



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

by M. P. Howell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Monday 20 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/21/3284374

127 Langley Road, Slough SL3 7DZ

- 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 Dinesh Sharma against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/17170/003, dated 26 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of a two-storey side extension and side extension to loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Langley Road is a residential area with a mix of dwelling types and sizes. The dwellings are, for the most part, set within spacious plots, front the road and maintain an appreciable visual gap at first floor between each dwelling. The pattern of development provides some uniformity and a sense of space that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal site is identified along with many others as being within a Residential Area of Exceptional Character.
4. 127 Langley Road is a semi-detached dwelling with a pitched roof, a design that is repeated regularly along the Road. However, the adjoining dwelling, 125 Langley Road is a larger detached dwelling with an alternative scale, design and appearance. No 125 has a building line that is forward of No 127, and an existing first-floor extension that extends up to the boundary.
5. The proposal would match the height of the neighbouring extension and extend up to the side boundary, where a minimal gap would be maintained between the built form. It is acknowledged that the extension has been proposed with a set back and down and the neighbouring dwelling is a property with an alternative siting, scale and design. However, the visual break at first floor is minimal and the difference in siting, scale and design would not sufficiently mitigate the close proximity of the two extensions. Consequently, the extension would fail to provide any visual relief at first floor, contrary to the existing pattern of development, where the visual spacing between dwellings creates a

sense of space and is an important part of the character and appearance of the area.

6. In support of the appeal, it was indicated that the extent of side space between built forms within the locality is visually dominated by slender divisions. However, within the context of the appeal site, I saw that slender divisions are in the minority and were in most part due to an extension to the property. In any event, those that I saw served to confirm that such extensions change the nature of the relationship between the dwellings, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
7. I, therefore, conclude that the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area would be unacceptable. As such, it would be contrary to core Policy 8 of the Slough Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008, saved Policies H12 and EN1 of the Slough Borough Council Adopted Local Plan 2004, the Slough Borough Council Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance 2010. These policies, and guidance, in general seek to ensure proposals are of a high-quality design, which respects its location and surrounding and does not have a detrimental impact upon the street scene. It would also fail to comply with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and taking into account the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M. P. Howell

INSPECTOR