
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2017

by D. M. Young BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI MIHE

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

Decision date: 4 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/17/3169361

3 Ennerdale Crescent, Slough SL1 6EH.

- 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 & Mrs Nazaruk against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/16792/000, dated 14 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a new attached two storey house incorporating a replacement porch to the existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of the garden to 3 Ennerdale Crescent, a semi-detached property located on the inside of a sweeping bend. The proposed dwelling would occupy the front part of the site and would align with the front elevation of the host property. A small garden would be situated to the rear of the dwelling with off-street parking to the side and front.
 4. Ennerdale Crescent is part of a wider post-war housing estate to the west of Slough. It is distinguished primarily by traditional semi-detached and terraced 2-storey houses arranged in a linear pattern facing the road. Dwellings are set back generously behind a consistent building line with modest front gardens most of which have been paved over for parking. Consistent spacing between groups of dwellings, open frontages as well as wide grass verges and street trees lend the area a uniform and spacious character. Whilst some houses have been extended and/or altered such changes are minor and appear subservient to host properties and have not compromised the intrinsic character of the estate.
 5. In my view the appeal site provides welcome breathing space between No 3 and the terrace to the east helping to reinforce the spacious character I have identified above. In this regard it is consistent with other gaps in the street scene most of which remain intact.
-

6. The erection of an attached house would, in my opinion, significantly diminish the gap between No 3 and the adjacent terrace. It would be a dominant addition to No 3 prominent from a range of public vantage points where its appearance would be unlike anything else in view. Although the siting of the dwelling would relate well to No 3, it would project well forward of the adjacent terrace. Due to the constraints of the site's size and shape the dwelling would be located significantly closer to the road than other properties in the locality.
7. The front of the property as well as No 3 would be taken up almost entirely by hardstanding for the parking of vehicles with little or no space for any meaningful landscaping. The size of the outdoor amenity area for future occupiers as well as the residual garden to No 3 is indicative of poor design and would compound the feeling of too great a building mass for the plot.
8. Overall, the development would substantially alter the appearance of the site as a whole and erode its open aspect thus giving the immediate area a more built-up appearance. This incongruence would be exacerbated by the dwelling's cramped appearance and awkward relationship with the adjacent terrace which would represent a conspicuous departure from the area's spacious character.
9. Based on the foregoing and notwithstanding that the scheme would deliver additional housing in an area of need and make efficient use of the land, it would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Core Policies 4 and 8 of the "*Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 Development Plan Document*", Policies H13, H14, H15, EN1 and EN2 of the "*Local Plan for Slough 2004*" and elements of the "*Slough Residential Extension Guidelines 2010*". Collectively these seek high quality, sustainable development that is compatible in design terms with its surroundings.
10. The appellant has referred me to other dwellings in the area most notably 1 Ennerdale Crescent. Whilst I do not know the exact circumstances of this development it is evident that it is a detached dwelling on a larger plot with landscaping across the site frontage. Given the lack of similarities with the scheme before me, I have afforded it little weight.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D. M. Young

Inspector