
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2017

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/16/3161548
27 Garrard Road, Slough, SL2 2QW.

- 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 P Josan against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. P/15954/005, dated 8 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension with garage on the ground floor and two bedrooms on the first floor.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on the 10 February 2017.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side extension with garage on the ground floor and two bedrooms on the first floor at 27 Garrard Road, Slough, SL2 2QW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. P/15954/005, dated 8 May 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans - drawing numbers GR/SC/03; GR/SC/04; and GR/SC/05 Rev B.

Preliminary matter

2. An application for costs was made against the Council by the appellant. This is subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and its setting in the wider street scene, and secondly the effect on highway safety and the convenience of highway users.
-

Reasons

Background

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey end-of-terraced property which is situated in a residential area of mainly similar properties. Garrard Road is the main through highway although this has a voluntary one way/no through road section close to the appeal site because of the proximity of a primary school. The property faces a small cul-de-sac and so its gable end is at right angles to Garrard Road. At my site visit I noticed that the property has a single storey extension to the rear and that there is a cream coloured detached garage in the space between the house and the road as well as an access in the flank boundary wall to the rear garden. It is proposed to erect a two storey side extension which would have a garage on the ground floor and two additional bedrooms above. I understand that previous applications for similar extensions have been refused and that this proposal seeks to overcome the reasons for refusal.

Policy context

5. The development plan includes the Council's Local Plan (2004) and the Core Strategy (2006). As these documents precede the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) I will consider the degree of accord of any saved policy with the NPPF as it arises in the main issue.

Effect on character and appearance

6. In assessing this effect I have taken into consideration the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Extensions (2010) (SPD). The Council is concerned that the side extension would breach established building lines and would be visually intrusive development in the street scene. However, it appeared to me at the site visit that there are many terraced properties which are sited end-on to Garrard Road and the distance that the flank walls are from the road varies considerably. A number of the terraced properties appear to have had recent extensions and the appellant's agent refers to examples of these in his statement, although the Council says that at least one of these extensions predates the SPD. Nevertheless, judged on its present merits, overall, I do not see the Garrard Road frontage as having a clear uniform building line and the proposed extension, which would be set back some 1.5m from the frontage in any event, would not have a harmful effect on the wider street scene.
7. In relation to the effect on the appearance of the existing property and the short terrace, the proposal would continue the overall form of the property albeit that it is proposed to break-up the plane of the roof with a modest 'set down' and the front wall would be slightly set in as well. I am satisfied that the design and form of the extension would continue the existing form and would not harm the appearance of the terrace. In terms of the local SPD guidance, I find that the proposal reasonably accords with the specific criteria set out in parts EX11, EX12 EX14 EX15, EX17; EX18 as well as the criteria for terraced house extensions and corner sites.
8. Overall, I find that the proposal would reflect the current street scene and distinctiveness of the area in accordance with Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy and is in keeping with both the existing property and the

distinctiveness of the surrounding area as required by saved policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Local Plan. These policies are generally consistent with the Framework which has a core principle of securing a high quality design and a good standard of amenity in new development and should be given significant weight.

Effect on highway safety and the convenience of users

9. The proposal makes provision for an integral garage on the ground floor which would replace the existing detached garage and I noted at the site visit that a space to the front of the property is used for additional parking.
10. The Council refers to parking standards, which indicate that three spaces should be provided, but considers that the site is physically constrained so that only two spaces could be formed off the highway as there is inadequate room for a third space in front of the garage for a vehicle positioned off the highway.
11. The appellant's agent refers to the informal parking arrangement at the rear of the site and to the availability of on-street parking in the vicinity of the site. As a result of a parking stress survey it is suggested though that there is adequate on-street spare parking capacity within easy walking distance of the site and also taking into account the voluntary movement restrictions.
12. In assessing the effect under saved policy T2, I note that the policy refers to parking 'on site' being restricted to a maximum level and that residential development will be required to 'provide a level of parking appropriate to its location'. The reference to minimum parking standards is not consistent with the much more recent guidance in the NPPF and in any event paragraph 8.62 of the reasoned justification to the policy accepts that it would be inappropriate to have a rigid implementation of minimum standards within new residential development. The paragraph also indicates that further relaxation in standards may also be allowed where dwellings are being extended to a size which would normally require an additional space.
13. In these circumstances and having regard to the evidence put to me, I do not consider that it is essential that the proposed extension is dependent on a third parking space within the site. I therefore find the provision of one space in the garage and an additional space in the curtilage would be appropriate for the enlarged dwelling in this location and the proposal would not be likely to give rise to a material parking deficiency which would harm highway safety or the convenience of other road users. I therefore find no material conflict with saved policy T2 or Core Policy 7.

Planning balance

14. Bringing together my conclusions on the main issues I have found that the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the existing terraced property, the terrace itself or the surrounding area and reasonably meets the local guidance on such extensions. Further, I have found that the parking needs arising from the extended house would not contribute to a local parking issue or be harmful to highway safety or the convenience of road users. The proposal accords with the relevant provisions of the development plan. There are no other considerations which outweigh this and I will allow the appeal.

15. The Council recommends that standard conditions are imposed on any permission. In addition to the statutory condition on the commencement of development, a condition is needed to ensure that the materials proposed match those on the present main dwelling in the interests of maintaining the appearance of the area. For a similar reason and in the interests of clarity, I will impose a condition to stipulate that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR