

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by David Cliff BA Hons MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/16/3164938

23 Harrison Way, Slough, Berkshire SL1 5LG

- 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 D Glewis against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/16678/000, dated 22 July 2016 was refused by notice dated 4 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side and rear extensions at 23 Harrison Way, Slough, Berkshire SL1 5LG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/16678/000, dated 22 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 18116-01, 18116-02, 18116-03, 18116-04 and 18116-05.
 - iii) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellinghouses with good sized rear gardens. The surrounding area is characterised by predominantly semi-detached properties, several of which have been extended to the rear and/or have single storey outbuildings.
 4. The part of the extension which extends across the entire width of the rear elevation of the existing dwellinghouse only projects outwards to a limited degree. However, a larger projecting element of the extension would adjoin the western side boundary of the site and would extend substantially into the rear garden. This part of the extension would be of a significantly greater
-

depth than recommended in the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (REGSPD).

5. Nevertheless, I consider there to be site specific factors in this case that are pertinent to the acceptability of the proposal. Firstly, the extension would be sited adjacent to an existing large single storey outbuilding located adjacent to the western boundary of the site. Secondly, whilst it would have a large footprint, its overall massing is limited by its modest eaves and ridge height. Thirdly, the appeal property has a large rear garden which would help to assimilate the extension in to its surroundings without it appearing as unacceptably obtrusive or cramped within the plot. Fourthly, the rear projecting part of the extension would not be visible in the streetscene and, given its low height and bulk and position adjacent to an existing neighbouring outbuilding, it would not appear as being excessively prominent in views from neighbouring gardens.
6. The proposed side extension would infill the gap between the existing dwellinghouse and the adjacent western side boundary. Although the flank wall of this part of the extension would appear as particularly high when viewed from the road and adjacent properties, it would be viewed against the larger two storey flank wall of the existing dwelling and would not be higher than the existing flank wall of the existing adjacent outbuilding. It therefore would not result in any significant visual harm.
7. For the above reasons, whilst it would be of a substantial overall size, I do not consider that the proposed development would appear as being unacceptably out of proportion in relation to the original dwelling.
8. Whilst the proposed extension contains a kitchenette, living room, shower room and bedroom, it would be linked internally and accessed from within the existing dwelling. The appellant states that it is intended to create ground floor accommodation for one appellant's wife due to difficulties accessing the first floor of the house. On this basis, it does not appear to be the intention to create an independent residential unit. Even should circumstances change in the future, the creation of a separate residential unit would be likely to be subject to relevant planning control.
9. Therefore, although larger than recommended by the REGSPD, the proposed development would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with the relevant design aims of policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough 2004, the National Planning Policy Framework and the overarching design aims of the REGSPD.
10. Therefore, having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
11. An approved plans condition is necessary to provide certainty to what has been approved. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

David Cliff

INSPECTOR