
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2016

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/16/3160922
84 Churchill Road, Slough SL3 7RB

- 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 Amrik Singh Soomal against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/16648/000, dated 29 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as construction of a front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. I have used the description of development as it appears on the decision notice as this reflects a more accurate description of the development proposal. Although the appeal documents refer to a retrospective application, it was evident from my site visit that only a porch had been constructed at the site.
3. The reason for refusal refers to an unauthorised full width front extension at No 86 Churchill Road. I did not see this structure during my site visit and in any event, the presence of existing or otherwise unauthorised development at a neighbouring property is not a matter for my deliberations.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a mid-terraced two storey dwelling located within an established residential area. The area has a mixed character with a block of flats neighbouring the appeal site. However, the terrace where the appeal site is located appears largely unaltered from the street scene.
 6. The appeal proposal would involve a front extension which would measure 1.12m in depth and extend to the full width of the property. My attention has been drawn to policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Slough Local Plan (LP) 2004. Policy EN1 requires a high standard of design and specifies that development proposals must be compatible with, amongst other things, the scale, height and massing of its surroundings. Policies EN2 and H15 reinforces this policy objective by referring specifically to extensions to existing buildings.
-

7. As a result of the size, scale and design of the proposed extension, it would in my view fail to be proportionate in scale, height and massing to both the host property and surrounding area. Its size, scale and depth would mean the proposal would appear overly dominant in the street scene and in particular this stretch of largely unaltered terraced properties. It would therefore fail to be in keeping with the identified character of the area.
8. In addition to the above development plan policies, the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2010 provides guidance in relation to front extensions at section 3.0. In particular, the guidance notes that front extensions shall be single storey and normally restricted to front porches only. The guidance goes on to note at paragraph 3.3 that front canopies or extensions which span the entire width of the property will not normally be permitted unless such extensions form the predominant character of the street. There would be a clear conflict with the SPD in this regard.
9. I accept that there are examples of existing full width front extensions evident along Churchhill Road and these have been referred to by the appellant within their grounds of appeal. I also acknowledge that there are further examples on surrounding streets. I have no information concerning when these extensions were permitted, or the development plan policies which were applicable at the time. Some of the examples such as Aldin Avenue relate to the terrace as a whole. In my view, the examples along Churchhill Road are isolated developments which do not form part of the predominant character of the street as envisaged by the SPD.
10. I therefore conclude the proposal would cause material harm to the maintain the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to accord with the development plan policies referred to above, as well as policy CP8 of the Core Strategy (CS) 2008 which requires, amongst other things, that all development is of a high quality design which respects its location and surroundings. The proposal would also fail to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular paragraph 17 which advises that high quality design should be sought from development proposals.

Conclusion

11. I therefore conclude that having considered all matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Christa Masters

INSPECTOR