



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 18 May 2021

by James Blackwell LLB (Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/21/3268164

26A Chalvey Road East, Slough SL1 2LU

- 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 Nazaqat Riasat against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/17989/001, dated 13 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the insertion of rear dormers and 2 x no. front roof lights to form habitable space.
-

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 area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of number 24 Chalvey Road East.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The site is a semi-detached residential property containing two maisonettes located on a busy road, which includes a mixture of residential, retail and commercial premises. Whilst set back slightly, the appeal property is sited close to the pavement and benefits from large bay windows on the ground and first floors. There is an enclosed garden to the rear. The style and design of the appeal dwelling is typical of other residential properties in the surrounding area.
4. There is a pair of semi-detached houses very similar in appearance immediately adjacent to the appeal property. The two sets of properties are similar in design, frontage and roofscape, providing a symmetry between the dwellings which contributes positively to the general street scene.
5. The Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (adopted January 2010) (SPD) sets out certain requirements for any proposed roof extensions and/or dormers which should be achieved before they can be considered acceptable. Guideline EX34 of the SPD says that dormers will normally only be permitted where there is a

minimum set in distance of 1 metre at either end of the main roof slope on which it sits and that the bottom of the dormer should be at least 1 metre above normal eaves level. Guideline EX34 also says that a dormer must not occupy more than 50% of the width of the existing roof slope on which it sits.

6. The proposed rear dormers fail to meet each of the guidelines highlighted above. This is true of both the dormer along the roof over the main part of the house as well as the roof which extends out from the rear of the property. Due to the conflict with the guidelines set out in the SPD, the additional bulk of the proposed dormers would be completely disproportionate to the size of the appeal property, causing substantial harm to its appearance, particularly from the rear.
7. Similarly, the significant scale and bulk of the rear dormer additions would cause a notable disparity with the roofs of neighbouring properties, including those immediately adjacent and other nearby dwellings of a similar style to the appeal property. This imbalance would be visually prominent and disruptive to the pattern of development in the area, which in turn would detract from the character and appearance of both the appeal property and the surrounding area.
8. Whilst I acknowledge there are examples of other residential properties with dormer features near to the appeal property, these are generally smaller and more proportionate in scale than the development proposed, and therefore more consistent with the surrounding roofscape.
9. For these reasons, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and would conflict with Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006 – 2026), as well as Policies H13, H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough (adopted March 2004). Taken together, these policies require extensions to achieve improvement of the area through high quality design, be of a scale which is compatible with the existing property and be compatible with the surrounding area in terms of scale, bulk and visual impact.

Living conditions

10. As highlighted above, the proposed rear dormers would add significant bulk and mass to the roof of the appeal property, both along the roof of the main part of the house as well as the roof which extends out from the rear of the property. The rear dormers, which would affect almost the entirety of the rear roof of the appeal property, would have an overbearing impact on the occupiers of 24 Chalvey Road East, as the additional height and bulk would lead to an unacceptable sense of enclosure within both its rear garden, and the rooms to its rear.
11. The garden of number 24 and the rooms to its rear already experience a degree of overshadowing due to the height and siting of neighbouring properties. Any increase to the level of overshadowing experienced at number 24 would therefore be felt keenly by its occupiers. The additional height and bulk of the proposed dormers would invariably lead to an increased level of overshadowing at certain times of day. Whilst this increase would not be substantial, the impact would still be to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupiers of number 24 given the levels of overshadowing already experienced.

12. The additional height and bulk of the proposed development would create a feeling of enclosure to the rear of number 24 and would also lead to an increased level of overshadowing at its rear, both of which would be harmful to the living conditions of its occupiers. As a result, the development would conflict with Policy EN1 of the development plan and guidelines DP6 and DP7 of the Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines (adopted January 2010). These policies state that any extensions should not be overbearing on neighbouring properties, nor result in significant overshadowing, loss of sunlight or daylight to neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and to the living conditions of number 24, which is contrary to the development plan. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR