

## **SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**REPORT TO:** PLANNING COMMITTEE

**DATE:** 17<sup>th</sup> October 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**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Appeal</b>	<b><u>Decision</u></b>
Enf – P/01423/EA	<u>15 Cedar Way</u>  ERECTION OF A FRONT EXTENSION TO THE DWELLING HOUSE COMPRISING OF A PORCH AND CANOPY	Appeal allowed, Enforcement Notice quashed and planning permission granted.  3 <sup>rd</sup> May 2013
P/15377/001	<u>4 Radcot Avenue</u>  ERECTION OF A PART SINGLE / PART DOUBLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH A GABLE ROOF (SINGLE STOREY ELEMENT WITH A HIPPED AND PITCHED ROOF); CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO A HABITABLE SPACE, PART SINGLE / PART DOUBLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH A HIPPED AND PITCHED ROOF (SINGLE STOREY ELEMENT WITH A MONO-PITCHED ROOF INCORPORATING A SKY LIGHT).	Appeal Dismissed  8 <sup>th</sup> May 2013
P/13100/002	<u>89 Waterbeach Road</u>  ERECTION OF AN ATTACHED GARAGE TO THE REAR WITH A PITCHED ROOF.	Appeal Dismissed  22 <sup>nd</sup> May 2013
P/15283/000	<u>2 Glentworth Place</u>  ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE	Appeal Dismissed  10 <sup>th</sup> June 2013

	EXTENSION, A PART SINGLE AND PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION ALL WITH PITCHED ROOFS AND CONVERSION OF DWELLING HOUSE INTO TWO SELF CONTAINED FLATS	
P/03798/001	<p><u>29 Merton Road</u></p> <p>DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY SIDE PROJECTION TO NO. 29 MERTON ROAD AND ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY FOUR BEDROOM DETACHED DWELLING WITH ON SITE PARKING FOR 2 NO. CARS.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the main issues of the appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the:</p> <p>(a) Character and appearance of the surrounding area; and</p> <p>(b) The living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to outlook from the rear gardens.</p> <p>In respect of the first issue, the Appeal Inspector concluded that the proposed dwelling would be set back in relation to the adjacent properties and would reflect the layout of the properties in the immediate vicinity. In this way, he considered that the greater set back of the proposed dwelling would not appear out of keeping. As many of the properties in the vicinity occupy virtually the full width of their plots, significant gaps between houses are not a prominent feature of the area. Consequently, in this respect the siting of the proposal would not be out of keeping with the area. The proposed development would not remove any of the mature vegetation, but would be located behind it and thus would be largely screened from view. Consequently it would not result in any significant changes to the current streetscene and would not create a greater degree of enclosure.</p> <p>In respect of the second issue the Appeal Inspector concluded that :</p> <p>the distance of the proposed house to the</p>	<p>Appeal allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>13<sup>th</sup> June 2013</p>

	<p>boundary combined with the intervening vegetation would be sufficient to ensure that the proposal would not be overbearing. As such it would not significantly harm the outlook from the garden of the adjacent property at 27A. Although the proposed development would reduce the garden area of No 29, it would retain a substantial rear garden. As a consequence of this, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not appear overly dominant to the occupiers of No 29 when utilising their rear garden. The garden area of No 29 does not at present have a formal seating area. However, should the occupiers wish to create such an area, the garden area is sufficiently large to enable one to be provided with a pleasant outlook.</p>	
P/02094/007	<p><u>28 Lynwood Avenue</u></p> <p>ERECTION OF A 1ST FLOOR FRONT EXTENSION WITH PITCHED ROOF.</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>20<sup>th</sup> June 2013</p>
P/15312/001	<p><u>96 Hazelmere Road</u></p> <p>ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH MONO-PITCHED ROOF INCORPORATING A VELUX WINDOW</p> <p>The Inspector allowed the appeal and concluded that the main issue was the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers at Nos. 94 and 98, in relation to a sense of enclosure.</p> <p>Supporting reasons:</p> <p><b>Reasons:</b></p> <p>1. A mid-terraced two storey property with a planning approval Ref. P/15312/000 for a rear extension to the depth of 3.65m. The application subject to appeal applied for a single storey rear extension to the depth of 4m. The principal difference between the two proposals is that the latter would project 0.35m further beyond the rear wall of the dwelling.</p>	<p>Appeal Allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> July 2013</p>

2. The 4m depth is contrary to Residential Extensions Guideline, Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) adopted 2010. However; SPD takes site specific factors into consideration as part of determining the maximum acceptable depth in any individual case.
3. Neighbouring properties on either side of No. 96 has had single storey rear extensions built to them. No. 98's rear extension projects 3.5m and No. 96 extension would project by a small amount and would not appear dominant or increase the sense of enclosure for the occupants of no. 98.
4. Neighbouring No. 94 has single storey rear extension which does not extend the full width of the house. As such there is a modest gap between the flank wall of rear extension and the shared boundary wall with No. 96. There are no windows that would look out on this gap and the main outlook is from the windows in the rear extension. In this context the proposed extension would not have an overbearing effect or create an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupants of No. 94.
5. Having considered the fallback position which would be to implement the existing planning permission; the additional depth of the appeal proposal would cause no significant difference in the living condition of the adjoining occupants.

**Conclusions:**

For these reasons the proposal is not considered to be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of the adjoining properties. The appeal therefore is allowed subject to conditions with regards to time limit, matching material and building in accordance with approved plans.

<p>P/15285/002</p>	<p><u>68 Norway Drive</u></p> <p>ERECTION OF AN ATTACHED TWO STOREY THREE BEDROOM HOUSE AND PART TWO STOREY/PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO THE EXISTING HOUSE WITH A PITCHED AND HIPPED ROOF AT THE FIRST FLOOR AND A MONO-PITCH AT THE GROUND FLOOR</p> <p>The Inspector considered the main issues of the appeal are the main issues are the effect of the proposal on, firstly, the character and appearance of the host property and the locality and, secondly, the living conditions of neighbours</p> <p>In respect of the first issue the Appeal Inspector concluded the two storey element would be set in on all sides from the single storey part.</p> <p>Roof pitches and a hip would be used. The ground floor element would project a relatively modest 3.6 metres or so and the upper level would be about 2.7 metres outward and under 5.5 metres across the two homes in total. The scheme would certainly partly read as one across both homes but unity of appearance across rear elevations can make a reasonable change to what one often sees as a disjointed approach to building works behind houses. The Appeal Inspector considered the scheme would be not be excessive given its dimensions, design form, the backdrop of the main elements of the homes and the scale of gardens and would not be harmful as a result of the symmetry. The nearest properties are, perhaps unusually, not extended at the rear although looking beyond those in each direction it is obvious that various, not insignificant works, have been undertaken to increase the scale of local homes. Rear building lines vary between different terraces and this run of homes along its rear has no particular prominence from the public realm. In the overall context the proposal would not be jarring on the eye and would not detract from the established character and</p>	<p>Appeal Allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> July 2013</p>
--------------------	---	---

	<p>appearance of the immediate or wider locality.</p> <p>In respect of the second issue, the Appeal Inspector concluded that: Local people will certainly notice some change when they view in the direction of the appeal site but because of the overall design and scale of the scheme and the separation of the two storey element the Appeal Inspector did not consider that this as unduly imposing or a scheme which would prevent the normal enjoyment of neighbours' rear gardens. The variation in the elevations and the stepping of development which would be seen here is something often found in suburban settings at the rear of properties and the plot sizes here can take the proposal comfortably in this context. Neighbours would not be hemmed-in</p>	
P/15362/000	<p><u>243 Long Furlong Drive</u></p> <p>ERECTION OF A THREE BEDROOM DWELLING HOUSE.</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>30<sup>th</sup> July 2013</p>
P/15285/001	<p><u>68 Norway Drive</u></p> <p>ERECTION OF AN ATTACHED TWO STOREY THREE BEDROOM HOUSE AND PART TWO STOREY / PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO THE EXISTING DWELLING WITH PITCHED ROOF AT FIRST FLOOR AND MONO PITCH ROOF AT GROUND FLOOR.</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>7<sup>th</sup> August 2013</p>
P/15404/000	<p><u>100 Elmshott Lane</u></p> <p>ERECTION OF AN EXTENSION TO FORM ADDITIONAL THREE BEDROOM DWELLING WITH PARKING TO FRONT AND AMENITY SPACE TO THE REAR</p> <p>The Inspector identified the main issue as being the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene and the local area.</p> <p>The proposal included the provision of a splayed flank wall and angled front wall. Planning permission was refused on the basis that this would be unacceptable in design</p>	<p>Appeal Allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> September 2013</p>

	<p>terms. The Inspector concluded that that the proposal would be of an acceptable design and form, and would be in keeping with the distinctive local group of houses of which it would be part.</p>	
P/06713/002	<p><u>33 Mulberry Drive</u></p> <p>ERECTION OF A PART TWO STOREY/PART SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND PART TWO STOREY/PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, BOTH WITH HIPPED AND PITCHED ROOFS. CHANGE IN THE SHAPE OF THE MAIN ROOF TO INCLUDE A FLAT TOP.</p> <p>Whilst the Inspector thought the development would lead to considerable alterations in terms of the dwelling on this plot, there would be a re-modelling to create a larger somewhat changed profile of a house. However given the shape and scale of the plot, inconsistent building lines both front and rear and the variation of dwellings within the cul-de-sac the project would look reasonable in its setting. Inspector approved the appeal using 6 of the 9 conditions suggested.</p>	<p>Appeal Allowed subject to conditions</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup> September 2013</p>
P/15400/001	<p><u>18 Laburnham Grove</u></p> <p>ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH A PITCHED ROOF.</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>27<sup>th</sup> September 2013</p>