

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by P Jarvis Bsc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 05 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/16/3159987
332 Wexham Road, Slough, SL2 5QL

- 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 Niaz Ahmed against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/13112/005 dated 29 June 2016 was refused by notice dated 14 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located along a main road and comprises an end terraced dwelling of a short terrace of four dwellings. The wider area is mainly residential, comprising of a number of similar short terraces, which front a secondary road, set back from the main road behind a wide grass verge with some trees. Some of the terraces have two storey front projections at either end with hipped or pitched roofs over.
 4. The proposed single storey addition would extend across the whole width of the front of the dwelling, which has itself been extended, to a depth of 1.5 metres, with sloping mono-pitch roof and finished in materials to match the host dwelling. None of the other dwellings within the immediate terrace have been extended to the front, the only additions being what would appear to be original flat canopies over the front doors. However, there are some similar but smaller extensions along this part of Wexham Road, though only one that I saw on my site visit that spans the whole width of the property.
 5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions Guidelines (2010) (SPD), which supports the policies of the development plan, seeks to limit front extensions and, in particular, extensions that span the entire width of the property will not normally be permitted unless such extensions form the predominant character of the street scene. The SPD notes that such extensions are considered overly dominant and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the original house.
-

6. In my opinion the proposed extension, by reason of its width spanning the whole of the front elevation, would introduce an overly large and dominating feature that would detract from the simple appearance and modest proportions of the host property, and wider terrace. Whilst front extensions have been added to other properties within the locality, as referred to above, they are predominantly of smaller size and proportions and as such appear as subservient elements in the streetscene. The appellant has also referred to other larger, full width additions, but they are not an established or predominant part of the wider streetscene within which the appeal site is located.
7. I therefore consider that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene. It would thus fail to comply with Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 (2008), which requires all development to be of high quality design that improves the quality of the environment and respects its location and surroundings, and Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Local Plan for Slough (2004) which seek to ensure that residential extensions are compatible with the original dwelling and have no significant adverse effect on the streetscene. It would also fail to comply with the guidance in the SPD.
8. Furthermore, it would not satisfy the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek good design which responds to local character and adds to the overall quality of the area.
9. The appellant has indicated that his wife suffers from a debilitating illness and thus having additional room downstairs would be a great benefit, including a bedroom and bathroom. However, whilst I agree that in these circumstances such provision would be of great benefit, it is unclear why the proposed extension is necessary to achieve these additional rooms. Overall, I do not find that this outweighs the harm identified above.

Conclusions

10. I conclude that for the above reasons the proposal would not be acceptable and the appeal should fail.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR