

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/23/3317630

30 Castlevue Road, Slough SL3 7NQ

- 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 and Mrs A Mughal against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/15162/002, dated 21 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable and rear dormer loft conversion, installation of French Doors with a Juliet Balcony, a new gable end window and front roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the local area.

Reasons

3. Castlevue is a residential street lined mainly by hipped roof semi-detached houses of similar design. No 30 is a typical example. The proposal would add second floor level accommodation by extending the hipped roof to form a side gable and adding a flat roofed box dormer structure at the back.
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 will not normally be permitted – but the SPD also confirms that each planning application will be considered on its own individual merits. In this case, such a large number of hip to gable extensions have taken place locally that this aspect of the proposal would be fully in line with existing local character. It would appear as a normal and unremarkable aspect of the evolving street scene.
5. EX34 of the SPD says that dormer windows should be in proportion to the size of the roof, occupying no more than 50% of the roof space and with set backs from the sides, ridge and eaves. The proposed dormer in this case would occupy almost the full extent of the rear roof slope, with only slight set backs at the top and bottom and no significant set backs at the sides, in conflict with

the SPD's guidance. It would appear as a full, flat roofed second storey extension at the back, rather than as a dormer structure inset into the roof slope.

6. I saw a number of other rear box dormers on Castlevue Road during my site visit and have looked at the examples provided by the appellant. None of these appear to be as extensive as is proposed here. Many of those other dormer extensions are screened from view from the street, so that they are only glimpsed.
7. In contrast, the proposed rear dormer at No 30 would be prominent in views from Castlevue Road due to the house's location on the outside of a bend and forward of the next house, No 28. In this situation, it would be an intrusive, uncharacteristic and bulky structure, detracting from the street scene.
8. I conclude that, although I see no objection to the proposed hip to gable extension on its own, the addition of the rear dormer structure as proposed would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the building and the local area. The overall proposal therefore conflicts with the shared aims of Core Strategy Core Policy 8, Local Plan for Slough policies EN1, EN2 and H15 and the SPD, to secure high quality design for extensions, which should be compatible with the original structure and respect its surroundings.
9. I have considered all other matters raised and recognise the reasonable desire of the appellants to improve their home. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR