



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 May 2025

by **R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCI Arb MCIL**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2025

Appeal Reference: APP/J0350/D/25/3363249

48 Avebury, Slough SL1 5SY

- 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. N. Gill against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application reference is P/08016/003.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The first main issue to be determined in this appeal is whether the scheme would provide satisfactory living conditions for occupiers of the existing house at 48 Avebury. More broadly, it is also necessary to consider the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. Avebury is a residential road located to the south of the main A4 road through Slough. It forms part of a closely built-up but relatively modern residential area that is suburban in character, even though it is densely developed, with irregularly laid out terraces of two-storey houses.
4. The road is oriented approximately south to north but number 48 is sited at the end of a short terrace of houses that is oriented west to east and reached by a pedestrian pathway. Car parking spaces are located along the road, either as on-street parking or as grouped parking areas. The houses are conventional in style, constructed of brickwork with pitched roofs, although some have been altered.
5. Number 48 Avebury has been altered by the addition of a rear “box dormer” to the original two-storey house, creating a bedroom at second floor level. There are two bedrooms and a bathroom on the first floor, with a large living and kitchen area on the ground floor, as well as a small bedroom or study, with an en-suite facility (shown as a “living” room on the submitted plans).
6. The house has a good-sized front garden (larger than those of its neighbours), which is fenced and enjoyed as a sitting area rather than being merely decorative.

The paved rear garden is smaller than others in the vicinity, however, and is irregular in shape, due to the geometry of the layout.

7. It is now proposed to extend the living space on the ground floor, projecting the building into the rear garden.
8. The 'National Planning Policy Framework' emphasises the aim of "achieving well designed places" in the broadest sense (notably at Section 12), while making effective use of land and encouraging economic activity. It is aimed at achieving good design standards generally, by adding to the overall quality of the area and being visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, although it is also recognised that appropriate change may include increased densities. The achievement of good design includes protecting existing residential amenities and providing good standards of accommodation in new development.
9. Policies in the Development Plan also share these basic principles.
10. Core Policy 8 of the 'Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document' (which was adopted in December 2008) deals with "Sustainability and the Environment" and seeks to promote "high quality design (among other things). Saved Policies from 'The Local Plan for Slough' (which was adopted in March 2004) provide more detail. Policy EN1 is concerned with the "Standard of Design" and points out the need for new development to "reflect a high standard of design". Policies EN2 and H15 are specifically relevant to proposals for extensions to buildings, while Policy H14 specifically identifies the need for adequate amenity space.
11. The 'Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document' (which was adopted in Adopted January 2010) is also relevant, although it does not have the force of the statutory Development Plan. Section 11.0 emphasises the need for garden spaces, taking account of their usability and quality.
12. The proposed rear extension would add to the habitable accommodation at number 48 Avebury but it would leave the house with a significantly smaller private garden area. Even in the suburban context, where absolute privacy obviously cannot be guaranteed, a more private garden area is necessary, to meet good standards of design in accordance with design policies. Although the rear garden would have the benefit of a south facing orientation, it would be very constrained and awkwardly shaped and would be inadequate, in my view, to serve a family dwelling of the size of the existing house.
13. I am convinced, therefore, that the garden space as proposed would not provide satisfactory living conditions for occupiers of the existing house.
14. Moreover, I have concluded that the finished design would be out of keeping with its suburban location, amounting to an overdevelopment of the site that would create a cramped residential property and erode the environmental qualities of the appeal site and its surroundings.
15. Evidently, the appeal site lies within an established urban area, which is "sustainable" in planning terms, and the proposed development would make a useful addition to the existing house. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the harm which I have identified, to the living conditions of occupiers and to the character of

the surroundings more generally, outweighs the benefits of the project. Hence, I have concluded that the scheme before me would conflict with both national and local planning policies (including the Development Plan) and that it ought not to be allowed.

16. Although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations, I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decision.

Roger C. Shrimplin

INSPECTOR