
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/19/3236427
95 Gosling Road, Slough SL3 7TN

- 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 Nuri Kurtulus against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/17094/002, dated 10 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing store and construction of a part single, part double storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two bedroom dwelling located on the end of a terrace of Gosling Road. Gosling Road forms three sides of a square with part of Cockett Road forming the fourth side. The houses are generally set in terraces, but with a number of semi-detached properties. For dwellings on this side of Gosling Road there is a strong defined building line, and a general uniformity of building design, scale and ridge height of the roofs.
4. The appeal proposal is for the demolition of an existing store, and the construction of a part single, part double storey side and rear extension. The proposal would increase the numbers of bedrooms within the property to four. The appeal site sits within a corner plot, and the ground floor elevation has been designed with a chamfered corner which is parallel to the site boundary. The Slough Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that as a general rule two storey side extensions should be designed with walls that are parallel to the existing house walls. Whilst the extent of the chamfered corner would be relatively small, it is not in keeping with the character and appearance of other properties within the street scene.
5. The proposed extension would have the same eaves height as the host property, but a lower ridge height. The first floor element of the extension would be set back from the front building line by approximately 1.25metres

and includes a hipped roof. Whilst the proposed design allows the extension to appear subservient to the host dwelling, the difference in ridge height and the set back from the front elevation would not be in keeping with other properties within this terrace. This would make the appeal proposal appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and the street scene.

6. The SPD states that two storey extensions should be no larger than half the width of the existing building. The width of the two storey side element is larger than the SPD allows for side extensions. The scale and mass of the proposal is not in keeping with the host dwelling, and would be a noticeable addition to the street scene. Given the sites prominent corner location the proposal would be highly visible and would appear as an incongruous addition in the street scene. The proposal therefore harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
7. The appellant has cited two examples¹ of two storey extensions allowed by the Council, which include similar design elements as the appeal proposal. Both examples have a ground floor element with a hipped roof similar to the appeal proposal. I have not been provided with the full details of these schemes so cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same. In any case I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
8. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such there would be conflict with Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 and Policy EN1 of the Slough Local Plan 2004 (LP). Together these policies seek, amongst other things, that development is of a high-quality design which respects its location and surroundings. It would also be contrary to the SPD which amongst other things, seeks that residential extensions are of a high-quality design. These policies are broadly consistent with the Framework relating to high quality design. The Council has referred to policy H13 of the LP, however I do not find this relevant as it relates to back land and infill development for new houses.

Other matters

9. I note the objections from the occupiers of the neighbouring property of No.97 Gosling Road in respect of their living conditions. Whilst the proposal would bring the flank wall of the appeal proposal closer to this property, given the corner nature of both plots there would maintain an acceptable separation distance between the two properties. I find that there would be no harm in respect of outlook or privacy from the appeal proposal. Thus, these matters do not add to my reasons for dismissing the appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR

¹ Council References P/16197/001 and P/16937/002