



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2025

by **A Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/24/3350532

105 Langley Road, Slough, Berkshire SL37DY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sukhpal Sran against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/18064/004.
 - The development proposed is replacement of the existing dwelling with the newly constructed house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Sukhpal Sran against Slough Borough Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the effect on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site currently accommodates a detached dwelling on the corner of Langley Road and Mina Avenue. The surrounding area is predominantly urban and residential. The appeal site, as well as the detached dwellings on the opposite side of the road and east of the site, are designated as being within an Area of Exceptional Residential Character (AERC). The row of terraced dwellings on the opposite corner of Mina Avenue are not within the AERC.
5. The existing house is modest in its scale and proportions and includes a flat roofed garage to its side closest to Mina Avenue. It also has a small flat roofed rear extension.
6. A plan was provided with the appeal which shows the footprint of the existing dwelling, the proposed development and a previous scheme¹ which has planning permission. This shows that the proposed dwelling would be 8 metres deeper than the main part of the existing house at ground floor level, and 4.1 metres deeper at first floor level. The development would also be a little wider than the existing

¹ Ref P/18064/003

house at ground floor level by abutting the west boundary, and around 2.4 metres wider at first floor level.

7. When seen from the front, the proposal would be generally comparable to other dwellings on Langley Road in terms of its width, height and design. This includes Nos 109, 110 and 112 which are all in close proximity of the site and are large detached properties which substantially fill the width of their plots.
8. However due to the site's corner position, its side elevation would also be prominent. From here, the total depth of the proposed dwelling would appear excessive and would be significantly greater than the existing house. In particular, its bulk at first floor level, where it would be around 12 metres deep and set back about a metre from the boundary, plus the roof connecting the front and rear gable ends, would render it dominant.
9. In the context of the other neighbouring properties, this excessive scale would appear incongruous. It would be considerably deeper than the terraced house on the opposite corner of Mina Avenue, and despite the fact that this terrace abuts the pavement and rises to a gable end, the greater depth of the proposal would mean it would be more dominating than that neighbouring terrace. Indeed there are no other corner properties nearby whose side elevations are as prominent or as dominant as that which the proposal would have; either being set further back from the pavements or not as deep.
10. There is some landscaping in the rear garden of the site which would hide views of the proposal from a few positions. However from directly to the side of the plot, and from positions in Langley Road to the west, the full scale of the development would be starkly apparent.
11. Consequently, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with policy EN1 of the Local Plan for Slough (2004) and Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy (2008) which together seek to ensure development respects its surroundings in terms of scale, visual impact, massing and bulk. It would also fail to accord with Local Plan policy H12 which requires replacement houses in the AERC to be in keeping with the design and character of dwellings in the vicinity.
12. I note the planning permission for a replacement dwelling on the site. Whilst those plans show the previous scheme is also larger than the existing dwelling, it would not be as large as the appeal proposal which would be closer to the Mina Avenue boundary at ground floor and in part at first floor level, would be deeper at first floor level, and would incorporate a rear facing gable end instead of a hipped roof. These combine to result in a greater massing above ground floor level when seen from the side, despite the slight reduction in width at first floor level. The current proposal is therefore materially different from the previous scheme.
13. I also understand that prior approval has been granted to extend the existing dwelling by 8 metres as permitted development². Although this is comparable to the depth of the proposal at ground floor level, as it only relates to a ground floor extension it is not comparable to the proposal in terms of the first floor and roof levels.

² Ref Y/18064/002

14. The appellant has also drawn my attention to other new dwellings elsewhere along Langley Road and Mina Avenue. But few appear to be on corner plots like the appeal proposal, so have little bearing on my considerations.

Highway safety

15. It is understood that the proposed four bedroom house would generate a need for three parking spaces, as set out in the Council's parking standards. The existing plans illustrate three cars parked at the front of the site as well as the existing garage. The proposal would retain this space for parking, with the garage removed.
16. Although the space in front of the house would be small, I consider it would be large enough for three cars to park and, due to the open porch feature at the front of the house, would allow sufficient space for residents to enter and leave the house comfortably.
17. The access to this parking area is via a dropped kerb on Langley Road. There is a dropped kerb pedestrian crossing with tactile paving on Mina Avenue which is separated from the vehicular access to the site by just one full height kerbstone. Although vehicles entering and leaving the site may run over the tactile paving, it is considered that access to and from the site could be achieved without doing so. Indeed, as the existing parking area would be sufficient for the three parking spaces required, no changes to this area including to the boundary wall, the street sign or its drainage, would necessarily be required, and none are shown on the plans.
18. The development would result in an additional bedroom on the site. Any increase in vehicle movements resulting from this would be minimal given the site would remain in use as a family house and there would be no increase in the number of parking spaces provided.
19. Overall, the proposal would not unacceptably compromise highway safety. It would therefore accord with Core Strategy Policy 7 and Local Plan policy T2 which together seek to ensure that the amount of parking is appropriate to its location and scale.

Other Matters

20. I understand that the property suffers from crime and antisocial behaviour in terms of the alley at the side of the property. Also it is recognised that the design of the previously approved scheme would not suit their needs. However eliminating such antisocial behaviour could be achieved by other designs, and such personal circumstances should not justify the current design which would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.
21. The appellant has provided a copy of the Council's Annual Monitoring Report from 2023 which states the Council have only a 2.6 year supply of housing land. The Council have not disputed this. Moreover, the Council's Housing Delivery Test figure published in December 2024 is 58% which would trigger the application of paragraph 11d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') notwithstanding what their current housing land supply figure may be.

22. Paragraph 11d) advises that permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits having regard to the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
23. The development would be of very little benefit to the Council's supply of housing given it involves no net increase in units and only one additional bedroom. Similarly though there is no dispute that the site is in a sustainable location, this would be of no additional benefit as there is no net increase in dwellings. For the same reason there would be no greater effective use of the land.
24. There would however be conflict with paragraphs 135 and 139 of the Framework which require that development is sympathetic to local character and reflects local design policies which, as set out above, the proposal fails to do. This is an adverse impact which carries substantial weight.
25. Overall, I consider the adverse impacts of the development would significantly outweigh the limited benefits when considered against the Framework as a whole.

Conclusion

26. Although I find there would be no harm to highway safety, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and so would fail to accord with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.
27. Therefore for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Owen

INSPECTOR