

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 29th November 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/07447/002	45 Thames Road ERECTION OF A FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION WITH PITCHED ROOF.	Appeal Dismissed 3 rd October 2012
P/13721/002	35 Mansel Close ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION WITH FLAT TOP PITCHED ROOF FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE	Appeal Dismissed 5 th October 2012
P/10434/007	1 Dashwood Close SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH PITCHED ROOF LINKING MAIN HOUSE WITH DETACHED GARAGE The Appeal Inspector concluded that there is one main issue in this appeal, that is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, the Council being concerned that the proposed extension, which would link the house with this garage, would have the undesirable effect of causing development within these two roads to merge together. In respect of this issue, the Appeal Inspector concluded that <i>the proposed extension would be a minor addition, set well back in relation to the garage. As such, it would be neither prominent nor dominant in the street scene. The existing garage, being significantly further forward, would largely screen views of the extension when approached along Upton Court Road from the west. When approached from the east, the garage would be the only projecting element, leaving the proposed extension as a clearly subservient and subsidiary structure. I therefore consider that the Council has over-stated the effect that the proposal would have. In particular, I am not persuaded that any significant undesirable merging, as alleged by the Council, would occur. This leads me to conclude that the proposed development would cause no significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.</i>	Appeal Allowed subject to conditions 5 th October 2012

P/15286/002	15a Windmill Road ERECTION OF A FRONT PORCH WITH PITCHED ROOF AND LOFT CONVERSION TO CREATE THIRD BEDROOM BY MEANS OF 2 NO. ROOF LIGHTS IN FRONT ROOF SLOPE The Inspector in his report stated the Council raised no objection to the front porch, which is agreed. However we saw the roof light in the loft bedroom as poor outlook for the habitable room. The Inspector saw the two bedrooms on the first floor as primary living rooms and the additional bedroom in the loft as a spare room or study agreeing the deficiency in outlook. The Inspector's opinion was given its perceived intermitted use as a study or spare room the deficiency in terms of outlook is considered within acceptable limits. The other appeal case mentioned by the Council was judged to be of little relevance, as each case must be assessed on its merits and was not before this Inspector for consideration.	Appeal Allowed subject to conditions 5th October 2012
P/08569/005	204 Burnham Lane ERECTION OF A FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION WITH FRONT FACING DORMER WINDOW, PART FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION / PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION	Appeal Dismissed 5 th October 2012
P/15281/000	22 Olivia Drive ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH PART PITCHED/PART FLAT ROOF	Appeal Dismissed 23 rd October 2012
P/03167/021	Wellington House, 20 Queensmere CHANGE OF USE OF PART OF FIRST FLOOR FROM OFFICE USE (CLASS B1) TO RESIDENTIAL (CLASS c3) AND TO PROVIDE 6 NO. STUDIO FLATS AND 2 NO. ONE BEDROOM FLATS	Appeal Dismissed 1 st November 2012
P/04900/003	302 Wexham Road ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, A PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION PART FLAT ROOF PART MONO PITCHED ROOF	Appeal Dismissed 6 th November 2012
P/07315/002	150 Granville Avenue ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR AND FRONT EXTENSION BOTH WITH PITCHED ROOFS. The Inspector thought it was better to keep the uniformity of the row of 3 terraced dwellings on a corner position, rather than to keep the overall look of the street scene without full front extensions. The Inspector thought with the absence of a lean to front extension, the appeal site looked disjointed when considered in context with the other 2 terraced dwellings which have the full front extensions. He acknowledged that the other 2 full front extensions had been given permission prior to the	Appeal allowed subject to conditions 6th November 2012

	adoption of the Residential Extensions Guidelines. He concluded that the proposal was in line with the National Planning Policy Framework and did not undermine the Supplementary Planning Document.	
P/14857/003	<p>2 Baylis Road</p> <p>RETENTION OF A FLAT ROOF REAR CONSERVATORY</p> <p>The conservatory the subject of the appeal was already in place and was fully confined to the rear of the property and not visible within the street scene. The Inspector stated that the original dwelling had several extensions added to the host dwelling over a number of years and the mainly see through rear conservatory only just taller than the boundary fence would not cause harm to the neighbouring occupiers or the visual amenity of the area, therefore the relaxation of the guidelines was applicable in this case and allowed the appeal.</p>	<p>Appeal Allowed</p> <p>9th November 2012</p>