
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/17/3170972

67 Parlaunt Road, Slough, SL3 8BE

- 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 Sukhbir Gosal against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/16705/002, dated 20 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage to the side, construction of a double storey side extension with front porch & loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing garage to the side, construction of a double storey side extension with front porch & loft conversion with rear dormer, at 67 Parlaunt Road, Slough, SL3 8BE, in accordance with the terms of application ref: P/16705/002, dated 20 December 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; and Drawing No 67 003 (Proposed Plans).
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on Parlaunt Road and accommodates a two storey semi-detached dwelling. I observed that the wider area is largely residential with a mix of dwelling types and architectural styles. The scheme seeks to construct a double storey side extension with front porch, following the demolition of the existing garage. The proposal also includes a loft conversion with a rear dormer. The Council has not raised any concerns with regard to the proposed double storey side extension with front porch and I see no reason to
-

take a different view. The Council's reason for refusal relates solely to the proposed rear dormer window.

4. I agree with the Council that the proposed dormer would be a very bulky addition that would dominate both the rear roofscape and elevation of the host dwelling, which would cause harm to its character and appearance. This would run contrary to Core Policy 8 of the Slough Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) and Policies EN1 and EN2 of the Slough Local Plan (2004). The scheme would also run contrary to the Slough Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2010).
5. Notwithstanding the above, the appellant has provided details of a permitted Lawful Development Certificate (LDC), dated 28 October 2016 (Council Ref: P/16705/000) for a proposed loft conversion. The drawings supporting the LDC application, as provided by the appellant, show that this was for a rear dormer window exactly the same or very similar to the one proposed in this case. As a result, the rear dormer proposed as part of this appeal scheme could be constructed under permitted development rights in any event. This is a material consideration that I afford significant weight, which outweighs the identified harm. This is because, the appellant is capable of constructing the rear dormer at any time and it is therefore a legitimate fall-back position.

Planning Conditions

6. As well as the standard time limit condition (1), a condition is necessary to ensure the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved plans to secure certainty (2). To ensure the suitable appearance of the scheme, a condition (3) is necessary to ensure that the external materials of the proposed extension match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, there are material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. The appeal is therefore allowed.

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR