



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/25/3359168

1 Millington Close, Slough, Berks SL1 5FY

- 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 Andrea Costanzo against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/16694/003.
 - The development proposed is described as the construction of a single storey utility room on the side and extend front porch up to the existing house boundary.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are a) whether the proposal would result in an increased risk of flooding; and b) its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Flood Risk

4. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was submitted as part of the planning application to which the Council has had regard. No additional information has been provided with the appeal. Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 (CS) seeks to ensure that there is minimal risk of flooding to the property, development will not impede the flow of floodwaters, increase the risk of flooding elsewhere or reduce the capacity of a floodplain. It explains that development must manage surface water arising from the site in a sustainable manner which will also reduce the risk of flooding and improve water quality.
5. The FRA sets out the mitigation measures of the development. It does not acknowledge how it would reduce the impact on the adjoining land nor an evacuation plan. Whilst the development is minor, it would still increase the built form and run off and resultantly would take up storage capacity in the ground without understanding how or where the excess water would be drained. I appreciate that the development is small in scale, however it is no less important to establish any potential impact it would have in flood risk terms with the aims of the development plan in mind.

6. In regard to the previous scheme which was allowed at appeal without a FRA or any further assessment on the impact of flooding, it appears it was not raised as a reason for refusal and this, along with the information that was submitted at the time, did not result in a disputed issue at appeal. With this and the above in mind, the proposal would conflict with the aims of Core Policy 8 of the CS and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which I have set out.

Character and Appearance

7. The Council appear to have an issue with the accuracy of the plans which has translated into a reason for refusal. However, for the purpose of establishing a sufficient indication of the visual impression of the scheme and to understand its impact on the character and appearance of the area, they go far enough.
8. The appeal site is located within a small enclave of dwellings to which the side elevation faces the entrance to the street. The aforementioned permission is extant due to being partially implemented. This scheme is similar to the extant one by virtue of the front extension, however it is to wrap around the side elevation and enlarge the front. The semi-detached pair are already unbalanced as a result of the previously approved loft conversion. The wider enclave is detached from this set of semi-detached dwellings and are different in their appearance. These features result in a varied yet pleasant street scene which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
9. The appeal proposal would clearly be subservient to the existing dwelling in both height and scale even in combination with previous extensions. Whilst the front extension would be larger than previously permitted, it would not be so significant in scale terms, even in combination with the side extension, to result in unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the area. It would result in an increase in an imbalance to the semi-detached dwelling however, due to the varied character it would sit congruously. Moreover, and whilst the proposal would be visible when entering the close, it would clearly be a subordinate addition which would not detract from or unacceptably shield the side elevation of the building.
10. The proposal would not therefore detrimentally change the building to result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would comply with Saved Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Slough Local Plan 2004, Core Policy 8 of the CS and DP1 and EX1 of the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document which, together, seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard amongst other things.

Other Matters

11. The submitted drawings also include measurements, but those provided for the side elevation and floor plan for the side extension do not match. The appellant advises that thickness of the walls has been added to the floor plan but not the elevations. This is not clear, and the elevations should also take this into account and resultantly not have a difference. This therefore casts doubt as to the exact dimensions to which the proposal would be built if it was approved. Notwithstanding that the appeal scheme is recommended for dismissal on other grounds, the plans would not be sufficiently exact to be enforceable and would thus not be able to be secured by condition.

12. The appellants are also seeking to add solar panels to the side extension to improve the energy efficiency of the property. However, no details have been provided and therefore only little weight can be given to their potential installation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposed development would not comply with the development plan, specifically in regard to the first main issue. I have found in the appellant's favour on the second, but this would be a lack of harm and thus neutral in any balance. I have been given no compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate from the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR