

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2020

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th June 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/19/3244086

12 Knolton Way, Slough SL2 5TB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Joanna Tomar against Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/17817/001, is dated 7 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, and planning permission is refused.

Background and Main Issue

2. This appeal has been lodged following the Council's failure to determine the application within the relevant timescale. The Council in their submission include a reason for refusal had they been in a position to determine the application. This includes reference to those development plan policies that the Council considers to be relevant to the refusal reason put forward.
3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is located within a terrace of four properties and forming part of a large planned residential estate comprising primarily small blocks of terrace dwellings. The appeal dwelling is one of two mid terrace properties flanked by the gable frontages of the two end dwellings. The positioning and uniformity of windows, doors and other architectural features such as chimneys and roof canopies give the terrace a symmetrical appearance that contributes positively to the street's character.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (the SPD) states that front extensions will only be permitted if it is considered that they respect the character of the street scene and the design and appearance of the original house. Furthermore, it also advises that front extensions which span the entire width of a dwelling will not normally be permitted unless such extensions are considered the predominant character of the street, as such extensions are considered overly dominant and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the original house.
6. The proposed front extension would extend across the entire width of the dwelling contrary to the guidance in the SPD. The combined width, height and depth of the extension would result in a bulky addition that would have a dominating effect on the dwelling's front elevation. Moreover, its larger scale and design would contrast

markedly with the modest front door canopies along the terrace, whilst also having a greater forward projection than the gabled frontages of the two end properties. This would result in the proposal having a jarring and incongruous impact, to the extent that it would adversely harm the host dwelling and the fundamental balanced appearance of the terrace in the street.

7. During my site visit I noted that some of the surrounding dwellings incorporated front porch extensions, yet these are primarily smaller in scale and more proportionate to the host dwelling, in contrast to the appeal proposal. I also observed front extensions that spanned the entire width of properties, yet, in the context of the area, these were in the minority and their expansive scale highlighted their unsympathetic impact upon the character of terraces in the street.
8. I have been referred to a front extension similar in scale to the proposal and extending across the dwelling's frontage that was allowed at appeal¹ on Wexham Road. However, unlike the appeal proposal, this extension appears subordinate to the dwelling and terrace it relates to given its recessed position in relation to the projecting gables at either end of the terrace. It is also symmetrical with the scale and design of the extension it adjoins and does not unbalance the terrace. Therefore, I do not consider that the appeal proposal bares any similarities with this example and accordingly I attach it limited weight in my overall assessment.
9. Further examples of front extensions in the locality have been referred to by the appellant. However, I have not been given the full details of these cases and cannot be certain from the very limited evidence before me as to the circumstances or policy context in which they were built, or whether they have received planning permission. I have also noted that some of these examples (No 1 The Frithe and No 99 Knolton Way), were approved prior to the issuing of the guidance on front extensions in the SPG. Accordingly, I have given these examples limited weight in favour of the appeal. In any event I have considered the current appeal scheme on its own planning merits.
10. I acknowledge that the proposal would benefit the occupiers of the appeal dwelling by increasing the amount of internal living space. Nevertheless, it would still have an adverse effect on the dwelling and surrounding area for the reasons I have identified.
11. The proposed development would result in adverse harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and to the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with the design aims of Policies EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough (2004) and Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2026). These policies require proposals to reflect a high standard of design that is compatible with the original dwelling and the surroundings. The proposal would also conflict with the SPD.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

RE Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal Ref - APP/J0350/D/15/3129615