

PLANNING COMMITTEE **13th October 2010**

THE FOLLOWING ALTERATIONS AND AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN
RECEIVED SINCE THE PLANNING OFFICER'S REPORT WAS
PRESENTED TO MEMBERS

AGENDA ITEM 4

P/14368/002 – Land adjacent to and rear of 14 Upper Lees Road, Slough

1. Condition 6, page 13, requires the implementation of a landscaping scheme, which has already been submitted to the Council. This scheme has been reviewed and it has been decided that in order to provide more soft landscaping on the northern boundary, the scheme should be amended. The following condition is therefore recommended as a replacement:

No development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a detailed landscaping and tree planting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme should include the trees and shrubs to be retained and/or removed and the type, density, position and planting heights of new trees and shrubs.

The approved scheme shall be carried out no later than the first planting season following completion of the development. Within a five year period following the implementation of the scheme, if any of the new or retained trees or shrubs should die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, then they shall be replaced in the next planting season with another of the same species and size as agreed in the landscaping tree planting scheme by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and accordance with Policy EN3 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

2. A further objection has been received from the owners of 14 Upper Lees Road and 93 Farnham Lane, raising the following additional objections:
 - The rooflines of new houses are much higher than existing houses;
 - A “door opening” is visible above the 3m boundary wall;
 - Questioning why the development has been allowed to continue.

In response to these objections, it can be reported that the ridgeline of the new houses are 0.6m higher than the existing house at 14 Upper Lees Road and 1.2m higher than the properties in Doddsfields Road. The nearest property in Farnham Lane is 30m to the north of the new dwellings and the photograph submitted by the complainant illustrates that the existing dwellings in Upper Lees Road is more visible than the new dwellings. The “door opening” is in fact a ground floor toilet window, which has already been installed with obscure glazing and a top opener only. This window will therefore not result in a loss of privacy for the occupiers of Farnham Lane. In light of the fact that the dwellings have already been approved at a previous Planning Committee Meeting, it would have been unreasonable to serve a “stop notice” on a development that the Council has previously found acceptable.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

AGENDA ITEM 5

P/00864/050 – Quality Hotel Heathrow, London Road, Langley, Slough

It has been noted that the conditions to be varied have been moved to numbers 11 and 12 on the Officers Report due to the deletion of the time condition that is no longer required as the works have commenced on site. It is therefore proposed to rearrange the conditions to ensure that those the subject of this application remain as conditions 12 and 13.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

AGENDA ITEM 6

P/09639/003 – 135 Upton Court Road, Slough

On the front page (page 53), the Officer's recommendation should read refuse and enforce. This also applies to paragraph 18.1 of the Officer's report on page 10.

5 No. letters of support have been received from the following addresses: 62, 156 Upton Court Road; 19 Marlborough Road; 61 Stile Road & 51 Courtland Avenue. The main points raised are as follows:

- The sloping roof looks good and is better for security than a flat roof, has no material impact and is likely to be more water tight.
Response: The roof as approved in relation to the previous planning permission reference P/09639/002, was for a hipped and pitched roof with crown top. This reflected the design of the main roof and is not an uncommon approach in such scenarios.

- The gate facing onto Blenheim Road is not overly dominant and overbearing in the street.

Response: The general character of the surrounding area is one of low front walls and minimal enclosure to frontages. The site is located within a Residential Area of exceptional Character, where the need to protect the existing character of the area is important. The applicant has in any event agreed to set back the gates further into the site which addresses the issue.

- A reduction in the height of the boundary fence is unreasonable as an exiting car will have a view of pedestrians when the gate is open. A 1.8m high fence exists on another property on the corner of Marlborough Road and Blenheim Road and therefore a precedent is set.

Response: Not agreed a driver sitting in a car would have nil visibility until he/she is level with the fence, by which time the front or rear of the car would already be across the footway. The applicant has in any event agreed to set back the gates further into the site, to construct a curved wall and reduce the height of the side fence with 1 Blenheim Road which will improve the driver's visibility.

- A requirement for the alterations to be made within a period of 6 weeks is unreasonable.

Response: The 6 week period stipulated by Planning Committee was for further negotiations to take place with a further 3 months for compliance.

A letter of support has also been received from Councillor Dillon who as well as raising issues with regards the sloping roof, as discussed above, also states that it should be noted that the neighbours seem to hold no objections.

Response: Although neighbour consultations are considered during the course of making a decision due regards also needs to be given to National and Local Planning Policy and as shown in the Officers Report it is considered that these proposals fail to meet the policy for the reasons stated below.

Since the Officer's report was written there have been further discussions with the applicant in relation to reasons for refusal 2 and 3 as set out in the Officer's report. As stated in the Officer's report three options for gates and boundary fence were proposed, none of which were acceptable to the highway engineers. However, through further negotiations the highway engineers have accepted option 3 which would constitute an improvement in terms of pedestrian visibility. It would have the added advantage that the gates would be set back into the site and would be less dominant in the street scene. The details of option 3 will be displayed at the Meeting.

On the basis that Option 3 is acceptable to members it is recommended that reasons for refusal 2 and 3 are withdrawn and that the applicant be given 3 months from the date of this Meeting to implement the proposals in accordance with the proposals submitted. However should the applicant fail to comply with this requirement that a planning enforcement notice be served, at the end of the compliance period.

Since the Officer's report was written there have been no further discussions relating to the proposals for the additional roof slope which the applicant proposals to treat with tile hanging on the Upton Court Road frontage. As such Officer's maintain their objection to the retention of this additional element. As such reason for refusal no. 1 remains.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

1) Reason for refusal No. 1 to remain and that Officers be authorised to serve a planning enforcement notice seeking its removal

2) In the event that the applicant does not implement the proposals for a repositioning of the vehicular access gate and removal/changes to the boundary fence in accordance with deposited plan SK-001 dated September 2010 and received on 29th September 2010 within a compliance period of 3 months from the date of this Meeting that Officers be authorised to serve a further planning enforcement notice.

AGENDA ITEM 7

**P/10033/016 – Colnbrook Landfill Site, Sutton Lane,
Colnbrook, Slough**

Letter received from Biffa agent applying for temporary footpath diversion until 31st December 2012 to be consistent with reimposition of Condition No. 44 regarding footpaths. He further confirms that the request for the change from a permissive right of way to public right of way has been submitted to the landowner and the reply is outstanding.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION