



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/23/3323905

43 Richards Way, Slough, SL1 5TR

- 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 M Farooq against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/15794/003, dated 14 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of garage in front of house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of garage in front of house at 43 Richards Way, Slough, SL1 5TR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/15794/003, dated 14 February 2023, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing house.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan 1; Block Plan 1; 43/Ric/02; 43/Ric/03.
 - 4) The garage hereby permitted shall only be used to accommodate cars which are used ancillary to the enjoyment of the dwelling-house on the site and shall not be used for any trade or business purposes; nor adapted as habitable space.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2 storey detached house set back from the road and footway behind metal railings and a hedge, within a modern housing estate. It shares a dropped kerb and access from the road with the neighbouring house. The estate layout and building lines vary. Neighbouring properties are similarly set back with paved forecourts, other houses nearby have much shallower front gardens without boundary features. Where nearby estate roads branch off

Richards Way, corner properties have side and garden walls facing close to the public highway. On the opposite side of the road, houses back on to Richards Way behind a row of mature trees.

4. The proposed garage would sit forward of the house close to the boundary fence and footway. The Council is concerned that it would appear incongruous and dominate the street scene. However, 37 Richards Way has a double garage close to its front boundary wall. Because No 37 is located on a bend in the road it forms a backdrop to views of the appeal site when approaching it from the roundabout at the junction of Paines Close and Richards Way. Although it predates the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (SPD), which states that generally outbuildings to the front of houses are unacceptable, it nonetheless sets the context for the proposed development.
5. The proposed garage would be subordinate in scale to the main house and fall below the 4 metre height restriction set out in the SPD. The front and side boundary hedges would reduce its visual impact and it would not appear out of place or dominant in the context of the garage at No 37 and the varied building lines nearby. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or wider street scene and would comply with most of the requirements of Policies EX38, EX39 and EX43 of the SPD, Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and Saved Policies EN1 and H15 of the Local Plan for Slough (2004) which seek to ensure that outbuildings are a suitable scale and do not detract from the appearance of the host house or have a significant adverse impact on the street scene.

Conditions

6. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans to provide certainty and imposed a condition regarding materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. I also accept the Council's concern that if the proposal were to be used as a unit of accommodation or for commercial purposes the lack of privacy from shared use of the garden and drive would harm the living conditions of occupants of both the main house and the proposal. It is therefore necessary to impose a condition preventing its use for ancillary accommodation or commercial purposes.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR