
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2020

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/20/3256925

Wisteria, Bath Road, Colnbrook, Slough SL3 0HZ

- 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 K Hafeez against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/13413/004, dated 4 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed part single part two storey side and rear extension and outbuilding'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The proposal includes a number of elements, with extensions to the side and rear, and an outbuilding. The Council have not raised an issue with the outbuilding and rear extensions, and state that extant planning approval exists for these. Based on the evidence provided I have no reason to reach a different conclusion.

Main Issues

3. Therefore, the main issues are the effect of the proposed first floor side extension on:
 - i) the living conditions of the occupiers of 'Littlecot' with particular regard to outlook; and
 - ii) the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. The appeal site is occupied by a 2-storey detached dwelling with single storey elements to the west and rear elevations. Adjacent to the appeal site is 'Littlecot', a detached single storey dwelling. This has three windows and a partially glazed entrance door on its east elevation. These would face directly onto the proposed first floor side extension.
5. The additional mass and bulk at first floor level would bring the built form closer to 'Littlecot'. Due to the mass, bulk and proximity of the extension the

proposal would be visually intrusive from the side elevation windows of 'Littlecot'. This would result in a significant overbearing impact, harmful to the outlook of the occupiers of the neighbouring property from a significant number of windows. Whilst the extension would be set away from the boundary with reduced eaves and ridge, this would not entirely mitigate the sense of enclosure.

6. Therefore, in conclusion on this main issue the proposed first floor side extension would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 'Littlecot' with particular regard to outlook. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough, Adopted 22nd March 2004 (LP) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These local and national policies seek to ensure high quality design that protects the living conditions of adjoining occupiers by ensuring a compatible relationship between nearby properties is provided.

Character and appearance

7. Core Policies 8 and 9 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026, Adopted 16th December 2008 (CS) and Policy EN1 of the LP seek high quality design that respects its location and surroundings. Pursuant to this I have had careful regard to the Council's guidance, in particular Chapter 5 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010 (SPD). However, the document is clear at paragraph 1.2.7 that each case needs to be assessed on its own merits as every circumstance cannot be foreseen.
8. The proposed first floor side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the building, which includes a projecting two-storey bay window. It would be set in from the side boundary of the appeal site and the existing ground floor. Furthermore, it would be clearly lower in height than the main body of the house. As such, despite its slightly unusual roof form, with reduced eaves, the proposal would appear subservient to the host building. Furthermore, views of the proposal are filtered by the existing landscaping that is subject to protection¹. Given this and the wide range of architectural style in the vicinity, the proposal would satisfactorily assimilate into its location and surroundings.
9. Therefore, in conclusion on this main issue the proposed first floor side extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. As such, in this regard the proposal would not conflict with Core Policies 8 and 9 of the CS, Policy EN1 of the LP, paragraph 127 of the Framework, or guidance within the Council's SPD. However, this does not mitigate my conclusions on the first main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR

¹ The Urban District Council of Staines: Tree Preservation Order No. 29