



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2022 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/21/3287374

Site Address: 5 Severn Crescent, Slough SL3 8AT

- 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 Sunesh Koshy against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/19414/001, dated 26 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side & rear & part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed single storey side & rear & part two storey rear extension at 5 Severn Crescent, Slough SL3 8AT. In accordance with the terms of application Ref P/19414/001, dated 26 July 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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: 2154/PL/01, 2154/PL/02, 2154/PL/03, 2154/PL/04, 2154/PL/05 and 2154/PL/06.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The Council has raised no concerns in respect of the ground floor elements of the extension, and a proposal which was similar to this was approved in 2021. Accordingly, the main issues are the effect of the first floor rear element of the extension on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and
 - ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 11 and 13 Torridge Road, with regard to whether it would be overbearing.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property sits on the end of a terrace of three two-storey dwellings with a gable end roof on Severn Crescent. The dwelling is situated within a housing estate comprised of mostly terraced dwellings. The character of the area is residential with a relatively consistent design and form. This terrace is a smaller terrace than others in the area and has a light brick colour, stone porches and there is only a small amount of white cladding under the windows. No.1 Severn Crescent has a ground floor rear extension that is about 3m deep with a tall parapet that is visible from the appeal property. The appeal dwelling is set back from and faces perpendicular to the road and is only accessible by footpaths to the front and the rear gardens. To the rear of the property is a veranda with a flat roof at ground floor level.
5. The proposal includes a part two storey rear extension. It would include a hipped roof that would sit well below the ridge of the main roof. The proposed extension would have a minimal projection and would follow a similar building line to the ground floor extension at No.1. There are not any first-floor extensions on this terrace. However, due to a complimentary and subordinate design with its modest projection and height it would integrate well with the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.
6. For the reasons detailed above, the first-floor extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal is considered to accord with Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Local Plan for Slough 2004 (Local Plan). Together, these policies permit development that is of a high-quality design, that respects the identifiable character of the street scene and surrounding area by being compatible with the scale, form, materials, design and architectural style of the existing property and has a suitable relationship to nearby properties.
7. The proposal would also not be in conflict with the Slough Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD) DP3 and EX28, which advises that extensions should be in keeping with and respect the original form of the house and its surroundings by being subordinate and in proportion to the original house.

Living conditions

8. The host property is situated perpendicular to the rear gardens of a row of terraced properties on Torridge Road and there is an alleyway between them to the west. The terrace runs from no.1 at the north of the host dwelling to 19 in the south. There is also a gap between the host dwelling and its own boundary. The proposal includes a first-floor extension of 2.49m in depth from the original rear wall of the property. The roof would be pitched and significantly set down from the ridge of the main roof.
9. Guideline EX18 of the SPD is only relevant to side extensions and, as the first floor element of the proposed extension would be to the rear, there would not be a direct breach of this guidance in the SPD. The first floor part of the extension would be off set from the rear boundaries of the neighbouring dwellings including by the alleyway and step in from the side boundary at the appeal property. It would also be of a modest height. Although the

neighbouring gardens are relatively short in length, the separation, together with the low ridge height would be sufficient to avoid an undue overbearing effect or loss of light.

10. The reasoning behind guideline EX32 of the SPD relates to overlooking, which was not a concern raised by the Council in its reason for refusal. This suggests that a minimum distance of 15 metres be maintained between the first-floor rear wall of a two-storey rear extension and the side boundary of an adjacent property. In respect of some of the properties in Torridge Road, the distance would be less than this. However, overlooking would be at an oblique angle and not significantly greater than can occur from the current rear elevation of the appeal property. The SPD is a guidance document, and, in this case, the proposal would not be contrary to the overarching aims of the relevant Policies.
11. For the reasons detailed above, the proposed development would not cause undue harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. The proposal is considered to meet Core Policy 8 of Slough Core Strategy 2006 -2026 and Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan (2004) which together require that proposals for extensions to existing dwelling houses to have an appropriate relationship to nearby properties and that there is no significant adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Other Matters

12. The positioning of the rear wall of the first-floor elevation would partly change. However, the level of overlooking towards the adjoining 3 Severn Crescent would be similar to that which already exists. The Council have found no harm in respect of privacy, and I have no reason to disagree with them.
13. The drawings demonstrate that the first floor element of the extension would comply with the 45-degree code on the horizontal axis when measured from the window at the attached neighbouring dwelling. Given the scale of the extension it would not be overbearing or in breach of the principles set out in the SPD in respect of this neighbouring dwelling.
14. The proposed extension would be modest and offset from the neighbouring dwellings. Any increased effect on overshadowing or light would not be significant and would not substantially affect any pre-existing issues including those related to mould and energy. Therefore, in this regard, it would not conflict with Core Policy 8 from the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006).

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, a condition has been recommended requiring the development accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition to secure matching materials is recommended.
16. The Council requested a condition to remove permitted development rights in relation to the addition of new windows in the flank elevation of the development. However, this would not be necessary as legislation requires that any new windows, above ground floor level, be obscure glazed with restricted opening and therefore privacy would be retained.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR