



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: 11 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/24/3357140

151 Parlaunt Road, Slough, SL3 8BG

- 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 Satpal Matharu against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/03933/005.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a part first-floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a part first-floor rear extension at 151 Parlaunt Road, Slough, SL3 8BG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/03933/005, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Drg Nos 24007-00-DR-T-0101 Rev P01, 24007-ZZ-DR-T-0301 Rev P01, 24007-XX-DR-T-0302 Rev P01, 24007-ZZ-DR-T-2001 Rev P01 and 24007-XX-DR-T-2101 Rev P01.
 - 3) 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application form described the proposed works as '*Construction of a part first floor side & rear extension*'. The proposal is for a first-floor rear extension to the original house only. This would sit over part of an existing full-width single-storey rear extension and would abut an existing first-floor side and rear extension that was constructed following a grant of planning permission in July 1988 (Ref P/03933/001). The banner heading above therefore uses the description of development which was given by the local planning authority on their decision notice and which was repeated by the appellant on the appeal form. This accurately describes the extent of proposed works.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, linked semi-detached property within an urban residential location comprising mainly terraced and semi-detached properties set uniformly to either side of a wide carriageway. Like the appeal property, many dwellings in the area have been altered beyond their original forms with a variety of front and side extensions, materials changes, and window alterations. The appeal property has a recessed first-floor side extension over its original attached garage. This projects beyond the dwelling's original rear elevation with a gabled roof and aligns with the depth of a flat roof, single-storey rear extension across the width of the original dwelling. The appeal proposal is to erect a flat roof, first-floor extension abutting the existing first-floor side/rear element and set away from the shared side boundary with the attached property at No 153.
5. 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.
6. The planning officer's report and the reason for the refusal on the decision notice both quote detailed guidance at EX12 and EX14 from the SPD. These come within section 5.0 where the SPD deals specifically with two-storey/first-floor side extensions. As a first-floor rear extension across part of the original dwelling, this part of the SPD is not applicable.
7. The SPD deals with two-storey/first-floor rear extensions at section 7.0. It's detailed design guidance at EX26, EX27, EX28 and EX29 states between them, amongst other things, that two-storey and first-floor rear extensions should be subordinate to the original dwelling, set back from neighbouring boundaries, have a maximum depth of generally no more than 3.3m, that they should respect the original form of the house, and that flat roofs will not be acceptable.
8. The proposed extension would be set back from the boundary with No 153. Its depth would not exceed 3.3m and it has been demonstrated that it would not breach a 45-degree line on the horizontal axis when projected from the closest edge of the neighbour's nearest first-floor window. Although it would adjoin the existing side/rear extension, creating a combined width between them that would exceed half the width of the original house, the additions overall would not entirely subsume or obscure the dwelling's original façade. Having regard also to the fact that the extension would be regular and uncomplicated in scale and form, I am satisfied in this instance that the proposal would be appropriately subordinate and proportionate to the original dwelling, compliant with EX26, EX27 and EX28.

9. The flat roof would not respect the roof form of the original dwelling. In this regard the proposal would directly conflict with the SPD's EX29. However, it would tuck up against the gabled form of the existing side/rear extension, aligning with its depth and eaves height, which in turn aligns with the eaves on the original dwelling. The rear of the appeal property is not open to view from the public domain. The extension would undoubtedly be seen from some adjoining gardens, but only against the backdrop of the dwelling's existing pitched roofs that would surround it on two sides. The flat roof would not be seen from any aspect as standing proud. Its visual impact would thereby be significantly limited.
10. Having regard to the specific circumstances at No 151, I am satisfied that the proposal would appear as a reasonably sympathetic addition that would be neither visually intrusive nor harmful to the character or appearance of the appeal property or wider area. As such, despite some conflict with the SPD, there would be no conflict with CS Core Policy 8, or with Policies EN1 (*Standard of Design*) or EN2 (*Extensions*) of The Local Plan for Slough, adopted in March 2004, as far as they seek to ensure that development is compatible with its surroundings. For the same reasons there would be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit and plans conditions, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, a condition is required to ensure that the external materials used match those on the existing building.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR