The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2023

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2023

Appeal ref: APP/J0350/D/22/3305564

26 Farnburn Avenue, Slough SL1 4XT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Kasar Mahmood against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
- The application, ref. P/19514/002, dated 12 April 2022, was refused by a notice dated 26 July 2022.
- The development proposed is the: Demolition of the existing garage. Construction of a single storey front extension, part single storey, part two storey side and rear extension, raising and enlarging the existing roof, dormer windows in the rear roof slope, roof lights to the front and rear roof slopes.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extensions to the dwelling, No 26, on the street scene in this part of Farnburn Avenue.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling, No. 26 Farnburn Avenue, Slough, is a small hipped roofed detached house on a fairly narrow plot. The appeal project is intended to substantially enlarge the dwelling following removal of the single garage at the side of the house close to the neighbouring dwelling, No. 24.

4. I agree with the Appellant ,Mr Mahmood, that the design and finishes of the resulting enlarged dwelling would be generally sympathetic to those of the existing house and its immediate neighbours. The side extension when seen from the road would also be acceptably subordinate to the main house and be built with matching brickwork, rendered finish and have matching roof tiles. The considerable increase in the size of the house caused in part by the expansion of the volume of the roof, resulting in a flat section on top, (described by the Council as a flat crown measuring 3.6 metres deep), would not easily be seen from directly in front of the house. However, this substantial increase in the bulk of the house could be seen from the sides.

5. Although the widened house would, in isolation, look well proportioned, the side extension would fill the gap to No. 24 next door to the east almost

completely. The enlarged house would occupy the entire width of the plot. The pattern of gaps between houses of the approximate width of a single car garage along this part of the road would here be replaced by an untypical and unfortunate terracing effect. I consider that would be substantially detrimental to the street scene. It would also fail to meet the exhortations in the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010 at EX11, which states that two storey/first floor side extensions should be set off the side boundary by a minimum of 1 metre. Also, para. 5.4 says in cases where a two storey/first floor side extension exists and is built up to the boundary, planning applications for similar extensions on the neighbouring property will not normally be permitted unless a minimum 2m gap can be achieved at first floor level between the two extended properties. That is not achieved in this instance.

6. I agree with the Council's conclusion that Mr Mahmood's project at his home would therefore not be visually compatible with the existing dwelling or the character and appearance of the immediate surrounding area.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR