

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 19th June 2014

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/07482/009	38a, Harrow Road, Slough, SL3 8SQ ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH A HIPPED ROOF. (REVISED SCHEME OF P/07482/008) Reasons for refusal: 1. The proposed development will reduce the amount of useable amenity space to a level which would be insufficient to adequately serve a family dwelling. The development thereby represents an overdevelopment of the site and is contrary to Policy H14 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004, which seeks to ensure that an appropriate level of amenity space is provided having regard to the type and size of household likely to occupy the dwelling and EX48 of the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document Adopted Jan.2010. 2. The proposed single storey side extension by virtue of its siting, design, excessive width, scale, massing and lack proportionality do not appear subordinate to and is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the original house and that of the general street scene. The issues of scale, massing and lack of proportionality are compounded by the excessive width, bulk and unbalance element which would detract from and upset the symmetry and balance of the wider terrace. The development is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy and Framework (NPPF) 2012, Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 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; (Incorporated in the	Appeal Granted 14th April 2014

Composite Local Plan for Slough 2013), the Slough Local Development Framework, and the Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010.

The Inspector considered that the appeal property is a two storey, end of terrace dwelling. Whilst it is an extension of the original terrace, the form and appearance of the property is consistent with the formally laid out dwellings which characterise the area.

The property has a side garden enclosed by a substantial hedge, to the south of which is an area of grass and parking. This area provides fairly generous separation between the appeal property and the end of the next terrace along Harrow Road (number 36). It also allows views to Hampton Road to the rear.

The proposed side extension would, therefore, occupy a corner location in the street scene. To that extent it would be prominent. However, there are a number of other examples in the area of single storey extensions on the ends of terraces including, 36 Harrow Road, directly opposite the appeal site across the grass and parking area and 50 Hampton Road immediately to the rear.

Moreover, the northern end of the appeal property terrace has a hipped roof, single storey wing. As such, I consider that the siting and form of the proposed extension would be in keeping with the character of the area and would not unbalance the symmetry of the terrace. I also note that there is an extant planning permission for a slightly narrower side extension to the appeal property (Application ref P/07482/008).

Although the appeal proposal would be some 650mm wider than the permitted scheme, it would still be set in from the side boundary and single storey in height with a shallow pitched, hipped roof. Given the reasonably generous scale of the space around the appeal property, I consider that it would not dominate or have a materially enclosing effect on that space. Furthermore, the proposed extension's modest height, set back from the rear elevation and simple form would help ensure its subservience to the host property.

Therefore, I find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area or the host property. As such, it would comply with

The Local Plan for Slough (LP) policies H15, EN1 and EN2 and policy 8 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS) which, together, require residential extensions to achieve a high standard of design and be compatible with the original structure and the street scene. It would also accord with the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) insofar as it has similar aims and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it seeks high quality design.

The appeal property has external amenity space to the side and rear. Where it faces Harrow Road, the space to the side is enclosed by a 1.2m high fence. As a result, it does not provide occupiers with a high degree of privacy. The space to the rear has greater enclosure and appears to be more intensively used. The proposed extension would take up most of the space to the side of the existing building. Although the remaining space to the rear would be relatively small, it is the more useable area.

Moreover, the extant permission would result in the loss of the space to the side of the property. Whilst that extension would be slightly narrower, there is nothing to suggest that the space it would leave to the side of the property would provide useable amenity area. Consequently, the extant permission amounts to a relevant and realistic fallback position were this appeal to be dismissed. I am also mindful that the proposed extension would provide more living space for occupants, but no additional bedrooms. The level of occupation of the dwelling, therefore, would be unlikely to increase as a consequence of the proposal.

Having regard to these considerations, I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with the aims of LP policy H14. This policy requires the level of residential amenity space to be determined based on, among other things, the type and size of the dwelling and the privacy and usefulness of the space provided. The first reason for refusal also refers to guideline EX48 of the SPD.

The inspector also considered that although the guideline deals with rear, rather than side, extensions and therefore the suggested garden size dimensions are not directly applicable to the appeal proposal. Nevertheless, the proposal would be consistent with the underlying aim of ensuring that residential occupiers have an appropriately

	sized, useable amenity area.	
P/15625/001	6, Salt Hill Avenue, Slough, SL1 3XP ERECTION OF A REAR OUTBUILDING WITH FLAT ROOF	Appeal Dismissed 25th April 2014
P/11887/004	67-69, London Road, Slough, Berkshire, SL3 7RS ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION WITH FLAT ROOF ACROSS BOTH DWELLINGS.	Appeal Dismissed 9th May 2014
2013/00070/ENF	9-10, Chapel Street, Slough, SL1 1PF UNAUTHORISED USE OF LAND AS SHISHA LOUNGE AND ERECTION OF MARQUEE AND NEW TOILET	Appeal Dismissed 15th May 2014
2013/00070/ENF	9-10, Chapel Street, Slough, SL1 1PF AWARD OF COSTS FOR ABOVE	Appeal Dismissed 15th May 2014
P/09057/003	38, Barnfield, Slough, SL1 5JW ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH MONO PITCHED ROOF Reason for refusal: The proposed two storey side extension does not allow sufficient separation distance between the host dwelling and the boundary with the adjacent flatted development and future development would close the visual gap between these two buildings which would have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding street scene. As such the proposal is contrary to policies: H15, EN1 and EN2 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; The Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document Adopted January 2010; and National Planning Policy Framework. The Inspector identified the main issue as being the effect of the proposed development on the street scene. The Inspector concluded that given there was no evidence to suggest that a future extension of the adjacent flatted development may further reduce the	Appeal Granted 16th May 2014

	separation between the two properties he was satisfied that the proposed extension would maintain a visual gap sufficient to preserve the established character of the street scene.	
P/13700/007	17, Royston Way, Slough, SL1 6EP APPLICATION FOR LOFT CONVERSION AND TWO SIDE FACING DORMERS ONE WITH ONE WINDOW, THE OTHER WITH TWO WINDOWS AND CHANGE OF ROOF OF REAR ELEVATION TO FLAT.	Appeal Dismissed 27th May 2014