



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2022

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/21/3287846

37 Cranbourne Close, Slough SL1 2XH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Abdul Hamid Suleiman against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/00066/006, dated 24 February 2021, was approved on 19 August 2021 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
 - The development permitted is for the construction of a part single/part two storey side and rear extension following demolition of the existing outbuilding.
 - The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: The development hereby approved shall be implemented only in accordance with the following plans and drawings hereby approved by the Local Planning Authority: (a) Location Plan, Block Plan, Proposed Plans (Dwg No PL-01 Rev P3) received 07/07/2021 (b) Proposed Elevations (Dwg No PL-02 Rev P2) received 07/07/2021.
 - The reason given for the condition is: To ensure that the site is developed in accordance with the submitted application and to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenity of the area and to comply with the Policies in the Development Plan.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for part single/part two storey side and rear extension following demolition of the existing outbuilding at 37 Cranbourne Close, Slough SL1 2XH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/00066/006, dated 24 February 2021, is varied, by deleting condition No 2 and substituting it for the following condition:

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-01 Rev P1 and PL-02 Rev P1.

Procedural Matters and Background

2. Application Ref P/00066/006 was submitted seeking planning permission for a single storey and two storey extension to No 37. The scheme was approved, but in amended form on account of design (insofar as the original ground floor layout was concerned). That is hereafter referred to as the 'approved scheme'. There is no indication, were I to dismiss the appeal, that the appellant would not seek to implement the approved scheme.
3. The appellant seeks the removal of condition 2, and its replacement with a condition setting the plans that reflect the originally submitted design. For clarity, the plans submitted originally and being considered are referenced PL-01 Rev P1 and PL-02 Rev P1. I have hereafter referred to that scheme as the 'development proposed'.

4. The Council states that the property has been extended extensively in terms of a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and hip to gable roof alterations. For clarity, although there are approvals for these works, No 37 has not been extended in this manner. From what I saw, there was only a rear conservatory extension.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. Cranbourne Close is a residential cul-de-sac predominately of semi-detached two storey dwellings with bay windows and hipped roofs. The properties have a fairly consistent building line, set behind front gardens and driveways, which are largely open with low-lying fences and walls. The dwellings, for the most part, sit within spacious plots, front the road and a large central area of grassed land. The low density, consistent building line together with the low-lying enclosures and central area of green space produces an openness that results in a pleasant character and appearance to the area.
7. 37 Cranbourne Close is a semi-detached two storey property, which is positioned on a curve in the Close. The resultant plot is tapered with a large rear garden that narrows towards the front. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling along with several other dwellings within the Close have been extended. Despite the extensions, the scale and appearance of the dwellings as well as the spaces in-between the properties at first floor have largely been maintained. This consistency of scale and appearance as well as the appreciable spaces in-between contributes positively to the open character and appearance of the area.
8. The development proposed would be very similar to the approved scheme. The two storey elements to the side and rear remain the same, but the ground floor side extension has a greater length, which extends just beyond the proposed rear ground floor extension. The development proposed would be finished in materials to match the existing dwelling.
9. The development proposed, while substantial, is nonetheless of a scale, design and form that has due regard to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The two-storey elements are proportionate to its scale, with the more prominent side extension having a notable set back from the front elevation and a set down from the main roof. Due to the shape of the plot, the most prominent aspect of the ground floor side extension would be tapered to a narrow width to the front. The remaining single storey extensions are sizeable, but they are subordinate to the host dwelling, proportionate to the large plot size and mostly contained to the rear. As such, despite a considerable increase in the floorspace, the proposed development would have a scale, height and design that would appear subordinate, and would not unduly dominate the appearance of the host dwelling.
10. The two-storey side and rear extensions of the proposed development would be proportionate to the changes made on the adjoining semi, maintaining a good balance and symmetry between the pair of dwellings. On the other side, the two-storey side extension would retain a gap between the neighbouring dwelling at first floor level. Although the gap would be smaller, it would be consistent with

the built form and spaces present within the Close, which contribute positively to the open character and appearance of the area. The single storey side extension would have a splayed wall, but this is not uncharacteristic in the Close. Furthermore, the orientation of the dwelling, its set back from the road and the position of the neighbouring property ensures the splayed wall would not be a prominent or incongruous feature from public vantage points on the Close.

11. Accordingly, the proposed extension would not be detrimental to the scale, design or appearance of the host dwelling or the wider character and appearance of the area. The proposed development would comply with the relevant provisions of Core Policy 8 of the Slough Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008, saved Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Slough Borough Council Local Plan 2004 and guidance in the Slough Borough Council Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010. These policies, and guidance, seek to ensure proposals are of a high-quality design, which respects its location and surroundings, improving the quality of the environment and street scene. It would also accord with the general design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

12. As I have concluded that the proposed development would be acceptable in respect of character and appearance, it would be necessary to remove condition 2 of the permission and replace it with a condition detailing the plans approved. This is to ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the approved details. The remaining conditions were not in contention and remain unaltered.

Conclusion

13. I accept that allowing the appeal would effectively revert to a design which has been amended through a process of modification and acknowledge that the approved scheme would have a lesser effect on its surroundings than the scheme before me. However, as reasoned above, given the nature of the proposal and its surroundings, I have determined that the proposed development would be acceptable.
14. Consequently, I find that the disputed condition is not reasonable or necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. I conclude that planning permission should be allowed, and the condition varied as set out above.

M. P. Howell

INSPECTOR