
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/19/3242011

11 Briar Way, Slough SL2 1ER

- 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 Gill against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/13012/002, dated 18 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension and addition of porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for single storey front extension and addition of porch at 11 Briar Way, Slough SL2 1ER, in accordance with the terms of the application, P/13012/002, dated 18 September 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Planning Drawings Ref PL-01 Rev P2
 - 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.

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. Although there is a general consistency to the style and features of the several blocks of properties in Briar Way, there is some variation to their frontages. This includes porches/front extensions with lean to roofs and ones that extend across the whole of a dwelling's front elevation. While these may have been

introduced prior to the SPD¹, they nonetheless form part of the existing context of the site and streetscene.

5. The SPD states that normally front extensions should not span the entire width of the property. Notwithstanding this, the proposed extension would be single storey, retaining the existing flat roof form and height. It would also not extend further forward than the existing porch line in the row or beyond the maximum depth stated in the SPD. Moreover, the extension would have matching external materials and replicate the existing fenestration. The extension would not replicate the predominant character of the street. Nevertheless, the existing variation in the streetscene and the above factors would prevent the proposal being overly dominant in, or distorting the appearance of, the row.
6. Consequently, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policies EN1 and EN2 of The Local Plan for Slough and Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy where they, in part, require developments to be compatible with their surroundings and reflect the streetscene. Moreover, the scheme would comply with the aim of the SPD to ensure that extensions harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building, and the character of the area. It would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework where it states developments should be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

7. The proposal would not extend closer to 13 Briar Way or be higher than the existing porch. The porch at 9 Briar Way has a level window in the elevation facing the proposed extension. Nonetheless, this window is high level and there are larger glazing areas on its other elevations. Therefore, sufficient light would still be able to enter these properties.
8. While concerns have been raised over the Council's ability to resist further schemes, I have considered the proposal on its own individual merits. I have found it would be acceptable and therefore see no reason why it should lead to harmful development elsewhere. I note comments relating to the Party Wall Act. Nevertheless, this is dealt with under separate legislation and unrelated to the planning merits of the scheme.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is to provide certainty. A further condition is imposed requiring the external materials of the scheme to match those at the existing building to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, and having taken all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions above.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR

¹ Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document