

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 25th October 2011

PART 1 FOR INFORMATION

Planning Appeal Decisions

Set out below are summaries of the appeal decisions received recently from the Planning Inspectorate on appeals against the Council's decisions. Copies of the full decision letters are available from the Members Support Section on request. These decisions are also monitored in the Quarterly Performance Report and Annual Review.

WARD(S)

ALL

Ref	Appeal	Decision
P/10995/001	<p>39 Mirador Crescent</p> <p>RETENTION OF FRONT PORCH WITH CANOPY WITH MONO PITCHED ROOF</p> <p>The development was a front porch and canopy with a mono pitched roof. At the time of the planning application, the development was in situ. The application was therefore retrospective.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority refused the application on the grounds that the development, by reason of its design, size, and bulk, was an overly dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene which was detrimental to the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.</p> <p>The Inspector acknowledged that the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document limits front extensions to porches, and that front canopies will not normally be permitted because they are considered to be overly dominant forms of development which are out of keeping with the character and appearance of the original house. Although, it was noted that canopies may be permitted where such extensions form the predominant character of the street.</p> <p>The Inspector observed that there were examples of full width canopies in the surrounding area. Taking a different view to that of the Local Planning Authority, the Inspector considered that canopies were prominent and established features of the streetscene in an area where the original coherent character and appearance of the short terraces of dwellings has been eroded. On this basis, the Inspector opined that the proposal was not incongruous or visually intrusive, or a dominant form of development which would be incompatible with the character of the streetscene and the surrounding residential area. The appeal was allowed.</p>	<p>Appeal Allowed</p> <p>31st August 2011</p>

P/05655/001	28 Wexham Road ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH PITCHED ROOF AND GABLE END, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH FLAT ROOF AND ALTERATIONS TO MAIN ROOF. CONVERSION OF EXTENDED HOUSE TO PROVIDE 1 NO.X ONE BEDROOM FLAT AND 1 NO. X TWO BEDROOM FLAT	Appeal Dismissed 6 th September 2011
P/10793/004	77 Belgrave Road CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING OUTBUILDING FROM STORAGE / GYM TO HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION TO BE USED BY FAMILY MEMBERS. REMOVAL OF FRONT BAY WINDOW	Appeal Dismissed Costs refused 13 th September 2011