



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/22/3313820

8 Litchum Spur, Slough SL1 3HU

- 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 Mrs Sangeeta Kumari against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/17073/006, dated 11 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'amendment to initial planning application for a further extension to the first floor'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey and a part double storey rear extension at 8 Litchum Spur, Slough SL1 3HU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/17073/006, dated 11 August 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 00101_03_01, 00101_03_02 and 00101_03_10.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal on the application form includes reference to an unimplemented planning permission on the site (Ref: P/17073/005) ('permitted scheme'). However, in the interests of clarity, and as I have considered the impact of the proposed development as a whole, I have used the description provided on the appeal form and the appeal statement, which is consistent with the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The host comprises a mid-terrace, two storey property. To the front, its form and style is broadly similar to the other properties in this short cul-de-sac, thus

- giving the streetscene a fairly cohesive appearance. However, I observed that the dwellings on Litchum Spur and on adjacent roads display considerably greater diversity to the rear as a result of extensions and alterations.
5. In particular, there are large rear extensions at 5, 9, 12, 15 and 19 Litchum Spur, and many others on Oatlands Drive and Waterbeach Road which are clearly visible from the host, and from other properties nearby. Some span the whole of the respective property's rear elevation. They give the rear faces of the buildings an eclectic form. Whilst some may have been permitted under a previous development plan, or may not have planning permission, they nonetheless form part of the area's established character.
 6. The Slough Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 ('SPD') states at DP3 that extensions should be subordinate, and in proportion, to the original house. However, having regard to its Sections 5 and 7, the advice that two storey extensions should typically be no more than half its width appears to relate to side extensions.
 7. The proposal includes a predominantly double storey rear extension, whose form and appearance would be the same as the permitted scheme. However, whilst the permitted scheme had a single storey extension to the side of that two storey section, this proposal would have another two storey projection, with a single storey section beyond.
 8. The roof of the proposed two storey extensions would be set well down compared to the original building, in accordance with the advice in the SPD. One would also be much shorter than the other, thus helping to break up the scheme's mass, and providing it with some articulation.
 9. Nevertheless, as none of the host's existing rear wall would be visible, and given its scale, the scheme would not appear entirely subordinate to the original building, and it would not fully comply with the advice in the SPD. However, in this location to the rear, it would not harm the streetscene. Moreover, the scheme would be faced in matching materials, and given the diverse rear faces of nearby buildings, viewed from surrounding properties it would not harm the character and appearance of the host or the area.
 10. The scheme would not therefore conflict with Policies H15 and EN1 of The Local Plan for Slough (2004) or Core Policy 8 of the Slough Core Strategy 2006-2026 (2008). Amongst other things, these set out that development should be of a high standard of design, which is compatible, or in keeping, with the existing property and its surroundings with regard to matters such as scale, materials, massing, bulk and visual impact. Neither would it conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's environmental objective.
 11. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of good design, a condition is also necessary requiring that the development be faced in matching materials. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR