
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2017

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/17/3171368
113 Marlborough Road, Slough, SL3 7JS

- 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 Kuldip Singh Chana against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/03349/003, dated 20 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of a part double storey rear and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on Marlborough Road and accommodates a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The wider area is largely residential and there is a mix of dwelling types. I observed that most dwellings in the area maintain reasonable gaps between them. Although, there are some examples where extensions have been granted in the past that have resulted in the eaves of some dwellings almost touching one another.
 4. The scheme seeks to construct a part double storey rear and two storey side extension. The Council has referred to the Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (the SPD). I see no reason not to afford the SPD significant weight. This advises that two storey side extensions should be no more than 50% of the width of the host dwelling.
 5. In this case, the proposal would result in a substantial two storey side extension that would be approximately 75% of the width of the host dwelling. I agree with the appellant that there does not appear to be any clear policy or guidance that states a rear two-storey extension should only be 50% of the width of the host dwelling. However, the rear part of the scheme would be approximately 112% of the width of the host dwelling. Whilst the proposed extension would be set down from the ridge height of the host dwelling, I consider that due to its considerable width and scale that it would dominate the
-

- host dwelling and would not appear subservient. This would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
6. The proposed side extension would be set within 1 metre of the boundary with No 115 Marlborough Road, which is set on the boundary. I agree with the Council that this would create a terracing effect and would not reflect the predominate pattern of development in the area, where most dwellings maintain a reasonable gap between each other. This would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
 7. I acknowledge the other examples provided by the appellant, namely the extensions at No 101 and No 109. Whilst No 109 has a large extension, it nonetheless maintains a generous gap with the neighbouring property, which would not be the case here. In terms of No 101, the first floor part of the extension is set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling, which gives the extension a subordinate appearance. These examples are therefore not, in my view, directly comparable to this appeal scheme.
 8. As set out above, I observed other examples in the area, which are similar to the appeal scheme. However, I do not consider that these represent the predominant character of the area, which is largely detached and semi-detached dwellings with reasonable gaps between them. I consider that the existing examples generally have awkward relationships with their neighbouring properties and have created a terracing effect, which has been detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. It is also very likely that such examples were permitted some time ago and before the current development plan policies and SPD were adopted. Given the above, I am not of the view that the presence of similar existing examples, which in themselves cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, provide justification for further harmful development.
 9. Given all of my above findings, I conclude that the scheme would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Core Policy 8 'Sustainability and the Environment' of the Slough Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) and Saved Policies H15 'Residential Extensions', EN1 'Standard of Design' and EN2 'Extensions' of the Slough Local Plan (2004). The scheme would also run contrary to the SPD.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR