



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2023

by R Lawrence MRTPI, BSc (Hons), PGDip (TP)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/23/3322820

77 Harrow Road, Slough SL3 8SH

- 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 Amrik Singh against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/17249/009, dated 7 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2023.
- The development proposed is described as "Retrospective application for the construction of a single storey front extension and a part two storey, part single storey rear extension to No. 77 Harrow Road and retrospective construction of an attached 3no. bedroom house".

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey front extension and a part two storey, part single storey rear extension to No. 77 Harrow Road and retrospective construction of an attached 3no. bedroom house at 77 Harrow Road, Slough SL3 8SH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/17249/009, dated 7 March 2023, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: As-Built Site Plan_(P-)01, As-Built Plans_(P-)02, As-Built Roof Plan_(P-)03, As-Built Elevations_(P-)04 and Design and Access Statement_ 77&77A Harrow Road Slough (prepared by TVR Design Consultancy and dated 08.03.2023).

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. The description of development on the planning application sets out the background to the submission of the application, together with supporting comments, rather than describing the development itself. I have therefore used the description of development set out on the appellant's appeal form in the above banner heading.
3. The development had already taken place at the time of the site visit. There are some differences between the development constructed on site and the submitted plans. These include differences in the fenestration, the access and a structure in the rear amenity space of the property known as No 77a. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the appeal scheme on the basis of the submitted plans.
4. My attention has been drawn to a number of permissions and Certificates of Lawful Development which are relevant to the appeal proposal. The effect of these, is that the majority of the appeal scheme already benefits from permission. This is reflected in the Council's sole reason for refusal which

relates to the effect of the front extension. The main issue is therefore the effect of the front extension on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two storey, former end of terrace property, which has been extended with the addition of a further attached dwelling. The area is residential and characterised by terraced housing which is generally of a similar form and appearance. The housing is broken up by various pedestrianised areas which in some cases include attractive areas of open green space. One such green space is located to the front of the appeal site.
6. The front extension, whilst single storey, is of a significant scale. The height of the extension sits just below the eaves of the first-floor window, and also extends the full width of the property. Front extensions on neighbouring houses are often similar in terms of their height. However, these are of a much smaller width and a reduced scale overall. In this case, the main front elevation of No 77 is stepped back from its neighbour, No 75. The depth of the front extension at single storey level aligns with the front elevation of No 75, and therefore visually blends in with the stepped pattern of the row of houses. Although the width is significant, the single storey nature of the extension avoids it appearing unduly prominent within its setting. The set back of corner dwellings is a characteristic seen in the wider area and this is also replicated in the terrace to the north. In this case, the retention of the set back at first floor level is sufficient to reflect this pattern.
7. The overall level of amenity space has been drawn to my attention, as the appeal scheme has reduced both the front and rear amenity space. The reason for refusal refers to Policy H14 of the Local Plan for Slough 2004 (LP), which requires the provision of an appropriate level of amenity space. The Council's submissions indicate that this policy is relevant insofar as the reduced amenity space is harmful to the character of the area and cumulatively results in overdevelopment. The front extension, in combination with the other additions to the property including the addition of a new dwelling, result in development sitting much closer to the site boundaries and a reduction in amenity space to the front and rear. Although the space is reduced, the amenity space remains comparable in size to other front and rear amenity areas, such to avoid a harmful effect by way of overdevelopment.
8. My attention has been drawn to an appeal decision relating to a property on Brackenforde. That appeal related to a front extension and was dismissed on the grounds of the effect on the character and appearance of the area. Although that site is geographically close to the current appeal site, the context is notably different, relating to a detached chalet bungalow located centrally in a uniform row of similar detached houses in an area which exhibits a higher degree of openness. In comparison, the current appeal site is an end of terrace property which is enclosed by boundary hedging along its frontage.
9. Paras 3.2 and 3.3 of the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (RESPD) require front extensions to respect the character of the street scene and the design and appearance of the original house. The guidance goes on to state that front extensions which span the entire width of a property of dwelling will not normally be permitted. The inclusion of the term 'normally' indicates this is not an absolute requirement in

all cases. In this case, the setting immediately around the site is such that the front extension does not lead to an adverse effect on the surrounding pattern of development.

10. In conclusion, whilst there is a small degree of conflict with the RESPD, this does not result in any material harm in this context. Therefore, the effect of the front extension on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area is acceptable. The proposal therefore accords with Policies H14, H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan (2004) and Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy (2008). These policies, insofar as relevant, require that development is of a high-quality design, respects its location and is compatible with its surroundings, including in terms of scale, height and mass and provides an appropriate level of amenity space.

Other Matters

11. In addition to concerns about character and appearance, which I have addressed above, third parties have raised concerns about discrepancies between the development as constructed and the submitted plans, the retrospective nature of the proposal and the effect on car parking.
12. It is understandable that the retrospective nature of the appeal scheme together with the discrepancies with the submitted plans are causes for concern and frustration amongst third parties. The role of this appeal however, is not a punitive one, and the appeal has been assessed based on the merits of the case.
13. In respect of car parking, there is no additional effect on car parking over and above that approved pursuant to the planning permission for the construction of a rear extension and additional dwelling¹ P/17249/002. The front extension has not resulted in the loss of a parking area and there is no increase in cars. In considering the effect on parking more widely, there is a high dependency on, and high levels of, on-street car parking. This is however an existing position, which the addition of one additional dwelling is unlikely to unacceptably add to.
14. As such, there is no clear justification to depart from the Council's position, who raise no objection in respect of car parking and which does not lead me to find otherwise than that the proposed development is acceptable.

Conditions

15. The Council has requested that a plan numbers condition be imposed in the event of my allowing the appeal. This is necessary in the interests of clarity. As the appeal scheme has already been constructed and found acceptable, it is not necessary to impose any further conditions in this case.

¹ Council's reference P/17249/002

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the development accords with the development plan and there are no other material considerations which warrant a different decision. The appeal is therefore allowed.

R Lawrence

INSPECTOR