The Planning Inspectorate

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/23/3317421
29 Stoke Poges Lane, Slough SL1 3NX

- 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 Jasvinder Jolly against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/12815/001, dated 7 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2022.
- The development proposed is a first floor rear extension with loft conversion.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
   i) The character and appearance of the building and the local area; and
   ii) Living conditions at 27 Stoke Poges Lane next door, in terms of outlook and daylight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 29 is one of a number of similar semi-detached 2 storey houses lining this part of Stoke Poges Lane, with an upper floor gable/window feature to the front, hipped roofs at the side and both 1 and 2 storey extensions at the back. The proposal would add a first floor extension to the rear and create space for accommodation within the loft by increasing the roof pitch and raising the rear roof sections, with a new flat roof in the middle of the pitched roofs (an arrangement often called a 'crown roof').

4. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises at EX33 that alterations to the main roof of a house by changing its shape and/or pitch or raising the ridge line will not normally be permitted – but it also confirms that each planning application will be considered on its own individual merits.

5. In this case, No 29 is part of a row of semi-detached houses which all have much the same roof pitch and design. The proposal would significantly and noticeably steepen the pitch of the main, hipped roof and the attached side roof of the 2 storey rear wing. This would give the pair of semis an awkward, discordant appearance that would make it stand out from the other, much more uniform pairs in the row.

6. Furthermore, although the new roofs to the rear would not be quite as high as the main ridge, the long and unarticulated 2 storey rear wing would become larger and bulkier due to the extra height. That side elevation is fairly prominent in views along the street. The proposal would make the rear wing an outsized feature in these views, out of scale with neighbouring buildings.

7. I note that other 2 storey extensions and roof alterations have been approved locally, but have seen none which closely parallels this proposal. These other extensions have not changed the character of the area to an extent that would alter my findings on this issue.

8. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the building and the local area. It therefore conflicts with the shared aims of Core Strategy (CS) Core Policy 8, Local Plan for Slough (LP) policies EN1, EN2 and H15, the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), to secure high quality design for extensions, which should be compatible with the original structure and respect its surroundings.

Living conditions

9. The Council's concern here is the effect of the proposed rear extension on a rear first floor bedroom window at No 27. Although the 45-degree test set out in the SPD has not been passed, that window would still have a broadly open, sunny aspect to the east. It is high enough up that it would continue to have a satisfactory outlook and receive plenty of light from the sky. The proposed development would be to the north of No 27, so that it would not cause any significant overshadowing.

10. I conclude that the proposal would adequately preserve living conditions at No 25. It accords in this respect with the aims of CS Core Policy 8 and LP policies EN1, EN2 and H15, to avoid any significant adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Conclusion

11. I have considered all other matters raised and recognise the reasonable desire of the appellant to improve their home. Although I find in favour of the appellant on the second main issue, my findings in regard to the first main issue are sufficient for me to conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR