
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2021

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/21/3275839

17 Telford Drive, Slough SL1 9AD

- 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 Sandeep Saddal against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/19122/001, dated 15 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is ground floor front entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy in my decision, planning decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, given the particulars of this case I am satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further comment from the parties on the revised Framework, and that in taking such an approach no party or their cases would be prejudiced.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and upon the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 17 Telford Drive (No 17) is an end-of-terrace house positioned within a residential estate that comprises mostly similar aged and styled houses and apartment blocks. The appeal property is within part of the estate that is characterised by terraces of two-storey houses. Constructed from a recurrent palette of materials, the houses within these terraces have similar repeated forms and sizes, giving this part of the estate a distinctly cohesive and planned appearance.
5. A further feature of some of the terraces is that at each end there are back-to-back houses. The presence of several such terraces, comprising repeated house sizes, forms, and materials enhances the cohesion of the area. Some of

the houses have tiled canopies over the front doors, with others having a canopy and a store. Such features give a clear legibility that differentiates each house, as well as maintaining the harmony of the terrace. No 17 is the rear property at the end of one of the terraces, and it has the simple form and style of the other houses, with a pitched roof canopy over the front door. Consequently, the house shares many of the repeated architectural details of the host terrace and those nearby, and it thereby makes a positive contribution to the harmonious character and appearance of the area.

6. Although the extension would not span the full width of the front elevation of the house, it would extend for much of the width of the dwelling, and it would thereby form a prominent addition to the property. Given that none of the nearby terraced houses have front extensions, the proposal would be an anomalous addition, unacceptably eroding the cohesive appearance of this part of the estate. The largely unaltered and repeated presence of entrance canopies and stores provides a visual harmony throughout the terraces that the proposed extension would disrupt.
7. Furthermore, the design of the extension would set it apart from the entrance canopies and stores. The enclosed nature of the extension with its front door and side window, blank side wall and glazed rear section would have a solid appearance that would mask much of the front ground floor. This would form an incongruous juxtaposition to the open, light-weight appearance of the canopies and stores nearby.
8. Moreover, the terrace is on a gentle slope, being in an elevated position that makes the property visible from Telford Drive. Having regard to this and that the property is at one end of the terrace, it would make the extension prominent within the area. In addition, views of the extension would be available from the parking areas. The use of materials to match the house would create some harmony with the host building. Despite this, the position, size and form of the extension would combine to harmfully disrupt the character and appearance of the terrace and the contribution it makes to the area.
9. I have considered the concerns of the Council that the grant of planning permission would set a precedent for other similar developments. However, each application and appeal must be treated on its individual merits, in accordance with the requirements of the current development plan and all other material considerations. It does not follow therefore, that if I were to permit this scheme that it would cause a precedent.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other front extensions. However, none of these examples is within terraces similar to that of which No 17 forms part. Of the others, some are upon semi-detached properties within part of the estate that has a broader diversity of house types. Given these differences, the comparisons do not form a binding precedent for approving the appeal scheme.
11. The extension would, therefore, neither respect the character and appearance of the host building nor that of the area, and this would be contrary to Policy 8 of the Slough Core Strategy (2008), and Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Slough Local Plan (2004). These Policies and the Slough Residential Extension Guidelines (2010) seek amongst other things, that development is of a high quality of design, which is compatible with its location and surroundings,

thereby reflecting objectives of the Framework. Consequently, the proposal would fail to accord with the development plan when considered as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.

Other Matters

12. Finally, the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the application are procedural matters. Such concerns fall to be pursued by other means separate from the appeal process and are not for me to consider.

Conclusion

13. Thus, for the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR