
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/20/3247070

14 Belmont Slough SL2 1SU

- 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 Mrs B Kaur against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/14363/002, dated 31 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, adjoining terraced properties and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property at No. 14 Belmont (No. 14) is a two storey end terrace dwelling located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by terraced and semi-detached properties set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway. The properties are relatively evenly spaced, of comparable scale and form, with the end terrace properties having distinctive gabled roofs that create a book-end feature to each of the blocks. No. 14 being situated on a corner plot has more expansive grounds with the front gable being a distinctive feature on a number of corner properties in the surrounding area.
4. The proposal would entail the construction of a two storey side extension that would extend across the full width of the house and project out by about 3.0m from the rear elevation of the property. It would be set back at first floor level from the front elevation by about 1m and would extend out about 3.5m from the side elevation of the property. The proposed extension would be constructed with a dual hipped pitched roof that would be stepped down below the ridge height of the host property and adjoining terrace.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document July 2010 (SPD) states that two storey side to rear extensions on corner plots should be subordinate to the main dwelling to avoid a detrimental impact on the area and the roofs should respect the original form of the house.

6. Although the proposed extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size, the two storey scale and form of the proposed extension would nevertheless be substantial in this location and would fail to respect the established pattern and layout of the area. Whilst it would be set back and stepped down, the awkward design and bulkiness of the hipped roof over the extension would be very much at odds with the distinctive gable roof of the host property.
7. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's prominent position, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Belmont and Greenside. The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and would detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. As such, I consider that the proposed extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property, adjoining terraced properties and the area.
8. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the extension has been carefully considered and redesigned in response to the previously dismissed scheme at the property¹ and the Council's comments during the planning application process. Whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the extension with the host property, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
9. I have noted the issues raised by the appellant regarding the way in which the application was processed by the Council. However, these are a material consideration to which I can attach only limited weight in making this decision. I also note the appellant's request to consider both sets of plans submitted to the Council. This, however, would result in material changes to the proposal before me and in any event, I am required to consider the proposal on the basis of the same details that were before the Council when it made its decision.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property, adjoining terraced properties and area. It would be contrary to the overall aims of Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008, Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Slough Local Plan 2004 and the SPD. These policies and guidance seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development and residential extensions are of a high quality design that is compatible with the existing property and respects the character of the surrounding area. The proposal would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework that developments should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 124) that are sympathetic to the local character (paragraph 127).

Conclusion

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

David Troy

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/J0350/W/17/3174339