
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/19/3242392

172 Langley Road, Slough SL3 7EE

- 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 M.A Choudhery against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/07749/011, dated 5 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two storey front extension, new front porch, storey side and rear extensions, roof alterations including a crown roof element, 2no. rear dormers, 2no front rooflights and 1.no rear rooflight to facilitate a loft conversion. Changes to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner heading above from the application form. While different to that given on the appeal form and decision notice, there has been no confirmation that any change was agreed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The area surrounding the appeal site comprises a mix of dwelling types and sizes. The appeal site itself is a detached dwelling made up of Mock Tudor type cladding and brick work that has previously been extended. It is of a distinctly different design and appearance to the other properties nearby on both Langley Road and the adjacent side street. Its unique appearance in the street is a positive aspect contributing towards its attraction. It is one of many properties identified as being within a Residential Area of Exceptional Character.
5. Although not matching, given their size and position low down on the main roof the existing dormers at the property are relatively discrete and partly hidden by the front and rear gables. The larger matching dormers would be more prominent, being located higher up the roof slope and would occupy a large part of the roof space. The proposal would introduce a crown to the main roof and much of the catslide element to the rear would be lost. While this would

- allow the gables to be enlarged and create a more balanced appearance and eaves height to much of the main roof, it would be at odds with the existing diverse roofscape character of the property.
6. Although the proposed side extension would bring the closer to the side street, it would not have a significant footprint and there is already a tall wall along the boundary with a wide verge beyond. Nonetheless, while the eaves height would be relatively low, this element of the scheme would add to the bulk of the property and introduce an uncharacteristic hipped element that would jar with the main roof. I note a single storey option was discussed however such a scheme is not before me.
 7. The appeal scheme would introduce a more uniform appearance to the property with proportionate features and openings. In addition, it would retain many of the existing windows and use matching materials. Notwithstanding this, the existing variation in the built form, comprising features of different designs and sizes gives a quirky charm to the property representing its development and extension over time. The appeal scheme would erode the variation to the existing roofscape and the property as a whole that currently contributes to the character and interest of the dwelling.
 8. The existing boundary treatments and vegetation would screen the proposal to some degree. Nonetheless, the increased bulk and more regimented design would increase the prominence of the dwelling from views along Langley Road and the side street as well as from nearby properties.
 9. The Council have raised no concerns over the proposed ground floor front extensions or effects on existing landscaping at the site. Given the low level and small scale of those extensions and their position, along with the separation between the proposed scheme and landscape features I see no reason to reach a different finding.
 10. Nevertheless, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Core Policies 8 and 9 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy as well as Policies H12 and H15 of The Local Plan for Slough. These, in part, seek to avoid developments that would have a detrimental impact upon the character of properties within a Residential Area of Exceptional Character and require development to be in keeping with the existing building.
 11. Furthermore, it would be contrary to the SPD¹ where it aims to ensure that extensions harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building. Finally, it would fail to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework where it states developments should be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

12. My attention has been drawn to several developments granted planning permission in the area² and that other properties have been extended on Langley Road. I do not have full details of the considerations that led to those schemes being considered acceptable. While many relate to corner plots and share elements of the appeal proposal, many are related to semi-detached

¹ Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document

² 45 Castle View Road, 96 Mirador Crescent, 90 Cherry Avenue, 8 Carlton Road and 92 Mirador Crescent

properties, of a different character to the appeal property and none would be viewed with it. Therefore, they are not directly comparable to the scheme before me.

13. There would be benefits associated with energy efficiency and sustainable construction from the scheme. However, given the scale of the proposal these benefits would be small. I also appreciate that the proposal would provide enlarge living accommodation for the appellant and their family. Nonetheless, even when taken cumulatively these benefits would not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.
14. The Council have not included refusal reasons relating to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties, security, parking or outdoor space at the appeal site. Nonetheless, a lack of harm is a neutral factor and does not weigh in favour of the scheme.
15. The conduct of the Council in its handling of applications at the site has been raised. Nevertheless, I have assessed the appeal on its planning merits.

Conclusion

16. For the reason given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR