
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2023

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/23/3317043

46 Parsons Road, Slough SL3 7GU

- 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 Davesch Chauhan against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/19377/001, dated 2 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey rear extension in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/19377/001, dated 2 October 2022, 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 hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, Block Plan, CHAUHAN/PLAN/002B, CHAUHAN/PLAN/004A, CHAUHAN/PLAN/005B and CHAUHAN/PLAN/007A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary matter

2. The Council based its decision on amended plans submitted during the application process. I have also based my decision on those plans, as listed above. During the course of the appeal, the Council provided 2 different versions of drawing CHAUHAN/PLAN/005B, both dated 20 December 2022. Only one of these is consistent with the other submitted drawings and the extracts shown in the Council's report. This is the version to which this decision refers.

Main issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:

- i) The character and appearance of the house and the local area; and
- ii) Living conditions at the next door property, No 48, in terms of light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

- 4. 46 Parsons Road is a 3 storey detached house of fairly recent construction and formal design, on an estate of similar houses. The proposal is to build a 2 storey extension across the whole back of the house. The appeal application follows on from the approval of a slightly smaller 1 and 2 storey rear extension. The single storey element would be the same, but the depth of most of the first floor element would increase from 4m to 5m (excepting a small section next to the boundary with No 48). The extension would connect to an existing single storey garage building at the back.
- 5. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises at EX27 that the maximum permitted depth for a 2 storey rear extension will generally be 3.3 metres although deeper extensions may be allowed where site circumstances allow. The Council also refers to SPD EX24, which states that for single storey rear extensions, pitched roofs should be at least 150mm below any first floor window cill. The same principle could perhaps be said to apply to the 2 storey extension in this case, though that is not stated in the SPD. The SPD further confirms that each planning application will be considered on its own individual merits.
- 6. In this case, the extension would be low for a 2 storey structure and would not extend out so far to the rear that it would appear disproportionate with this sizeable building. The low profile roofs, although not complying with the numerical requirement set out in SPD EX24, would not interfere with the house's second floor windows or otherwise harm the appearance of the house. This would be a subservient structure, much lower and smaller than the main house, and discreetly sited where it would hardly be visible from Parsons Road or any other public vantage point.
- 7. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the house or the local area. It accords with the shared aims of Core Strategy (CS) Core Policy 8, Local Plan for Slough (LP) policies EN1 and EN2 and the SPD, to secure high quality design for extensions, which should be compatible with the original structure and respect its surroundings.

Living conditions

- 8. The Council's concern here is that the extension would affect the light and outlook from a small first floor rear window at No 48 next door. The amended plans indicate that the extension would not break a 45 degree angle drawn from that window, so that there would not be any clear conflict with the 45 degree code set out at SPD EX26. Any infringement of the 45 degree line would be marginal and the window is high enough up so that it would continue to have views and receive light over the top of the extension. This window,

moreover, appears to be obscure glazed. The floor plans for No 48 submitted by the appellant indicate that it serves an en suite bathroom, which is not a considered to be a habitable room requiring protection of its light and outlook.

9. I conclude that the proposal would not significantly affect living conditions at No 48 next door, in terms of light or outlook. It accords with the shared aims of CS Core Policy 8, LP policies EN2 and H15 and the SPD, to ensure that extensions cause no significant adverse impact to the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Conditions

10. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty. A further condition requiring the use of matching materials is needed to ensure that the extension complements the character and appearance of the house.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR