

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2017

by K E Down MA (Oxon) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23rd October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/17/3180414
48 The Normans, Slough, Berks, SL2 5TY

- 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 A Hussain against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/14833/003, dated 7 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey front/side extension and alterations to front porch roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a single storey front/side extension and alterations to front porch roof at 48 The Normans, Slough, Berks, SL2 5TY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/14833/003, dated 7 March 2017, 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, Dwg No SA/01/17
 - 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. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of The Normans.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a traditional, two storey semi-detached house. It is set in a street of similar dwellings, some of which are semi-detached and some arranged in short terraces. A cul-de-sac set at 90° to the main street and close to the appeal dwelling is characterised by bungalows, the rear gardens of which face the side elevation of No 48. Owing to its wide plot and location adjacent to the gardens of the bungalows there is a wide gap to the side of the original side
-

elevation of the property. Much of this is filled within the appeal site by an existing single storey side extension. The property also has a front porch extension, similar to others in the street, which occupies less than half of the front elevation.

4. The appeal proposal involves erecting a small link section between the single storey side extension and the porch. The extension would be some 1.2m deep to match the forward projection of the porch and 2.8m wide to match the width of the side extension. The design, including that of the roof, and materials would be in keeping with the existing property and fenestration would match that in the front elevation of the side extension. Although the porch and proposed extension would occupy more than half the width of the dwelling this would not overly dominate the main façade because much of the width would be to the side of the original dwelling and it would be restricted to single storey. Overall the proposed extension would be modest in scale and both in itself and in combination with the existing porch would preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of The Normans.
5. Moreover, there are other wide front porch extensions on dwellings nearby and several similar semi-detached houses have been extended to the side at both ground and first floor level. The proposed extension would thus be consistent with other development in the immediate locality.
6. It is therefore concluded on the main issue that the proposed single storey front/side extension and alterations to the front porch roof would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene of The Normans. In consequence, there would be no conflict with Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006-2026, Policies EN1, EN2 or H15 of The Local Plan for Slough, adopted 2004 or Policy DP1 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted 2010. Neither would it conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. Taken together these policies expect residential extensions to be compatible with the host building, sustainable, improve the quality of the environment and be of a high quality design that is compatible with their surroundings in terms of, amongst other things, architectural style and materials. SPD Policy EX1 specifically states that front extensions shall be single storey and normally restricted to front porches but allows for extensions that respect the character of the street scene and the design and appearance of the original house. Given the sympathetic design and modest scale of the proposed extension and in view of existing development nearby I consider that the limited conflict with the guidelines is justified in this case.
8. The Council refers to another appeal decision (APP/J0350/D/16/3160922) for a front extension on a terraced property. Whilst I do not have full details of this case it appears to be materially different from the appeal proposal, relating to an extension at a property in a largely unaltered terrace that was overly dominant and not in keeping with the character of the area.
9. The Council suggests seven conditions. Of these I agree that the development should be subject to the statutory commencement condition and should be built

in matching materials and in accordance with the approved plans in order to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and to provide certainty.

10. I do not consider it necessary to restrict window openings in the flank elevation of the extension because this would overlook the front drive of the host property. Neither is it reasonable to withdraw permitted development rights which should only be removed in exceptional circumstances which do not appear to exist in this case. The amount of construction traffic associated with this small extension would not warrant a restriction on delivery hours and therefore a condition is not necessary. Finally, the proposed extension would not materially alter or reduce the existing off-street parking and turning space at the appeal site which is ample to serve the property. Hence there is no need to require these to be provided prior to the occupation of the extension because they already exist.
11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR