three-storey residential development, arranged as houses and small blocks of flats, and laid out in a spacious pattern set back from the footway behind front drives and grass verges. This gives the area an open and spacious character.
4. The proposed extension would extend above the existing side extension with a set-back approximately 1 metre from the front and side elevations and a pitched roof set slightly below the main roof ridge. This would make it appear subordinate to the existing property. However, this would not follow the advice set out with the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD). This sets out that side extensions to end of terrace properties should generally take the form of a continuation of the terrace rather than seeking to be subordinate.

5. The inset first floor would not align with the front elevation and as such would not integrate with either the existing extension or the terrace as a whole. As such it would appear incongruous and incompatible with the existing built form. The additional bulk at first floor would also reduce the space between the side elevation of No. 1 and the rear elevation of the adjacent two-storey block of flats at 292-298 Cippenham Lane (Nos. 292-298). This would erode the open and spacious character of the area. Whilst the extension may be built to high standards with quality and matching materials, this would not overcome the harm to both the host property and the surrounding area that I have identified.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 (Core Strategy) and Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Local Plan for Slough 2004 (Local Plan). These policies seek a high-quality design which respects its location and surroundings and is compatible with the existing building. It would also not comply with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). It would also not accord with the guidance set out in paragraphs 5.14 and 5.15 of the SPD which seeks to protect the space and visual breaks between terraces.

Living conditions

7. The proposed extension would be to the rear of Nos. 292-298, separated from these by the side passage to No. 1 and the area of communal garden to the flats. Within the rear elevation of this block, there is a central, large glazed stairwell with smaller windows serving each of the flats either side.
8. The proposed extension would increase the height and bulk of the building and reduce the space between No. 1 and the first-floor windows in the rear elevation of Nos. 292-298. Due to its proximity to these windows, it would restrict outlook resulting in an increased sense of enclosure for occupants.
9. This leads me to conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupants of Nos. 292-298 with particular regard to outlook. It would therefore conflict with Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy and Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Local Plan which seek development that does not adversely affect the amenities of adjoining occupiers. It would also similarly not comply with the design objectives of the Framework nor with the guidance set out in the SPD which seeks to protect the space between properties to ensure extensions do not have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties.

Other matters

10. The proposed development would provide the appellant with better living accommodation. However, this personal benefit is not sufficient to outweigh the harms I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin,

INSPECTOR