
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by Adrian Hunter BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/20/3245659

35 Blenheim Road, Slough SL3 7NL

- 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 Zoheb Chaudhry against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/05426/001, dated 2 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is construction of an outbuilding (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for construction of an outbuilding at 35 Blenheim Road, Slough SL3 7NL in accordance with the terms of the application, P/05426/001, dated 2 September 2019.

Preliminary Matters

2. I note that the application is retrospective and that the outbuilding has already been constructed and is partially in use. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined this appeal on the plans as submitted.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the area; and
 - The living conditions of surrounding residents, with particular regard to whether the use of the outbuilding would be ancillary to the main dwelling house.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached family dwelling, which has been extended over the years. It is located at the south-eastern end of Blenheim Road, which is a residential cul-de-sac. Due to the position of the appeal site around the vehicle turning area at the end of Blenheim Road, the plot width at the front is relatively narrow, but widens considerably at the rear. Within the surrounding area, there are a number of residential outbuildings to the rear of existing properties, including those within the rear gardens of the dwellings either side of the appeal site.

5. The proposed development is a single storey outbuilding, located adjacent to the rear boundary of the appeal site. It has a pitched roof and extends across the full width of the plot.
6. The building is of a considerable size, bulk and footprint when compared with the floorspace of the host dwelling. In this respect, the outbuilding is not subordinate to the main dwelling. Despite its size and bulk, it is however largely hidden behind the existing host building and, when viewed from the street, is only visible in limited, glimpsed views over the existing garage. It therefore does not detract from the character of the area through over dominance or obtrusiveness. Given this, I therefore find that, whilst it is larger than the footprint of the host dwelling, the development does not have a significant effect, such that the withholding of planning permission on these grounds alone would not be warranted.
7. Nonetheless, any lack of visibility from public areas alone does not justify the development plan's or the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) requirement to achieve good design. The proposed outbuilding is of a modern design, drawing inspiration from the existing house in terms of its finished materials and external appearance. Given the surrounding mix of house designs and other outbuildings, the design and appearance of the outbuilding is therefore not out of context. Furthermore, due to the size and dimension of the plot, the appeal property would still retain a reasonably sized garden, which even given the presence of the outbuilding, is in keeping with the wider area. As such, whilst the outbuilding is relatively large, it would not be overly dominant.
8. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area and, in this respect, is in accordance with Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 Development Plan Document December 2008 (Core Strategy), Policy EN1 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004 (The Local Plan), Slough Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document Adopted January 2010 (The SPD) and paragraph 127 of The Framework. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure a high standard of design which is compatible with the surroundings.

Living conditions

9. Concern has been expressed that the outbuilding is not incidental or ancillary to the main dwelling and as such, would impact upon the living conditions of surrounding residents.
10. From a review of the submitted drawings, these do not appear to indicate that the use of the outbuilding would be for anything other than activities which are ancillary to that of the main dwelling house. I have been presented with no substantive evidence to the contrary. Furthermore, I note that the appeal application was made on an application form for householder development and the appeal was made on that basis, as such no change of use is proposed, and I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
11. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development does not harm the living conditions of surrounding residents and, in this respect, is in accordance with Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy, Section 9 of the SPD, and The Framework. These policies amongst other things, seek to

ensure that new development respects the living conditions of adjoining residents.

Conclusion

12. I conclude, for the reasons outlined above, that the appeal should be allowed and, that as the development appears to have been completed, no conditions are necessary.

Adrian Hunter

INSPECTOR