



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/24/3349669

72A Knolton Way, Slough, SL2 5TJ

- 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 Amrik Singh against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/12198/004.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor infill rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace, two-storey dwelling set within a wider residential neighbourhood comprising a significant amount of similar style and aged terraces. The site lies adjacent to a service road which loops around the back of an adjoining local shopping parade. No 72A originally projected slightly deeper than its attached neighbour at full height, with a hipped roof over. Both Nos 72 and 72A have been extended to the rear in similar fashions, each with 6m deep full-width single-storey extensions constructed as permitted developments, and approximately 3m deep first-floor rear extensions that span approximately half the width of each house following a grant of planning permission in February 2024 (Ref P/20396/000). The appeal proposal seeks to fill the void between the first-floor rear extension at No 72A and the similar extension at No 72 which abuts the common side boundary between both.
4. The Council's *Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) was adopted in 2010. Its stated purpose is to principally provide additional guidance on how to interpret and implement Core Policy 8 (*Sustainability and the Environment*) of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006 – 2026 (CS), adopted in 2008, when assessing extensions to residential properties. SPD paragraph 1.2.6 states that the ultimate aim of the guidance is to ensure that the residential areas within Slough remain good places to live and are not adversely affected by inappropriate extensions. Specifically, Design Principle 3 (DP3) advises that extensions should be subordinate to and in proportion to the original house. It goes on to state that they should not dominate the original

building and that this can be achieved by, amongst other things, reducing the width of extensions to typically no more than 50 percent the width of the original dwelling, especially in the case of two-storey extensions.

5. When combined with the recently constructed extensions to the rear, the proposal would form part of an accumulation of additions that would span the full width of the appeal property, including specifically at first-floor level. Given also that the extensions would subsume and obscure the entirety of the dwelling's original rear façade, I cannot agree with the appellant's assertion that the resultant rear projection would appear subordinate merely by means of its lower ridge height when compared to the original dwelling. I find the proposal would be neither subordinate nor in proportion to the original dwelling. As such it would represent a form of development the SPD specifically advises against. As a typical terraced house amongst many similar properties in the immediate locality, I can see no specific reason why the Council's guiding principles should be set aside in this instance.
6. Additionally, whilst the extension would follow the form of the existing first-floor additions at the appeal property and No 72, the combined effect would be a double-valley and triple-pitched roof arrangement spanning both properties. This would appear incongruous and unrelated to the original form and appearance of each dwelling and the wider terrace. Moreover, whilst situated to the rear, the extension would not be out of sight, likely to be visible in oblique views from the adjacent service road, which is publicly accessible, as well as from adjoining rear gardens.
7. Overall, I find that the extension would be seen as a dominant and unsympathetic addition that would be visually intrusive and harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace and wider area. By failing to follow the SPD's guiding principles, the proposal would not display the quality of design needed to appropriately reflect the local distinctiveness of the area. As such it would conflict with Part 2 of Core Policy 8. For the same reasons there would be conflict with Policies H15 (*Residential Extensions*), EN1 (*Standard of Design*) and EN2 (*Extensions*) of The Local Plan for Slough, adopted in March 2004, as well as the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework for achieving well-designed places.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a planning permission granted in 2021 for development described, in part, as '*Change of design and size of the rear 1st floor extension to 1-3 The Normans*' (Ref P/16162/004). I have been provided with a copy of the decision notice, officer's report and approved plans. I note the officer's assessment was that the proposal would have an acceptable impact upon the host properties and wider area having regard to the specific circumstances in that case. I have no reason to disagree with that assessment. However, that does not reflect my findings in relation to the proposal at 72A Knolton Way, and which in any event resembles nothing of the appearance of the approved works at 1 and 3 The Normans.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan INSPECTOR