

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

**by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 8 February 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/16/3162280**

**100 Mercian Way, Cippenham, Slough, Berkshire SL1 5LX**

- 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 Mrs Jennifer Phillip against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
  - The application Ref P/16390/001, dated 21 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2016.
  - The development proposed is for a front porch and canopy, single storey side and rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch and canopy, single storey side and rear extension at 100 Mercian Way, Cippenham, Slough, Berkshire SL1 5LX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. P/16390/001, dated 21 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
  1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 Site Plan and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations at scale 1:100.
  2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

## Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposed works within the planning application form refer to " 'retention of' the existing front porch and canopy...". Retention does not fall within the definition of development set out within Section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. However, the porch and canopy elements of the proposal were substantially complete at the time of my visit and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the porch and canopy upon the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

4. The site is situated within a residential street predominantly comprising two storey semi-detached houses, many of which have been altered over time,

including through front extensions. These include the erection of a wide variety of porches, including canopies which can be seen on nos 60, 66, 80a, 98 (adjoining), 132 and 138 Mercian Way, in addition to the appeal site. I therefore consider that such front extensions are quite a common feature within the area and, therefore essentially form part of its overall character.

5. Notwithstanding the fact that the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (SPD) seeks to limit the erection of front extensions, particularly front canopies or extensions which span the entire width of a property, it does however highlight that these will not normally be permitted, unless such extensions form the predominant character of the street. The Council have provided little information on the planning history of other similar such features within the street, although the presence of the porch and canopy over 98 Mercian Way is material to the proposal before me. The porches to both nos 98 and 100 are not identical in their design, but nonetheless, in terms of their scale and form they are relatively similar.
6. Notwithstanding that porch/canopy features may not predominate in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, as I have highlighted above, there are a number of similar examples further along the street. I also consider that the proposal rebalances the pair of semi-detached houses and that by virtue of its design, size and width; the proposal would not detract from the character of the original dwelling. It would at the very least, have a neutral impact upon the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the wider area.
7. The proposal complies with Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004 and Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 – 2026 – Development Plan Document, December 2008, which require developments in general to respect their location and surroundings in terms of scale, building form and design and architectural style, and be in keeping with both the existing property and the identifiable character of the surrounding area. I have found no direct conflict between the proposal and the SPD and I find that the proposal complies with one of the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework which is always to seek high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

### **Conclusion and Conditions**

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
9. It is not necessary to impose a time limit condition as the development has begun. The Council has suggested a condition requiring external materials to be used in the construction of the extensions to match those of the existing building. In the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area this is an appropriate condition. In addition, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans is also imposed.

*C J Tivey* INSPECTOR