



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/24/3346315

6 Gloucester Avenue, Slough SL1 3AZ

- 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 Nisar Ahmed against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/06688/011.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of a first-floor rear extension and alterations to the existing ground-floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A proposal for "alterations to existing ground floor extensions and erection of part first floor rear extension at No.6 and roof alterations at No 6A" was dismissed on appeal in June 2024 (APP/J0350/W/23/3330236).

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and whether appropriate provision is made for parking.

Reasons

4. No.6 Gloucester Road is a mid-terrace property. The original terrace comprised Nos.2, 4, and 6 with the central property having a projecting gabled form to the front and rear. An additional property, No.6a, has been added to the side of No.6, and the façades of both properties have the same white render finish. To the rear, both properties have single-storey extensions, and a part first-floor extension with a hipped gabled roof has been added to No.6a.
5. The proposed first-floor extension would follow the form and extend off that erected to No.6a, but it would have a double-pitched roof. This would create an unusual triple-pitched arrangement, and due to its location, the rear of the whole terrace is visible from Warrington Avenue. While the design coordinates with the existing extension to No.6a, it would create an extensive projection across a large proportion of the property and does not reflect the original form or appearance.
6. The proposed extension would be set down further than the previously dismissed scheme, and the crown roof elements have been eliminated. I also acknowledge that the hipped roof design reflects the preferred form promoted in the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning

Document (SPD) to reduce bulk. Nevertheless, and whilst the SPD provides helpful guidance, the adherence to individual approaches or dimensions does not mean that such alterations are suitable for every property, and each proposal is to be considered on its own merits.

7. Many of the properties in the area have been extended, and the appellant has drawn my attention to a number of properties along Warrington Avenue with double-hipped extensions. While these can be seen on the aerial image, located to the rear, they are not conspicuous in the street scene, and overall, the general appearance of the area is maintained. I accept that there are alterations to other corner plots, although the rear projections are not of the same double-pitched design, and they relate to semi-detached properties.
8. As described by the appellant, the character of the area is unremarkable and has the capacity to accommodate change. In contrast to these other extensions to the semi-detached properties, the terraced row is somewhat different, occupying a prominent corner and comprising part of the street scene to Warrington Avenue. The whole corner plot (No.6 and No.6a) has already accommodated a number of changes, including extensive single-storey built-form in addition to the extra dwelling and its first-floor extension.
9. In my view, the proposed extension would appear disproportionate to the original property. Together with the existing extension to No.6a, the design and form of the extension would create an incongruous and dominant feature, which would be harmful to the appearance of the terrace, be visually intrusive and out of keeping with the character of the area.
10. The proposal would, therefore, be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposed development would conflict with saved Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough 2004 (Local Plan) and Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 (2008), promoting high-quality design, and which is echoed in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). It would also be contrary to Policies DP3, EX28 and EX29 of the SPD, which support extensions that are in keeping with and proportionate to the original property and sympathetic to the local character.

Parking

11. The proposal would increase the size of the first floor and alter the ground floor layout; nevertheless, the number of bedrooms would remain the same. The Council's highway officer suggests one of the ground floor rooms could be used as a bedroom, and parking is sought based on a four-bedroom house. However, that is not what has been applied for. There is nothing to suggest this would be the case, nor have I been directed to any policy or guidance which advises that parking requirements are to be calculated on that basis.
12. The application plans refer to a widened drop kerb, although this does not form part of the description of the development and also relates to arrangements for No.6a. There appears to have been a number of alterations to the location and provision of parking for the two properties and red line boundaries through the various planning applications, and it is unclear from the information before me if the existing layout to the front of the property is in the form approved. The parties also agree that the hardstanding area to the front of No.6 (between the

porch and the boundary) would not accommodate two parallel spaces based on the required dimensions of 2.4m x 4.8m.

13. However, I am also aware that planning permission has subsequently been granted (June 2024) for an alternative scheme with a reduced width to the first-floor extension (Council reference P/06688/012). I have not been provided with the plans for that scheme, but there is a reference to parking to the rear, and this approval indicates that alternative parking arrangements are available.
14. Notwithstanding these aspects, as the number of bedrooms would not be altered, I do not find that additional parking provision is required. Therefore, the proposal would not conflict with policy T2 of the Local Plan, which advises that residential development will be required to provide a level of parking appropriate to its location. Accordingly, there would also be no conflict with paragraphs 114 and 116 of the Framework, which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development does not have a significant impact on highway safety and to minimise conflict between road users.

Other Matters

15. The appellant has raised concerns regarding the Council's approach to development at the appeal property. There is an extensive planning history relating to Nos.6 and 6a, and there is some disagreement between the parties as to the specific arrangements approved, the need for the removal of the existing outbuildings to the rear, and a number of errors on previous plans have been identified. It is incumbent on all parties to provide accurate information, and the full details of the previous applications are not before me. Moreover, this appeal relates specifically to a householder application for an extension to No.6. As such, it is not for me to review or advise on these separate matters, and I have considered the proposal on its own merits.
16. The extension would increase the bedroom sizes, which would support the appellant's family requirements; however, these personal benefits do not outweigh the identified conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

17. Whilst I have found that the proposal would not result in a four-bedroom property requiring additional parking, the rear extension would be an unsympathetic addition that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
18. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

