
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/17/3171334
8 Hinksey Close, Slough, SL3 8EB

- 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 Harsha Gautam against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/10845/003, dated 25 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is construction of 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 the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within Hinksey Close and accommodates a two storey semi-detached property on a corner plot. The wider area is largely residential. The predominant character of the area is of two-storey semi-detached properties, many of which have a similar architectural style.
 4. The scheme seeks to construct a two storey side extension, which would extend to the boundary of the appeal site. 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 73% of the width of the host dwelling. Whilst the proposed side extension would be set down from the ridge height of the host dwelling, I consider that due to its considerable width, which would extend up to the boundary of the appeal site, and its significant 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 and to the area.
 6. I observed on my site visit that there are other examples in the immediate area of two storey side extensions. However, these all appear to be slimmer in
-

width than is proposed in this case and therefore subordinate to their host dwellings.

7. In conclusion on this matter and for the above reasons, 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

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

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR