

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

DATE: 26th July 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 Democratic Services on request. These decisions are also monitored in the Quarterly Performance Report and Annual Review.

WARD(S)

ALL

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Appeal</u>	<u>Decision</u>
P/15219/000	<p>241 Long Furlong Drive</p> <p>ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE AND PART TWO STOREY REAR, PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS WITH PITCHED ROOFS AND FRONT PORCH WITH PITCHED ROOF.</p> <p><i>Reason for refusal:</i> <i>The proposed two storey side and first floor rear extension by reason of their overall width and scale are not subordinate to or in proportion to the original house. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008, Policies DP3 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, January 2010, Policies H15, EN1 & EN2 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough: 2004.</i></p> <p>The inspector agreed that the proposal would be fairly bold in terms of scale and mass and would not follow the subordinate approach but in this instance felt the sizeable plot of the end terrace could take an additional mass and not look unduly cramped. The inspector concluded that the proposed development would not lead to visual detriment to the host property or wider area.</p> <p>The inspector also noted that the guidance was not so firm on the question of subordination when the case revolves around an end terrace property.</p>	<p>Appeal allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>14th June 2012</p>
P/15223/000	<p>6 Dariel Close</p> <p>CONVERSION OF ATTACHED GARAGE INTO A HABITABLE ROOM AND INSERTION OF A WINDOW AT THE FRONT</p> <p><i>Reason for refusal:</i> <i>The loss of the garage fails to provide adequate off street car</i></p>	<p>Appeal Allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>14th June 2012</p>

	<p><i>parking in accordance with the adopted Slough Borough Council standards and if permitted is likely to lead to additional on street parking or to the obstruction of the footway/access to the detriment of highway safety and convenience. The development is contrary to Policies H17 and T2 of the adopted Local Plan for Slough, 2004; Core Policies 7 and 8 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 Development Plan Document, December 2008; the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010; and PPS1 and PPG13.</i></p> <p>The Inspector did not sense that the parking provision was stressed given the on-site, street and courtyard parking within the small cluster of homes in this particular part of the estate and as such concluded that the proposed development would not lead to problems of highway safety or convenience.</p> <p>The Inspector also underlined that this decision should not be read as a precedent for conversions of garages on this estate. In this particular instance given the physical form of the property and its immediate surroundings, he was satisfied with the proposal in its own right.</p>	
P/15123/001	<p>47 Gilmore Close</p> <p>ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION WITH MONO PITCHED ROOF.</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>15th June 2012</p>
P/14916/002	<p>67 Salisbury Avenue</p> <p>ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR, PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY ATTACHED GARAGE AT THE SIDE AND PART FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION WITH PITCHED ROOFS.</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>15th June 2012</p>
P/04213/005	<p>202 Burnham Lane</p> <p>ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS WITH PITCHED ROOFS</p> <p><i>Reason for refusal :</i> <i>The proposal results in an unacceptable combined bulk and mass of extensions which would have a detrimental impact on the wider character of the Residential Area of Exceptional Character in which the property is located. In addition the extensions create an irregularly shaped Master Bedroom which is indicative of poor design and is out of character with the original dwelling. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies: H12, H15, EN1 and EN2 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004; Core Policies 1, 8 and 9 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006-2026, Development Plan Document December 2008; The Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010; and PPS1.</i></p>	<p>Appeal Allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>15th June 2012</p>

	<p>The Inspector thought the property has already been substantially altered by reason of the two storey side, single storey rear extensions and the conservatory, as he already judged the string of development to exceed the SPD Guidelines in terms of width, depth and design of roof form, however the Inspector thought that the front of the property does contribute to the street scene. The decision under Ref: P/04213/004 includes extensions at first floor and ground floor level, this application P/04213/005 would design out the flats and shallow pitched roofs, with all being replaced by pitched roofs, with pitched roofs being more in keeping with the character and appearance of the property leading to a higher quality of design. Because of the design and massing of the appeal scheme and the additions to the original property, particularly to the rear, the Inspector thought the proposed development would be in character with the property retaining the appearance of a large detached dwelling, thereby allowing the appeal.</p>	
P/02702/013	<p>Land to the r/o 10-18 Chalvey Road West</p> <p>DEMOLITION OF STORAGE UNIT AND ERECTION OF 1 NO. ONE BEDROOM TERRACE AND 2 NO. THREE BEDROOM TERRACES</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>21st June 2012</p>
P/07477/002	<p>149 Bader Gardens</p> <p>ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>3rd July 2012</p>
P/13898/002	<p>38 Downs Road</p> <p>ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH GABLE ROOF INCORPORATING A FRONT DORMER WINDOW WITH GABLE ROOF AND CONVERSION OF THE INTEGRAL GARAGE INTO A HABITABLE ROOM. ERECTION OF A PART SINGLE STOREY / PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH HIPPED AND PITCHED ROOF, THE SINGLE STOREY ELEMENT WITH MONO PITCHED ROOF INCORPORATING A SKY LIGHT</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>3rd July 2012</p>
P/15097/001	<p>11 Olivia Drive</p> <p>EXTENSION TO EXISTING GARAGE AND CONVERSION OF EXISTING GARAGE TO HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION. ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY GLAZED LINK WITH PITCHED ROOF CONNECTING THE EXTENDED GARAGE TO THE REAR OF THE MAIN HOUSE.</p> <p><i>Reasons for refusal:</i> <i>The proposed rear extension will reduce the area of the retained rear amenity space to a level which would not provide sufficient rear amenity space to meet the requirements for a 4 bedroom house contrary to Planning Policy Statement 1, Core Policy 8 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</i></p>	<p>Appeal allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>3rd July 2012</p>

Slough, 2004 and The Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010.

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the site is capable of providing on site car parking in accordance with the Council's car parking standards (3 car parking spaces). A failure to provide the necessary car parking on site is likely to lead to additional on street car parking or to the obstruction of the access to the detriment of highway safety and convenience contrary to Core Policy 7 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008, Policies H17 and T2 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough, 2004 and The Adopted Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document, 2010.

Both parties agree that originally the house was built as a 3 bed roomed house, with the applicant stating the 3rd bedroom had a floor area of 4sqm, so was integrated into another bedroom, therefore the proposal would give the property 3 good sized bedrooms. The local authority argued that it would be a 4 bed roomed property and that adequate amenity space and car parking spaces with the loss of the garage could not be accommodated on site. However the Inspector acknowledged that the amenity space is small; below that accepted in the guidelines for a 3 bed roomed dwelling. However he believes the space available is of good quality planting with an attractive patio area and is capable of providing day to day needs of the occupiers of the property. Regarding the lack of sufficient car parking spaces; the Inspector stated that standards are contained in the SPD Guidelines, however these can be relaxed if the street is capable of taking 'on street' car parking. The Inspector thought that 2 off street car parking space could be achieved in the existing driveway and the street was capable of taking any shortfall, thereby allowing the appeal.