



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020

by Rachael Pipkin, BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/20/3247514
53 Randall Close, Slough, SL3 8RJ

- 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 Shailendra Vispute against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: P/17897/000 dated 3 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension and front driveway with dropped kerb access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension and front driveway with dropped kerb access at 53 Randall Close, Slough, SL3 8RJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: P/17897/000 dated 3 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing: 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated within a relatively high-density residential estate, mainly comprising modest, two-storey terraced houses of a mostly uniform design. It forms an end of terrace and occupies a triangular shaped corner plot within a cul-de-sac. It is at a right angle to an adjacent terrace of similar houses at Numbers 12-22 Randall Close.
4. The proposed extension would align with the front elevation of the house with a pitched roof which would follow the same roof angle of the main roof. Whilst the extension would be wide when compared with the original house, due to

the width of the side garden, it would not appear overly large or cramped within the plot. Whilst the ridge line of the proposed extension would project slightly above the eaves of the main roof, the roof pitches would match, and this would make the extension harmonise with the existing property. Furthermore, the overall height of the proposed extension would be lower than the host property and as such it would not appear unduly bulky.

5. Due to the corner position of both the appeal property and the adjacent terrace, the proposed extension would not be widely visible from the surrounding area. It would not therefore be prominent, and it would not detract from the uniform appearance of the terrace. Furthermore, I observed on site that Numbers 25 and 27 Randall Close are both pitched roofed single-storey properties positioned at the end of two-storey terraced properties. These are similar in appearance but visually more prominent to the appeal proposal. As such, the proposed development would not be out of keeping with surrounding development.
6. The Council officer's report refers to an appeal at 28 Parry Green South¹ where permission was refused for a wide single-storey side extension. However, I have been provided with very limited details of this. Furthermore, I note that the Inspector in that case identified that the extension would be clearly visible from the street, whereas in the scheme before me, due to the corner position of the property, this would not be the case. I do not therefore find this directly comparable to the scheme before me which I must, in any case, determine on its own individual planning merits.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 and Saved Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Local Plan for Slough 2004. These policies seek a high-quality design which respects its location and surroundings and is compatible with the existing building. It would also accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). It would also comply with the guidance set out in the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD) which seeks to ensure side extensions do not detract from the original house or the character of the area.

Other Matters

8. There appears to be a matter of dispute between the appellant and a neighbouring landowner regarding garden boundaries. However, any ownership issues are a private matter between the relevant parties and not within my jurisdiction.

Conditions

9. The Council has proposed a number of conditions should the appeal be allowed. I have considered these and imposed them where they meet the tests set out in Paragraph 55 of the Framework, amending where necessary for the sake of simplicity, clarity and precision.
10. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. A condition requiring materials to match those of the existing house

¹ APP/J0350/D/15/3137125

is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR