
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2017

by S J Lee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/3169681
63 Langley Broom, Slough SL3 8NB

- 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 Nishan Dhillon against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/12915/006, dated 4 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 63 Langley Broom, Slough SL3 8NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/12915/006, dated 4 November 2016, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Drawing No. AC/63/16 Revision 01.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling situated in a prominent corner location adjacent to a pedestrian cut-through that links Langley Broom to Kimberley Close. The combined width of carriageway, grass verge and pavement results in a sizeable gap between the flank of No 63 and the rear of dwellings fronting onto Kimberley Close. The street pattern and road layout also result in a large area of space in front of the house. The combination of these factors results in an open and spacious environment.
 4. The extension would be set back from the front building line and the ridge height would be lower than the main roof. It would also extend no further back than the existing gable. The character of the extension would complement the host dwelling and would use matching materials. While it would close off the
-

gap that currently exists above the ground floor side extension, the building as a whole would come no closer to its boundary than the existing ground floor extension.

5. Therefore, while the overall bulk of the building would increase, the design of the extension and the existing levels of space to the front and side of the building would ensure any impact on the open character of the street scene would not be significant. I am also satisfied that the distance between the building and its boundary coupled with the width of the path and openness of the space leading to it, would ensure no overt sense of enclosure when walking along the pedestrian footpath. For the same reasons, the development would not be an overly dominant or intrusive feature.
6. There is already some variation in the outward appearance of the two dwellings when viewed from Langley Broom by virtue of different styles of ground floor side extension, doors, windows, porches and boundary treatments. Nonetheless, the development would lead to a greater degree of asymmetry than currently exists.
7. However, the subordinate and complementary nature of the extension's design and detailing would minimise any negative effects of this. There is a wide variety of dwelling types and styles in the area, both on Langley Broom itself and in view of the site on nearby streets. This variety leads me to conclude that maintaining the balance between No 61 and No 63 is not critical to the area's existing character. Therefore, while the reduction in symmetry would be noticeable, it would not result in an unduly incongruous or harmful relationship between the two dwellings or with others nearby.
8. In conclusion, the development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider area. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with policies EN1 and EN2 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough (2004), Core Policy 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006-2026 (2008) or the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2010) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure development does not detract from the character of the host dwelling or area as a whole. There would also be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which attaches great importance to the design of the built environment.

Other Matter

9. A neighbour has raised concerns in relation to privacy. However, the submitted plans do not show any windows in the flank elevation facing this property and, in any event, there would be sufficient distance between the dwellings so as not to cause harm to their living conditions.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawing as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition ensuring that the materials used match those of the host dwelling in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

S J Lee INSPECTOR