



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2019

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/19/3229664

22 Brackenforde, Langley, Slough, SL3 7AU

- 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 Mrs Kam Ahluwalia against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/12466/002, dated 18 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension and conversion of garage into habitable accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 22 Brackenforde is a detached chalet bungalow with a gabled side element which includes a gabled dormer facing the road. It is located in an established residential area which is characterised by bungalows sharing a similar architectural style with distinctive gables fronting the road, brick construction and contrasting tile hanging and a similar pattern of fenestration. Many of them, including the appeal property, are linked by flat roofed garages and several have gabled side extensions. Gabled dormer windows are also common.
4. Relevant policies in this case include H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough 2004 (the local plan) which, among other things, require development, including residential extensions, to be of a high quality of design compatible with the original structure and the surroundings. Similarly, Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 (the emerging local plan) requires all development to be of a high quality of design and to respect its location and surroundings.
5. The Council raises no objection to the conversion of the garage to habitable accommodation on the basis that it is permitted development. I see no reason to disagree with this view.

6. I consider that the proposed front extension would be out of keeping with the character of the existing house because of its width across the whole main frontage and its height to just below the first floor window. It would be similar in appearance to the rear extension at the property with the same style of mono pitch roof. It would dominate the front elevation, obscuring much of the main architectural detailing and the proposed grey tiles would be at odds with the red tile hanging in the gable. It would appear prominent and incongruous in the street scene and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the other properties along Brackenforde, none of which have front elevations altered in a similar manner.
7. I have considered the examples of other residential extensions in the area which the appellant has drawn to my attention. The majority of these relate to houses which are different in style or are to a side elevation rather than the front. 3 Brackenforde is on a corner plot and the front porch has a traditional dual pitched roof and extends from the subsidiary gable rather than the main gable elevation as would be the case at No. 22. 1 Ravensfield is a small detached two storey house in a different style with the roof ridge parallel to the street and a small mono pitch porch across part of the front elevation.
8. I saw one example similar to the proposal in Halkingcroft, but this was at an end property and in a less prominent position than the appeal site, and Halkingcroft has a more varied mix of styles, particularly in the orientation of gables towards or away from the street. I consider that this example does not support the case for allowing a proposal which would not respect the distinctive character of the street scene in Brackenforde.
9. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the street scene, contrary to policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the local plan and Core Policy 8 of the emerging local plan.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR