



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2019

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26TH November 2019.

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/19/3233803
98 High Street, Langley, Slough SL3 8JS

- 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 Shahid Mahood against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/17173/007, dated 15 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
- The development proposed is part retrospective application for the rendering of the dwelling and retrospective application for a single storey side and rear extension and rear outbuilding.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the Appeal Form as this is more succinct than the version provided on the Application Form.
3. Parts of the appeal development have already been built, however, at the time of my site visit this did not relate to the proposed external rendering of the dwelling.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed external render on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace dwelling located in a primarily residential area. The terrace the appeal property relates to, consists of 4 equally proportioned properties. A ground floor shop with a projecting shopfront occupies one of the end properties, while a painted garage door with fascia above covers part of the ground floor front elevation of the other end property. Despite the presence of these additions, the terrace is largely consistent in terms of the colour and detailing of brickwork on the front elevation, which is distinctive in terms of the brick window heads and contrasting brick banding that runs horizontally across the terrace. This homogeneity gives the terrace a pleasing rhythm, in contrast to some of the surrounding terraces, which are a mix of render and brick properties, with some having been extended unsympathetically on the front elevation.

6. The proposed pale render would appear stark in contrast to the brick exterior of the other properties in the terrace, when viewed from High Street and would remove the brick window heads and banding that are consistent features of this terrace. The appeal building would therefore appear as a visual anomaly in this line of properties that would disrupt the harmonious rhythm of the facing brickwork thus having a discordant impact on the immediate area.
7. It is acknowledged that there are properties along the same frontage of High Street that incorporate render, and, in some cases, these adjoin other terrace properties that have a facing brick finish. However, this does not make the proposal acceptable, and would not overcome the visually discordant effect this incompatible external material would have on the terrace of properties the appeal building relates to. This impact would be most detrimental when viewed from the street and publicly accessible areas in front of the dwelling.
8. Therefore, the proposed rendering of the dwelling's external walls would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006-2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008 and Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough Adopted 2004. The proposal would also be contrary to guidance contained in the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance, where it states that poorly matching materials can have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. The proposal would also be contrary to the Framework where it requires development proposals to be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matter

9. Whilst the Appellant considers that the proposed material would be more energy efficient and contribute towards reducing carbon emissions, I have not been presented with any compelling evidence of the energy efficiency improvements the proposal would make to the dwelling. I have therefore given this matter limited weight in my determination.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R. E. Jones

INSPECTOR