

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 28th March 2012

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/06883/002	<p>2 The Link</p> <p>ERECTION OF AN ATTACHED TWO STOREY THREE BEDROOM HOUSE TOGETHER WITH PARKING FOR BOTH EXISTING AND PROPOSED DWELLING</p> <p>The Appeal Inspector identified the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>The Appeal Inspector referred to an earlier appeal decision which was dismissed but was material to this case, but noting that, the previous scheme had a greater mass than that currently proposed, and was of a significantly different form and design.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Inspector decided that on balance he considered that the revised scheme had successfully addressed the previous Inspector's concerns on the issues of local character, appearance and openness. Additionally, the removal of the unsightly garage on the site represented a significant visual benefit.</p>	<p>Appeal Allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>5th January 2012</p>
P/05952/004	<p>188 Burnham Lane</p> <p>ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION, A PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION ALL WITH PITCHED ROOFS</p> <p>The Inspector allowed the appeal and thought that the 2 storey side extension was in keeping and subordinate to the host dwelling more so than the existing single storey side extension. There is sufficient gap between the dwellings not to cause visual terracing. The two storey rear extension and single storey rear extension would correspond with the main dwelling and not be visible from the street scene. The Inspector also thought the design of the extensions was sensitively designed to be subordinate and harmonize with the style and appearance of the house even though they did not comply with guidelines and policy given the application site falls within a Residential Area of Exceptional Character.</p>	<p>Appeal Allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>19th January 2012</p>

<p>P/15135/000</p>	<p>60a Upton Park</p> <p>ERECTION OF FRONT PORCH WITH HIPPED ROOF, FRONT EXTENSION WITH MONO-PITCHED ROOF, CIRCULAR BAY WINDOW AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH MONO PITCHED ROOF. INSERTION OF GROUND FLOOR FLANK WINDOW AND CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO HABITABLE ROOM</p> <p>Planning permission was refused on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The proposed front extension when combined with the existing forward projection with full width mono-pitched roof by virtue of its design, scale, bulk and visual dominance represents an overly dominant feature which detracts from the character and appearance of the original house and that of the general street scene and would create a negative impact on the conservation area across Upton Park contrary to Core Policies 8 and 9 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008, Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough, 2004; Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, 2010. <p>The Inspector allowed the appeal and concluded that the main issue was:</p> <p>The effect of the proposed alterations and extensions on the character and appearance of the host property and its setting in the street scene, including views from the Conservation Area around Upton Park opposite the site.</p> <p>And the reasons for supporting the appeal are as follow:</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is a detached house in a frontage of similar two storey properties of different designs. Immediately opposite the site is Upton Park and a more substantial form of buildings in a gothic style. 2. The single storey extension proposed at the rear of the property is not objected to by the Council and the appeal officer agree. 3. The proposed changes to the front elevation are seen in the context of the design of the house itself. The gable roof of the house is believed to be in contrast with most of the neighbouring houses. The neighbouring houses also are believed to have architectural embellishments in the form of projecting bay windows and/or porches. This results in the front elevation of the appeal site property being relatively bland. 4. The proposal would introduce a more elaborate front porch in the centre of the frontage and ground floor bay windows 	<p>Appeal allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>31st January 2012</p>
--------------------	---	---

	<p>either side of the doorway. Although the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) "Residential Extensions Guidelines" generally advises against a mono pitch roof across the full width of a house, as a matter of judgement, I consider that, in this case, the proposal would help add visual interest to the frontage, be an architectural improvement to the property and would aid its contribution to the street scene rather than harm it. The work would also improve the aspect of the property when viewed from the Conservation Area.</p> <p>5. Out of the 4 conditions recommended by the Council, condition No.1 is considered reasonable and necessary and is amended to disallow addition of any additional doors too. Conditions 2, 3 and 4 are not imposed as the appeal officer did not deem them necessary.</p>	
P/07211/003	<p>31 The Green</p> <p>RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR CONVERSION OF PROPERTY INTO SEPARATE DWELLINGS</p> <p>Planning permission was refused on grounds that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The dwelling created by the subdivision was unacceptable in principle as it did not create a family sized dwelling within an existing suburban residential area in line with Core Policy 4 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006-2026. 2. The floor space and private rear amenity space of the proposed dwelling were below Council Planning Policy minimum standards. <p>The Inspector concluded with respect to reason 1 for refusal that:</p> <p><i>"The new house is smaller than the minimum size for a family home defined in the Council's core strategy. Core policy 4 of the core strategy seeks to ensure a wide choice and mix of housing to meet local needs and reduce overcrowding by addressing the current shortage of family housing. As part of this approach, only limited infilling consisting of family houses is allowed in suburban residential area. Whilst the proposal would not meet this requirement, it would not decrease the number of family homes, or lead to the loss of development land suitable for an additional family home due to the restricted size and position of the site. In this particular case, therefore, the proposal would not be contrary to the objectives of core policy 4, but would make a positive, albeit modest, contribution to the supply of homes in the area."</i></p> <p>With respect to reason 2 for refusal the Inspector concluded:</p> <p><i>The Council has not referred to any minimum internal space standard for non family dwellings that it expects to be achieved....Whilst room sizes would be relatively small, all habitable rooms would have external windows and there would</i></p>	<p>Appeal allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>17th February 2012</p>

be appropriate internal circulation space.

The size of the back gardens would be restricted...the area usable as a garden would fall somewhat short of the council's minimum standards. However, this in itself would not cause living conditions to be unacceptable, particularly as this dwelling would be unlikely to be occupied by a family."