



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2025

by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/25/3360122

32 Knolton Way, Slough, SL2 5TB

- 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 B Singh against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application reference is P/18096/002.
 - The development proposed is proposed demolition of roof and the removal of WC and kitchen of out building in rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the appeal site and its immediate surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey, mid terrace, dwelling which is located in a residential area which comprises of relatively uniform two storey terraced dwellings that benefit from varying sized rear extensions, however, the street scene remains largely unaltered, and the area is characterised by generally long, unaltered, rear gardens with no substantial development. Properties within the vicinity of the appeal site appear to have good sized rear gardens and this is a key factor in contributing to a spacious and well-ordered character and appearance for the locality. The outbuilding which is the subject of this appeal is noted to have been the subject of an enforcement notice which was upheld (with a correction) as a result of appeal reference APP/J0350/C/21/3289352 – June 2023.
4. The proposal, as is before me, seeks to demolish and replace the roof to this existing outbuilding as well as remove the WC and kitchen shown/labelled on the existing plans. I note, from the Council's delegated report, that the proposed height (to lower the existing flat roof to have a uniform height of in the region of 2.5 metres across the entire building) would be acceptable and comply with the requirements of the Residential Extensions Guideline Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD). The amendment to height is, therefore, acceptable and I have no reason to conclude differently on this element as a result of the evidence before me and what I saw at the time of my site visit. Removal of the WC and kitchen is also considered acceptable by the Council, and I have no reason to conclude differently with the proposal being shown, on the proposed ground floor plan, as a store.
5. Despite this the bulk, massing and footprint of the building appears to have remained the same as that which has previously been refused by the Council and

at appeal as a result of the upheld enforcement notice. The footprint of the existing dwelling is in the region of 51.48 sq./m with the footprint of the outbuilding being in the region of 70.14 square metres. The SPD advises that the acceptable scale/size of outbuildings (including footprint and height) will be determined having regard to a list of matters set out with paragraph 9.4 advising that outbuildings should not exceed the footprint of the original dwelling and should always be subordinate to the main dwelling. Whilst the proposal is consistent with not exceeding the advised maximum height of 3 metres, in the case of an outbuilding with a flat roof, the proposal is contrary to the guidance as a result of notably exceeding the footprint of the existing dwelling.

6. The building occupies a notable portion of the rear garden which results in a reduction in the garden size compared to other properties in the vicinity which is part of the character of the area. Whilst I note the appellant contends that sufficient amenity space is retained for the host dwelling this is a separate matter to the character of the area which is the intrinsic qualities of an area – in this case good sized rear gardens which contribute to the spacious character of the locality. The building appears cramped within the appeal site (exacerbated by the shape fitting the site boundary) and is inconsistent with the prevailing pattern of development within the vicinity of the appeal site. Furthermore, as a result of my site visit, I found that the building is visible in views from within the street scene/pathways around The Normans where clear views are available between 12 and 14 The Normans, respectively. I find that the building would be viewed as an alien feature within views from the surrounding properties as well as from within the public domain as outlined.
7. The application form outlines that the proposed development does not require any materials to be used externally and furthermore, no materials are noted on the proposed elevational drawings. At the time of my site visit the building appeared to be unfinished, breeze block, to the elevations and based upon the evidence before me I have no indication as to the appellant's intention as to external materials in order to ensure that the proposals would adequately reflect the localised material pallet (brick/pebble dash finish). Despite this, had I found the proposal acceptable in all other regards, external materials could have potentially been secured via an appropriately worded, and time limited, condition (taking into account that the proposal is part retrospective at the point of determination).
8. Overall, whilst I acknowledge the altered roof height to be acceptable in principle, and the removal of the WC and kitchen is welcomed, the outbuilding, by virtue of its siting, scale and footprint would still fail to appear subservient and proportionate to the host dwelling. The outbuilding would be larger, in terms of footprint, of the dwelling and would therefore result in an overly dominant structure within the rear garden which would negatively contrast with the prevailing character of the area as well as being visible from surrounding viewpoints in the public domain.
9. I acknowledge that the appellant feels that the refusal, by the Council, was based on an overemphasis of the footprint, however, whilst the SPD is guidance, it is clear in its objectives to ensure that outbuildings are proportionate to a host dwelling. The proposal is inconsistent with this taking into account the local context, garden size and the impact of the amended design. I have considered the potential for securing external materials via condition, however, the use of conditions for further landscaping or other design aspects would not overcome the concern which I have

identified with regard to the scale and footprint of the proposal in the context of the host dwelling. I acknowledge that the site is not within a Conservation Area nor is the property listed; however, a lack of such designation is of limited assistance in the context of the issues that I have identified and does not diminish the requirement for high quality, character appropriate, design.

10. The proposal would be inconsistent with the Local Plan for Slough 2004 Policy EN1 which requires that development proposals reflect a high standard of design and must be compatible with their surroundings in terms of scale, massing and bulk and, in this case, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would also be inconsistent with the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 Core Policy 8 as a result of not being high quality design which improves the environment.
11. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance set out within the SPD in so far as it is clear (EX38) that outbuildings should not detract from the character of the area and (EX39) that outbuildings should not exceed the footprint of the original dwelling. Finally, the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 135, of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, which requires developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area as well as being sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, and into taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR