



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2024

**by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 25 October 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J03050/D/24/3346883**

**8 Sheffield Road, Slough SL1 3EE**

- 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 M Morshed against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is P/11124/003.
  - The development proposed is double side, first floor rear extension and hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for double side, first floor rear extension and hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer at 8 Sheffield Road, Slough SL1 3EE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: P/11124/003, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 08/She/01; 08/She/02; 08/She/03; 08/She/04; Block Plan; Site Plan.
  - 4) The extensions hereby permitted shall be used only in conjunction with the existing house and shall not be sub-divided or used in multiple occupation.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has granted a lawful development certificate for a proposed loft conversion with hip to gable and rear dormer in May 2023, under its Ref: P/1124/001.
3. The Council's decision letter refers to Plan 08/She/05 but I understand that this was added in error; I have been provided with no such plan.

## **Main Issues**

4. The main issues in this appeal are:

- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area, and
- The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents with particular regard to overlooking, outlook, daylight and sunlight.

## **Reasons**

### ***Character and Appearance***

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached property on the south side of Sheffield Road and within a predominantly residential area. Most of the semi-detached pairs have garages/outbuildings to the side presenting a linked effect at ground floor with an open gap above.
6. The proposal would replace the side garage/ outbuilding with a single storey extension the length of the house with a two storey element above which would be set back both from the front elevation and set in from the side boundary. There would be a hip to gable extension and rear dormer and the two storey side element would also have a gable side elevation under a pitched roof. The ground floor rear extension would be no deeper than the existing ground floor rear extension, and above, there would be a first floor extension under a pitched roof, inset from both sides and not as deep as the ground floor extension.
7. The design of the two storey element and its inset from the side boundary would ensure that appropriate spacing would be retained in the street scene and there would be no terracing effect. It would be of modest width compared with the width of the existing property, and would not appear as a dominant addition.
8. Although the roofscape in the local area is predominantly hipped roofs, a lawful development certificate exists for the proposed gable to hip extension. I do not consider that the addition of the gable end to the two storey side element would exacerbate the impact of this gable end in the street scene but would be in keeping with the proposed gable end to the main house.
9. The depth of the ground floor extension would be no greater than existing and would match the depth of the ground floor extension of the adjoining neighbour at No 6 Sheffield Road. The proposed first floor rear extension would be inset from both side boundaries and would not appear as an overly wide extension in relation to the overall width of the house as proposed to be enlarged.
10. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed extensions would respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. There would be no conflict with Core Policy 8 of Slough Core Strategy (2008), Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough (2004) (Local Plan) as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high standard of design which respects the local context.
11. I have noted that the proposals would not fully accord with parts of the Slough Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2010)

(SPD). However, for the reasons set out above and in the particular circumstances of this case, including the granting of a lawful certificate for a hip to gable roof extension with rear dormer, I am satisfied that there would be justification for an exception to be made to these parts of the SPD.

### ***Living Conditions***

12. There is no technical evidence before me in respect of the impact of the proposals on light to neighbouring windows. However, given the siting and spacing of the proposed extensions, and in particular the proposed first floor rear extension, in relation to the neighbouring properties and their windows, I am satisfied that the outlook from these neighbouring windows, including in respect of light and daylight would not be materially affected.
13. There is some overlooking of rear gardens from rear facing windows in residential areas such as the appeal site, but I do not consider that the additional rear facing windows proposed would materially exacerbate this situation.
14. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed extensions would not materially impact the living conditions of the neighbours on either side of the appeal property, with particular regard to overlooking and loss of privacy as well as outlook and daylight and sunlight. There would be no conflict with Policies EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan and the SPD as well as paragraph 135 f) of the Framework, all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupants.

### **Other Considerations**

15. The appellant has drawn my attention to other examples of extensions which have been permitted in the Borough, but my decision is based on the planning merits of the scheme before me.

### **Conditions**

16. In terms of conditions, the materials should match the existing to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area, and the approved plans should be listed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning. The Council has also requested a condition to be imposed to ensure that the accommodation is used in conjunction with the existing house and shall not be sub-divided or used in multiple occupation to accord with the provisions of the development plan.

### **Conclusion**

17. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

*L J Evans*

INSPECTOR