



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2021

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/20/3261708
23 Warwick Avenue Slough SL2 1DU

- 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 Amar Afsar against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/07522/002, dated 8 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and (ii) highway safety as a result of parking provision.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. Warwick Avenue is a street of terraced dwellings arranged predominantly in groups of six. The appeal property (No 23) lies in the middle of one of these terraced groups. I noticed that there were a number of ground floor extensions at the rear of the terraces, including at the appeal property and an adjacent dwelling, but that there was limited evidence of two storey extensions or roof dormers. The consistency of the underlying building pattern lends an architectural coherence and rhythm to the pattern of development in this location and in views from the rear amenity areas of the terraced properties.
4. The proposed first floor extension would be built across the full width and extend across much of the depth of the single storey extension. It would in part exceed the maximum depth recommended by the Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (January 2010) (SPD) and would be a notable addition to the building. It would appear disproportionately large and bulky in relation to No 23 and the other dwellings in the terrace and would be incongruous with the underlying building pattern. Furthermore, the flat roof element of the proposal would introduce a form of roof design at first floor level which would be unreflective of the area.

5. I recognise that the proposal would improve internal living arrangements in No 23 to the benefit of the appellant. I note that the proposed scheme would be constructed in matching materials but this is a fundamental to all developments and would not represent a notable benefit. I acknowledge too that the proposal has been designed to address concerns as to the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent property and note that no concerns have been raised in relation to privacy and light to any neighbouring property. However, these matters do not outweigh my findings in respect of the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
6. The proposed scheme would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would therefore conflict with Core Policy 8 of the Slough Core Strategy (adopted 2008) (Core Strategy) and Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Slough Local Plan (adopted 2004) (Local Plan) which amongst other matters requires development to be of a high quality design and for extensions to buildings to be compatible with the scale, form and design of the original structure. It would also conflict with the SPD which requires first floor rear extensions to be subordinate to and respect the original form of the dwelling, and to be a maximum depth of 3.3 metres. Under the SPD, it is also indicated that in general there is no potential for two storey rear extensions on mid terrace properties. In addition, the SPD indicates that flat roofs will not be acceptable and roofs must respect the original roof form of the house. The proposal would also be in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which encourages good design and seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character.

Highway Safety

7. The extension increases the number of bedrooms at the property from three to four. Under the SPD three parking spaces should be provided for a four bedroom dwelling. I note that the figures within the SPD specifically allows a relaxation of the parking standard for a 4 bedroom house down to 2 on site parking spaces where it can be demonstrated that there is a sufficient capacity within the street to accommodate the shortfall without causing congestion or road safety issues.
8. There is no evidence that there are any vehicle parking problems in this location that raise concerns about the safety of highway users and on my site visit I observed no obvious on street parking pressures. No 23, along with neighbouring properties, has the benefit of two parking spaces at the front of the property. Given these circumstances and the absence of clear evidence as to a local parking issue, I do not consider that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the safety of highway users. As such, the development would not conflict with Policy T2 of the Local Plan and Core Strategy Policy 7, both of which require the level of parking to be appropriate to its location. Nor would it be in conflict with the NPPF which provides that applications should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Conclusion

9. I have found that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Whilst I have not found the proposal would cause harm to highway safety, I consider that the harm to the

character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area to be unacceptable.

10. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR