
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2020

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT MCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/20/3256850

77 Grasmere Avenue, Slough SL2 5JE

- 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 Aftab Ali against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/17754/004, dated 28 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed single storey side and rear extension and part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side and rear extension and part first floor rear extension at 77 Grasmere Avenue, Slough SL2 5JE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/17754/004, dated 28 April 2020, subject to the conditions in the appended schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - character and appearance of the area;
 - living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of No.79 Grasmere Avenue, having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling located on Grasmere Avenue. The appeal site benefits from a detached garage located at the rear of the site. The appeal proposal is for the construction of a single storey side extension and rear extension, which would extend beyond the length of the house, and replace the existing garage at the rear of the property. A first floor rear extension is also proposed which would provide an additional bedroom.
4. The site benefits from an extant planning consent¹ which is largely identical to the appeal proposal. The extant proposal required a recess to be included on the flank wall of the side extension, which was of a depth of 1.4 metres. The appeal proposal differs from the extant permission as it seeks to replace this

¹ Reference P/17754/001 dated 15 August 2019

- 1.4 metre deep recess with a much smaller recess measuring approximately 10cm in depth.
5. The Council have confirmed that all elements of the scheme are acceptable in terms of character and appearance, aside from the proposed recess. Based on the evidence before me and observations made on site, I have no reason to disagree.
 6. Turning to the proposed recess, given the proposal extends the full length of the appeal site, it would appear as a solid unbroken elevation along the length of the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling of No.79 Grasmere Avenue. The recess therefore forms an important design element to break up the flank wall of the scheme. However, whilst the proposed recess is much smaller than the extant scheme, I am of the view that it would still achieve the same aim in as much as it provides a visual break within this flank wall of the proposal.
 7. Furthermore, based on the small separation distance between the two properties, the recess would not be readily visible from the public realm. Consequently, I am satisfied that would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
 8. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. There is no conflict with policy CP8 of the Slough Core Strategy 2006-2026 (CS), and policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Local Plan for Slough 2004 (LP). Together these policies seek, amongst other things, that extensions are of a high quality design that are in keeping with both the existing property and the character of the surrounding area.
 9. The Council have made reference to the Framework in their reason for refusal. Whilst I have not been directed to the specific area of conflict, the proposal would accord with section 12, which seeks amongst other things, that development is of a good design that is sympathetic to the surrounding built environment. There is no conflict with the Slough Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD) which seeks, amongst other things, that extensions are of a high quality design.

Living conditions

10. The Council have raised concerns that the proposal with its depth and height would create a sense of enclosure and be overbearing to the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No.79. I do not find this to be the case. The proposed elevation along the flank wall is a single storey, and does not differ in height to the extant scheme. In any event, the proposal is only single storey in height, and would in my view not lead to a sense of enclosure within this property. The inclusions of a recess would break up the built form of the proposal and would mean it would not appear as overly dominate or overbearing within this neighbouring property.
11. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers of No.79 Grasmere Avenue. There is no conflict with policy CP8 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 that does not cause a substantial loss of amenity.
12. The Council have made reference to the Framework in their reason for refusal. Whilst I have not been directed to the specific area of conflict, the proposal

would accord with section 12, which seeks amongst other things, that development is of a good design that achieves a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. There is no conflict with the Slough Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD) which seeks, amongst other things, that extensions do not adversely impact the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. A condition relating to materials is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. I have imposed a condition requiring the window of the WC to be obscured glass, this is to ensure adequate privacy for occupiers. It has been necessary to impose a condition restricting the formation of any new additional windows in the flank elevation. This is to ensure adequate privacy of neighbouring occupiers is maintained.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS – APP/J0350/D/20/3256850

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan Area 2 HA Scale 1:1250, 1916C/pl/01 Existing Drawings dated 27/04/2020, 1916C/pl/02 Existing Drawings dated 27/04/2020, 1916/pl/03 Proposed Plans dated 27/04/2020, 1916C/pl/04 Proposed Elevations dated 27/04/2020
- 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building
- 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, (or any Order or Statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order), no window(s), other than those hereby approved, shall be formed in the flank elevations of the development.
- 5) The flank window serving the WC at first floor level of the development hereby approved shall be glazed with obscured glass and shall only be top vent openable at a height not less than 1.7m above finished floor level. The window shall not thereafter be altered in any way.