



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/W/19/3242027

214 London Road, Slough SL3 7HT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sumesh Arora against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/17700/001, dated 15 April 2019, was approved on 25 October 2019 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
 - The development permitted is conversion of existing garage and construction of a single storey front and a part single, part double storey side and rear extension and installation of front/side boundary walls.
 - The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: The development hereby approved shall be implemented only in accordance with the following plans and drawings hereby approved by the Local Planning Authority.
 - (a) Drawing No PL-01 Rev P4, Dated 15/10/19, Recd on 15/10/2019
 - (b) Drawing No PL-02 Rev P4, Dated 15/10/19, Recd on 15/10/2019
 - (c) Drawing No PL-03 Rev P5, Dated 15/10/19, Recd on 15/10/2019
 - The reason given for the condition is: To ensure that the site is developed in accordance with the submitted application and to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenity of the area and to comply with the Policies in the Development Plan.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the planning permission Ref P/17700/001 granted on 25 October 2019 by Slough Borough Council, is varied by deleting condition 2 and substituting it for the following condition:
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans; Drawings ref PL-01 Rev P5, PL-02 Rev P4 and PL-03 Rev P7.

Background and Main Issue

2. The appeal seeks a revised but not substantially different design to a previously approved scheme. This includes larger extensions at ground floor level to the front and at first floor level to the rear. The appeal seeks the removal of the condition specifying the approved plans and replacing it with one specifying the plans that reflect the amended design.
3. During the appeal a plan was submitted to rectify an inaccuracy of the porch being missing on one side elevation. The porch was shown on the other elevations and roof plan. Therefore, the main elements of the scheme have not

altered from that originally submitted and upon which consultation took place. Against this backdrop, no injustice would be caused to any appeal party or third party by my taking this plan into account.

4. From the reason given for the condition being imposed and the information before me, the main issue of the appeal is the effect that varying the condition would have on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is one of many nearby identified as being within a Residential Area of Exceptional Character. There is a general consistency to the scale, form and materials in the row where the appeal site is located. Notwithstanding this, there is some variation between individual properties. This includes to the front elevations where the presence and size of porches differs and there is a 2-storey front gable extension at the dwelling attached to the appeal property. Moreover, there is no uniformity to the outbuildings and projections at the rear of the dwellings.
6. Some of the extensions and alterations in this row of properties, including that at 216 London Road may pre-date The Local Plan for Slough (LP) and the SPD¹. Nevertheless, they form part of the existing context of the appeal site and are seen in the same streetscene.
7. The SPD states that the width of an extension should typically be no more than 50% of the width of the original dwelling. Notwithstanding this, the front extensions would not span the entire frontage and would not adversely affect the existing bay window feature. Moreover, they would in part be forward of the proposed side extension rather than solely across the original dwelling.
8. Being single storey, the extensions would appear subordinate to the existing dwelling and they would not extend beyond the maximum depth stated in the SPD. Matching materials would be utilised. There would be only a minor increase in the projection of the approved porch and the hipped roof would be in keeping with nearby porches. Rather than jarring, the stepping back of the lean-to section on the front of the property would differentiate it from the porch and help to break up the mass on this elevation.
9. The property is set back from the A4 behind a wide verge and occasional landscaping. Nonetheless, the front elevation is clearly visible in the street. However, the scheme would be viewed in the context of the varied frontages and the larger projection at the adjacent property. As such, it would not dominate the streetscene or appear out of keeping.
10. While the first-floor rear extension would exceed the maximum depth generally permitted in the SPD, it also states that deeper extensions may be allowed dependant on the site circumstances. This rear element would also be greater than 50% of the width of the existing original property. However, it would be viewed with the, albeit single storey, full width extension at the rear of the adjacent dwelling. Moreover, its proportions would be considerably less than the depth and width of the ground floor extension. This along with the stepping of the ridge line reduces the bulk of the rear additions and it would be viewed with the varied built form at the rear of this row of properties. Therefore, even

¹ Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document

when taken cumulatively the proposed extensions would not overpower the existing property.

11. Consequently, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with EN1, H12 and H15 of the LP. 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 proposals to be compatible with the surrounding area.
12. Despite technical breaches of the SPD, the scheme would comply with its aims 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

13. The initially approved scheme was considered to have complied with the development plan policies as well as the design guidance and the appellant was amenable to amending the scheme during the application. Notwithstanding this, I have found the appeal proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, as with the reasons for the appellant seeking additional space, these factors do not alter my findings.
14. While concerns have been raised over the Council's ability to resist similar proposals, I have considered the appeal scheme 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.

Conclusion

15. I have considered other conditions attached to the permission but there is no substantive evidence before me to indicate that it is necessary to vary any of these.
16. For the reasons given above, and having taken into consideration all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, deleting and substituting the condition as set out above.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR