



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2022

**by A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 07 January 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/21/3278348**

**125 Monksfield Way, SLOUGH, SL2 1QJ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs McDermott against Slough Borough Council.
  - The application Ref P/19018/001, is dated 26 November 2020.
  - The development proposed is raise the ridge of main roof and increase the height of the previously approved dormer.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to raise the ridge of main roof and increase the height of the previously approved dormer, at 125 Monksfield Way, Slough, SL2 1QJ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/019018/001, dated 26 November 2020, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following submitted plans: S01, S03 Rev A, S04, C01 Rev B, C02 Rev A and C03 Rev B.
  - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on the approved plans.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal results from the Council's failure to determine the planning application within the prescribed period. There is no formal decision on the application, as jurisdiction over that was taken away when the appeal was lodged. The Council has not submitted an officer report or statement. I therefore do not have anything before me to inform me of the Council's view of the proposal. The Council has also not submitted copies of any local development plan policies that it considers to be relevant to the proposal. I will therefore determine the appeal on the basis of national planning policy.

## Main Issues

3. On the basis of my assessment of the proposal and my observations on site I am of the view that the main issues that I should consider are the proposal's impact upon:
  - a) the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area, and

- b) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, with regard to privacy.

## **Reasons**

### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal dwelling is within a 20<sup>th</sup> century housing estate. Dwellings in the area are consistent in terms of their two storey scale, terraced forms and use of brick and tile.
5. A rear dormer extension has already been approved at the site<sup>1</sup>. The proposal seeks to increase this in height, which would take it above the ridge height of the existing dwelling. The increase in height would be modest. It would follow the full width of the dwelling and would adopt the slope of the front facing roof at its southern edge. The appeal building is at one end of a staggered terrace where the individual dwellings already adopt different ridge heights. As such the increase in height will not appear out of place when viewed from the front of the appeal building.
6. The dormer would be visible across the adjacent rear gardens from the southern end of Doddsfield Road to the west. However, it would be set back beyond other dwellings and would thus not be a harmful addition to the streetscene.
7. In summary, the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the existing dwelling or the area. It would accord with paragraph 130 c) of the Framework, which seeks to ensure that development proposals are sympathetic to local character.

### *Living conditions*

8. The proposal would occupy almost the entire rearward roof slope and would effectively add an additional storey to the rear of the dwelling. However, it would be no more significant than that already permitted by the Council through the grant of the previous planning permission. It would be typical of the relationship between many terraced dwellings and their neighbouring gardens, and would not be so significant that it would erode the level of privacy already enjoyed by those using the rear gardens of the adjacent dwellings, given the level of overlooking that already takes place.
9. In summary, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings. It would accord with paragraph 130 f) of the Framework, which seeks to ensure that development proposals create places with a high standard of amenity for existing users.

## **Conditions**

10. The Council has not suggested any conditions. In considering which conditions I consider to be necessary I have had regard to the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty, and a condition to ensure that the materials match those specified on the approved plans to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

---

<sup>1</sup> Council Ref: P/19018/000

**Conclusion**

11. For the reasons above, the appeal should be allowed.

*A Tucker*

INSPECTOR