



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/24/3351920
143 Upton Road, Slough, SL1 2AE

- 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 Gurpreet Mann against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/13047/001.
 - The development proposed is the erection of double-storey extensions to both sides, rear and front and roof alterations to create habitable space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene, and upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at Nos 141 and 145 Upton Road, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a previously extended two-storey, detached dwelling within a residential neighbourhood. Upton Road displays an irregular but pleasing mix of property types, sizes and ages with no particular rhythm or uniformity to the street scene. The appeal proposal would include two-storey extensions to the existing dwelling on all sides, with expansion of the living accommodation within the roof space and dormer windows to the front and rear.
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.
5. The extensions would continue the eaves and ridge height of the existing dwelling but in every other way would remodel its size, scale, and appearance, resulting in a building that would be unrecognisable to the original. In this regard there would be

conflict with some of the SPD's design principles. For example, it could not be argued that the extensions or detailing of the resultant dwelling would be in keeping with the original design of the house, or that they would be subordinate to it. Nevertheless, appearing effectively as a replacement dwelling, I am unable to detect any general harm from the approach that has been taken.

6. As a two-storey dwelling with accommodation in the roof space, the extended building would appear balanced and proportionate, as would the dormer windows which would all sit well-framed and spaced within the respective roof slopes. Its width would not be excessive and would simply reflect the size of the plot. The dwelling's style and detailing would be a departure from the existing but would mirror and add to the mixed character of the street scene. Although the Council has hinted at some historic charm to the existing dwelling, I saw no features of any particular merit to suggest that the building was over-sensitive to change. In terms of appearance, I find nothing about the proposal that would be indicative of poor design.
7. Section 3.0 of the SPD deals with front extensions. Paragraph 3.6 states that two-storey front extensions will not be permitted. In this instance I have found that the altered appearance of the original house would not be harmful for reasons expanded upon above. However, the SPD also identifies how two-storey front extensions can be out of keeping with the rest of the street.
8. There is currently space to the side of the appeal property between its flank elevation and the boundary with 145 Upton Road. The proposed two-storey addition to this side would extend forward of the dwelling's existing front building line with a gabled projection. Although there is no common forward building line to dwellings along Upton Road, particularly on this side of the street, they are all recessed behind garden frontages such that none appear especially prominent within the street scene. The appeal proposal would undeniably change the existing dwelling from one with a modest presence to a property of much grander scale and form, and with a far greater visual impact. This change would be significantly exaggerated by the forward projection of a full height and prominent gable feature. This element would not only reduce the distance of the building's set back from the road but would itself stand proud as an incongruous intrusion in the vista along Upton Road.
9. Given the mixed character of the street scene, and the very close relationship between some notably different styled properties, I do not share the Council's view that the remodelled form of No 143 would visually jar with the closely set house at No 141. However, due to the forward imposing scale and bulk of the extension to the opposite side, the resulting dwelling would appear over dominant within the street scene. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. By failing to display the quality of design needed to appropriately reflect the street scene and local distinctiveness of the area, the proposal 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 (LP), adopted in March 2004, and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework for achieving well-designed places. The reason for refusal No 1 quotes LP Policy H12. This deals with residential areas of exceptional character. Upton Road is not identified as one such area and therefore Policy H12 is not relevant.

Living Conditions

10. No 141 Upton Road is a detached property to the north-east side of the appeal site with a single-storey, attached garage adjacent to the common side boundary between both. The enlarged two-storey side elevation of the appeal property would be set approximately 1m away from the side boundary with No 141 and would almost match the position and depth of the two-storey form of this neighbouring property. Although there are some first-floor flank windows to No 141, the separation distance between both side facing elevations would not be unusual or out of keeping with the local development pattern. The enlarged appeal building would obviously be seen in any outlook from these side windows, but it would merely appear as a neighbouring dwelling, neither unusual in terms of position nor scale. There is no evidence to suggest that there would be any impact upon levels of daylight or sunlight to any habitable rooms that would be significant.
11. Although the proposal includes a single-storey element that would project beyond the rear elevation of No 141, this would be set away from the boundary. Neither its height nor depth would be excessive. There would be no visual impact from this upon the outlook from the rear of No 141 or upon any adjoining outside amenity space that would be significant.
12. The extensions to the side adjacent to 145 Upton Road would be around 2.6m away from the shared common boundary between both properties. The rear elevations of both would approximately align with each other. There would be no visual impact from the extensions upon the outlook from the rear of No 145 or upon any adjoining outside amenity space that would be significant.
13. I saw two first-floor flank windows to No 145 that were both obscurely glazed. There is no evidence to suggest that there would be any impact upon levels of daylight or sunlight to any habitable rooms to this property that would be significant.
14. I note that there are slight differences in levels between the appeal property and both neighbouring dwellings, but nothing of significance. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of any adjoining occupiers. As such, I find no conflict with the Council's SPD or with CS Core Policy 8 and LP Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 as far as between them all they seek to ensure that new development safeguards the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Conclusions

15. Notwithstanding my findings with regard to the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, for the reasons given above I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR