



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2024

by P Terceiro BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/23/3330236
6 & 6A Gloucester Avenue, Slough SL1 3AZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nisar Ahmed against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/06688/010.
 - The development proposed is alterations to existing ground floor extensions and erection of part first floor rear extension at No 6 and roof alterations at No 6A.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It is clear from the evidence that the proposed development comprises alterations to both No 6 and No 6A Gloucester Avenue. On this basis, I have used the site address provided in the decision notice in the banner heading above.
3. During the late stages of this appeal the appellant brought to my attention that the Council recently approved a planning application for a part first floor rear extension and alterations to the ground floor extension at No 6 Gloucester Avenue. As this permission is of potential relevance to the appeal before me, and the parties are aware of it, I have accepted this late evidence and considered it as a part of my assessment.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the host dwelling and on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises No 6 and No 6A Gloucester Avenue, which form part of a row of two-storey terraced dwellings. The site lies on the corner of Gloucester Avenue and Warrington Avenue. It occupies a prominent position, with the side and rear elevations of the appeal dwellings visible within the street scene of Warrington Avenue. The rear elevation of remaining terrace is also visible in this street scene. The row of terraces has a hipped roof on either end with a central gable feature. Although many of the surrounding dwellings have been extended, there remains a strong prevalence of hipped roofs within the locale.
6. Even though the proposed first floor extension would not increase the existing footprint, it would be substantial in width, scale and would be marginally set

down below the main ridgeline of the roof. Consequently, the proposal would fail to appear as a subservient addition to the host dwellings. A crown roof would be introduced to restrict the height of the extension which would result in an uncharacteristic roof form that would appear in awkward visual contrast with the roof form of the host dwellings and erode their character.

7. Despite extending inwards, due to its siting and bulk, the proposal would be prominent in views within Warrington Avenue. By reason of the position of the sloped parts of the extension's roof and their connection to the main roof, the crown roof would be apparent within local views and the presence of the flat roof element would be perceived. Therefore, the extension would appear incongruous, markedly at odds with the prevailing hipped roof forms in the vicinity. As such, the proposal would fail to create a sense of place at this corner plot location and would not successfully integrate with the local townscape.
8. The appellant suggests that planting could be provided to assist in screening the extension from public views. However, given that the extension would be at first floor, planting would likely take a long time to grow to such a height that would effectively mitigate for the harm to the character of the area caused by the proposal.
9. The proposal would incorporate details to match the host dwelling, including materials, joinery details and eaves. In addition, it would be set in from the common boundary with 4 Gloucester Avenue. However, this would not overcome the harm that I have identified above.
10. I understand that this proposal follows previous planning applications for extensions to the property which were approved by the Council. I have limited details available regarding these other permissions, so I am unable to draw any meaningful comparison with the proposal before me. Nevertheless, while it may be that an approved scheme comprised a crown roof, as set out above, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character of the area in its own terms and, in any event, I am not bound by previous decisions of the Council.
11. I understand that a two-storey extension with a crown roof has recently been granted planning permission by the Council at 8 Gloucester Avenue. However, I have not been provided with the specific details of the circumstances and considerations that led to its approval. As such, I cannot make any useful comparison between the proposal and this scheme.
12. My attention is drawn to other crown roofs and gables within nearby properties. However, many of the examples provided are not prominent within the street scene. As such, the magnitude of these different roof types is not strongly influencing the local roofscape. In relation to the building that backs into Waverley Road, a flat roof is a feature of its design, contrary to the proposal which seeks to introduce a crown into a row of terraces where this roof form is not present. Views to the extensions at 5 and 7 Gloucester Road or 1 and 2 First Crescent from Waverley Road are limited, due to the depth of the rear gardens of these properties. As such, these other developments would offer very little justification for this proposal.
13. The appellant directs me to dormer windows in the area which have a flat roof. However, dormers are normally different to extensions in terms of siting, size and appearance, so they would not be comparable with the appeal proposal.

Additionally, other examples provided by the appellant would be of limited relevance, since they relate to other forms of development, including conversions and new dwellings.

14. The proposed extension would therefore fail to integrate satisfactorily with the existing host property. It would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and as such would not comply with Saved Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough 2004, and Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 (2008). These policies support high quality of design in new development, amongst others. Further, the proposal would be contrary to the Framework, where it supports development that is sympathetic to local character. In addition, the proposal would fail to accord with Policies DP1, DP3, EX26, EX28 and EX29 of the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010, which amongst others support extensions that are in keeping with the original design of the house and its surroundings.

Other Matters

15. Reference is made to a planning permission¹ for a part first floor rear extension and alterations to the ground floor extension recently granted by the Council at No 6 Gloucester Avenue. In comparison to the appeal scheme, the approved extension would be less wide, less high and would have a pitched roof. As such, I do not find that this approved scheme would justify the proposal before me.
16. I understand that the proposal would increase the size of existing bedrooms and that the crown roof design would provide storage space. However, I am not persuaded that the proposal before me is the only solution to achieve the appellant's aspirations. As such, these matters attract limited weight in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

17. Overall, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

P Terceiro

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA Ref P/06688/012.