

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 4th April 2013

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/15384/000	302 Langley Road ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, PART SINGLE, PART TWO-STOREY REAR EXTENSION, WITH PITCHED ROOFS, CONVERSION OF EXTENSION STORAGE OUTBUILDING TO A HABITABLE ROOM.	Appeal Dismissed 6 th February 2013
P/15371/000	16 Elliman Avenue ERECTION OF A PART TWO STOREY AND PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION BOTH WITH PITCHED ROOFS.	Appeal Dismissed 12 th February 2013
P/15276/001	38 Buckland Avenue ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, ERECTION OF A NEW ROOF, A TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, INSTALLATION OF 6 NO. FLANK VELUX WINDOWS, TWO VELUX WINDOWS IN THE FRONT ELEVATION, A DORMER WINDOW IN THE REAR ELEVATION AND A SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION WITH A PITCHED ROOF.	Appeal Dismissed 18 th February 2013
P/12982/005	Saints Transport Ltd, Halo House, Galleymead Road DISPLAY OF 1 NO. INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED ADVERTISEMENT PANEL TO THE REAR OF EXISTING ADVERTISEMENT HOARDING (18.3M X 4.9M) Advertisement consent was refused on the grounds that: The proposed sign by virtue of it creating a significant distraction for road users in a heavily trafficked and high-speed location between junctions does not have regard for public safety contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy EN11 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.	Appeal Allowed subject to conditions 11th March 2013

	<p>The Inspector concluded that:</p> <p><i>“The advertisement would be clearly visible from the M25 motorway. It would be a simple, easily read display that would be viewed below the nearby gantry sign and bridge deck, and so drivers would not need to look away from the motorway to see it. Also, its illumination would be less intense than that of the gantry signs, and there are a number of repeater signs on that stretch of the motorway. As such, I am satisfied that the proposed advertisement would be unlikely to attract driver attention away from the existing traffic signs to such an extent that it would be a safety risk.</i></p> <p><i>The accident data does not support the view that the advertisement would be such a distraction to drivers that it would harm highway safety.</i></p> <p><i>In support of its refusal, the Council has referred to a previous appeal decision, regarding a proposed advertisement at the same location as the current appeal. Whilst that advertisement would have been about half the size of the current appeal proposal, it would have had a changing display that would have been difficult to control, whereas the current appeal involves a static display that would not be changed. The decision letter does not refer to any evidence that had been presented at that hearing in relation to accidents and suggests that the Highways Agency objected to that proposed advertisement. Also, national policy guidance has changed with the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) in 2012 and Circular 03/2007. Therefore, the circumstances behind that decision are significantly different from those of the current appeal, and I have determined this appeal on the basis of its own individual planning merits in the light of the evidence provided and the prevailing policies and guidance.”</i></p>	
P/14846/003	<p>22 Cottesbrooke Close</p> <p>ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY PITCHED ROOF FRONT EXTENSION, A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH A PITCHED ROOF.</p> <p>Reason for refusal;</p> <p>The proposed two storey side extension by virtue of its inadequate set in from the boundary with the neighbouring property, which would have a negative impact on the open character of Cottesbrooke Close and would be contrary to the pattern of development in this area. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies: H13, H14 and EN1 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004; Core Policy 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008; Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions Guidelines; National</p>	<p>Appeal allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>18th March 2013</p>

	<p>Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Inspectors response;</p> <p><i>The Inspector felt that given the existing houses within the road were not uniform in arrangement and gaps of different sizes existed between properties, the small gap would not be out of keeping with the pattern and form of the surrounding development and the proximity of the extension to adjacent house that sits forward of the appeal house would not give rise to a continuous terracing effect.</i></p>	
P/08531/004	<p>177 Goodman Park</p> <p>ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH GABLE ENDED PITCHED ROOF</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>20th March 2013</p>