



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2023

by Michael J Muston BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/23/3319710

54 Greystoke Road, Slough SL2 1TT

- 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 Jugjot Dosanjh against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/20081/000, dated 13 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2023.
 - The development proposed was originally described as a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The development was described on the application form as set out in the heading above. This was amended by the Council, to "*construction of a two storey rear extension*". This describes the works more accurately than the original description, and was also the description used by the appellant on his appeal form. I have therefore used this amended description as the basis for my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:-
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 44, 46, 50 and 52 Greystoke Road, with particular regard to whether the development would be unacceptably overbearing or overshadowing, or result in an unacceptable loss of light; and
 - the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. No 54 Greystoke Road is a two storey end-terraced house. It adjoins a pair of maisonettes (Nos 44 and 50), whose rear windows face in the same direction as those in No 54. Two other maisonettes (Nos 46 and 52) are set at right angles to the rear elevation of the appeal property, and face towards No 54's rear garden at a distance of only a few metres. All of these maisonettes have windows that appear to light habitable rooms in their rear elevations.

5. The proposal would involve erecting a two storey rear extension that would extend 4.3 metres beyond the existing rear elevation, and would be 8.45 metres wide, extending right up to the existing side boundary fence. The result would be a new extension of considerable size set only a few metres away from the rear elevations of Nos 46 and 52. When seen from the rear windows of those dwellings, the proposed extension would appear unacceptably overbearing.
6. The Council points out that the application was not accompanied by plans showing whether the 45 degree code set out in the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Document (SPD) have been complied with. Such a plan would assist in assessing whether the impact on the occupiers of Nos 44 and 50 Greystoke Road would be acceptable. However, it is clear that this guidance would be infringed in relation to the impact on the occupiers of Nos 46 and 52, as their rear windows face directly towards the proposed extension from only a few metres away.
7. The proposal also includes a bedroom window on the side elevation facing towards Nos 46 and 52. The Council's planning application report states that *"the two storey extension would overlook onto the rear of Nos 44, 46, 50 and 53 Greystoke Road"*. The reasons for refusal do not then go on to mention overlooking. However, I consider that the bedroom window on the side elevation facing towards the neighbouring maisonettes would unacceptably overlook their private space.
8. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 44, 46, 50 and 52 Greystoke Road, contrary to Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy 2006-2026, and saved Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough (2004). These policies seek, amongst other things, development that does not result in a significant adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers, and that does not result in significant overshadowing.

Character and appearance

9. The appeal property is located in a residential area comprising two storey terraced buildings of varied appearance. No 54 currently has a gable end that faces the road and a side elevation that can be seen from the turning head at the end of the road. The appeal proposal would result in the elevation facing the turning head being 4.3 metres greater in depth than it is currently. However, in its context, this would not appear out of keeping with the rest of the development in the estate, nor appear unacceptably dominating or incongruous.
10. I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character or appearance of the area, and would comply with Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy 2006-2026, and saved Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough (2004) in this respect. These policies seek, amongst other things, development that respects its surroundings, that does not result in a significant adverse impact on the street scene, and that are compatible with the existing structure.

Conclusions

11. I have concluded that the proposal would not have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character or appearance of the area. However, I have also concluded that it would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 44, 46, 50 and 52 Greystoke Road. This outweighs the lack of other harm. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Michael J Muston

INSPECTOR