

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/22/3304182

28 Dennis Way, Slough SL1 5JP

- 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 Abel Abhilash against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application, ref. P/16028/001, dated 20 February 2022, was refused by a notice dated 11/05/2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two storey side and part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed side extension to No. 28 Dennis Way upon the appearance of the original semi-detached dwelling and upon the character of the immediate area.

Reasons

3. No. 28 Dennis Way, Slough, is one of 3 pairs of semi-detached 2 storey houses set in a small group in a somewhat unusual and untypical pattern to the road. The hip roofed Nos 24/26 and 32/34 are set at such an angle to Dennis Way that their side gable walls are closer to the road frontage than their front walls. No. 28, the appeal property, has, with No. 30, gables to the front and side. The 2 houses are set well back from the road, between Nos 24/26 and 32/34, accessed by a narrow shared private drive about 30m long. The result is that No. 28 is not readily seen from Dennis Way or from other public vantage points. No. 26, next door to the appeal house has a hip roofed side extension added to the house, partially filling the gap to No. 28.
4. There were 2 sets of drawings for the proposed side extension. Both show proposals for a 2 storey side elevation set back 2.5m from the adjoining front elevation extending back to the end of the long flat roofed single story rear extension. As originally submitted, the proposed side extension would have been 4m wide, with front eaves much higher than that of the main house frontage. Drawings Revisions A PL/03 and PL/04 dated 22/03/2022 show a 3.8m wide extension. None on the list of submitted drawings show a front

elevation with the eaves of the existing house and the proposed side extension at the same level as shown on Mr Abhilash's Agents' Statement.

5. In assessing Mr Abhilash's project, I agree with the Council that the proposed 2 storey side and rear extension would be unacceptably large and of unsympathetic design in relation to the original house and its surroundings.
6. The new side extension would fail the test that it be subordinate to the main house, considerably increasing the overall size of the house, particularly by extending the 2 storey height of the house deep into the rear garden of No. 28. That would fail to comply with requirement EX12 of the Slough Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, (RESPD).
7. The appeal project does not relate well to appearance or form of the existing house. It does not adhere to the design guidance set out in the RESPD. The front of the side extension would be set back an acceptable 2.5m from the house front wall. But this 2 storey side extension would run back some 10m, 5.5m beyond the original rear façade of the house, finishing flush with the end of the low rear extension. That would be well in excess of the maximum guidance depth of 3.3m set out in EX27 of the RESPD.
8. In addition, the design of the front façade of the proposed side extension is not fitting. Its higher eaves compared to that of the adjoining original house would be incongruous. The new works would not suitably blend in, failing to reflect the general character and appearance of the front of the existing house. A layout more akin to that shown of the front of the Appellant's Agents' Statement of Case would be more suitable. However, such a design was not shown on any of the application plans. The submitted design fails to comply with Slough Local Plan Policy H15 at (b) which says that house extensions are to be of a high quality of design.
9. Even at the slightly reduced width of 3.8m, the side extension at No. 28 would be wider than 50% of the 6.4m width of the original dwelling. Because the original house is quite narrow, the proportional excessive width of the proposed side extension is not the most significant objection to allowing the project, but here it adds to the concerns noted above.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR