

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 5th September 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/15140/002	<p>27 St. Johns Road</p> <p>APPLICATION FOR AN INFILL REAR EXTENSION WITH GLAZED MONO-PITCHED ROOF</p> <p>1- The proposed infill rear extension would result in an elongated rear extension along the boundary of no. 29 St. Johns Road. The proposal therefore by virtue of its depth would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the adjoining property at No. 29 St. Johns Road contrary to Core Policy 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008, Policies H15 and EN1 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004 and the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010.</p> <p>2- The proposed infill rear extension by virtue of its poor design when incorporated with the approved plan under the planning permission ref. P/15140/001, dated 5/10/2011 would result in an undesirable rear extension which would be out of keeping with the original Victorian character of the dwelling contrary to Core Policies 4 and 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008, Policies H15, and EN1 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004 and The Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January.</p> <p>Living Conditions</p> <p>1. A semi-detached property with a substantial single storey rear extension and large dormer window. To the rear of no. 29 there are 2 windows at ground floor level, a patio area and garden.</p>	<p>Appeal Allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>18th June 2012</p>

2. A single storey rear extension has been approved under planning permission ref. P/15140/001 to the full width of rear projection and has created an infill area between the boundary of no. 29 and subject rear extension. The proposed development is to infill the gap.
3. The proposed development would result in a total addition to the original dwelling along the boundary with no. 29 which would be greater than the SPD's maximum depth. One of the matters identified in the SPD concerning the length of an extension is the impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents, including matters such as daylight and outlook.
4. The height of the appeal scheme's flank wall would not be materially taller than the existing boundary wall and would possess a shallow pitch roof. Accordingly, by reason of height, the proposed extension would not adversely affect the levels of daylight or sunlight reaching the neighbouring property, patio area and garden when compared to the current situation. Further, adverse overshadowing would not be caused either.
 - a. When taken together with the existing rear extension, the length of built development along this shared boundary would increase. However, there would be a material difference between the height and massing of the existing extension's flank wall and the proposed development. By reason of these differences, whether in isolation or taking into account the cumulative impact, the appeal would result in neither an overbearing form of development along this boundary nor a material change to the outlook of the occupiers of No. 29.
 - b. Although its depth would be greater than the SPD's guideline, it is judged that the appeal scheme would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Character and Appearance

- c. Core policy 8 of Slough LDF, policy EN1, EN2, H15 and the adopted Guideline require high quality of design and compatibility with original property.
- d. The extension being at the rear would not affect the property's current contribution to the character and appearance of the street scene. The original Victorian character of the property has been lost through rear extensions and appearance has been significantly altered.
- e. The approved rear extension would further erode the character and appearance of the property. It is judged that the scale, height and design of the proposed development would not cause further unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the property.
- f. Accordingly, on this matter, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the property and, as such, would not conflict the relevant Policies and Guidelines.

	<p>Other Matters</p> <p>Little weight has been given to the personal circumstances of the family with regards to their health and need for supervision.</p> <p>Little weight has been given to the example of other development in the area as none of them are directly comparable to the subject proposal.</p>	
P/11741/002	<p>55 Oldway Lane</p> <p>DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY ATTACHED HOUSE</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>17th July 2012</p>
Enforcement	<p>139 Parlaunt Road</p> <p>Unauthorised erection of a front canopy.</p>	<p>Appeal Allowed and the enforcement notice as corrected is quashed.</p> <p>Costs Allowed</p> <p>17th July 2012</p>
P/15014/001	<p>2 Carrington Road and 122 Belgrave Road</p> <p>ERECTION OF A THREE BEDROOM DWELLING</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>24th July 2012</p>
P/15195/001	<p>8 Quaves Road</p> <p>ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH HIPPED AND PITCHED ROOF, ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION WITH PART MONO PITCHED / PART FLAT ROOF FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE. ERECTION OF A REAR OUTBUILDING WITH HIPPED AND PITCHED ROOF, FORMATION OF A VEHICULAR ACCESS ONTO BUCKLAND AVENUE</p> <p>Appeal against Condition.</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>Award of costs refused.</p> <p>2nd August 2012</p>