

## SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015

### 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/04439/001	<p>32, Amanda Court, Slough, SL3 7TE</p> <p>CONSTRUCTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND BASEMENT EXTENSION INCORPORATING THREE LIGHTWELLS FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GROUND FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION.</p> <p><i>Planning permission was sort for the erection of a two storey side extension ground floor rear extension and basement extension and was refused for the following reason:</i></p> <p><i>The proposed two-storey side extension by reason of its proximity to the side boundary would close the visual gap between the two neighbouring properties, thereby resulting in the terracing of buildings, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the original property, the surrounding area and visual amenity of the street scene. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008, Policies DP1 and EX11 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guide Supplementary Planning Document, January 2010, Policies EN1 &amp; EN2 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough: 2004.</i></p> <p>The Inspector concluded that:</p> <p>No 30 has been extended at first floor level, almost to the boundary. The proposed development would re-introduce symmetry between the two properties, and create a gap between them at ground floor level.</p>	<p><b>Appeal Granted</b></p> <p><b>27<sup>th</sup> November 2014</b></p>

	<p>The proposed design seeks to meet the principles set out in the development plan. The first floor side extension would be set back by about 1.1 metres from the existing front wall, the roofline of the extension would be significantly lower than the existing roof, and the roof would be hipped. In all these ways the extension would be clearly subordinate to the existing dwelling. Moreover, it would closely mirror the extension at No 30 by the use of matching roof design, matching eaves lines, matching brickwork and matching windows.</p> <p>In only one respect would the proposal fail to meet the standards set by the design guidelines. Whilst the flank wall would be around 1 metre from the boundary, complying with the guidelines, the gap between the neighbouring dwellings at first floor level would be about 1.4 metres, rather than the 2 metres specified by the guidelines. However, in this particular instance, the overall effect would be acceptable, for the following reasons. First, the proposal would provide a pleasing symmetry between the two dwellings. Second, although 'terracing' is defined in the guidelines only in terms of the separation between properties at first floor level, the separation of the garages at ground floor level would remove an existing element of terracing from the street scene. Third, the relationship between the dwellings would not be out of place in the street scene, given the great variety of gaps in evidence in the surrounding area. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would meet the objectives of development plan policy, being a high quality design which respects its location and surroundings.</p>	
<b>P/15614/001</b>	<p>13, Laurel Close, Colnbrook, Slough, SL3 0QB</p> <p>LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE FOR THE ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY OUTBUILDING WITH FLAT ROOF AT THE BOTTOM OF THE EXISTING REAR GARDEN.</p>	<p><b>Appeal Dismissed</b></p> <p><b>10<sup>th</sup> February 2015</b></p>
<b>P/05635/004</b>	<p>60, Furnival Avenue, Slough, SL2 1DW</p> <p>RETENTION OF THE REAR OUTBUILDING AND CHANGE OF ROOF DESIGN FROM GABLE END TO FLAT</p>	<p><b>Appeal Dismissed</b></p> <p><b>4<sup>th</sup> February 2015</b></p>
<b>P/13974/003</b>	<p>25, Carmarthen Road, Slough, SL1 3PT</p> <p>LOFT CONVERSION, REAR DORMER AND RAISING THE ROOF BY 0.4M</p>	<p><b>Appeal Dismissed</b></p> <p><b>13<sup>th</sup> February</b></p>

		<b>2015-02-27</b>
<b>P/14782/003</b>	21, Dolphin Road, Slough, SL1 1TF  CONVERSION OF EXISTING DWELLING INTO 2NO. TWO BEDROOM FLATS	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>  <b>16<sup>th</sup> February 2015</b>
<b>P/08130/002</b>	56, Alpha Street South, Slough, SL1 1QX  CONSTRUCTION OF PART SINGLE / PART TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION.	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>  <b>20<sup>th</sup> February 2015</b>
<b>P/06092/015</b>	26, Dolphin Road, Slough, SL1 1TD  CONSTRUCTION OF PART FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION WITH HIPPED PITCHED ROOF TO BEDROOMS 1 AND 2 TO CREATE WALK IN WARDROBE AND DRESSER	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>  <b>26<sup>th</sup> February 2015</b>
<b>P/06233/003</b>	11a, Lascelles Road, Slough, SL3 7PN  CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND AN OUTBUILDING AT THE REAR GARDEN.	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>  <b>16<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>
<b>P/15642/000</b>	7, Loddon Spur, Slough, SL1 3EJ  APPLICATION FOR A LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE FOR A PROPOSED REAR OUTBUILDING WITH FLAT ROOF.	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>  <b>9<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>
<b>P/08241/008</b>	2, Broadmark Road, Slough, SL2 5PT  ERECTION OF A PART SINGLE/PART DOUBLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH HIPPED AND PITCHED ROOF, PART SINGLE/PART DOUBLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH HIPPED AND PITCHED ROOF (SINGLE STOREY ELEMENTS WITH MONO-PITCHED ROOF).  <i>Planning permission was sort for the erection of a part two storey / part single storey side and rear extension and was refused for the following reasons:</i>  <i>The proposed first floor rear extension by virtue of its width exceeding the width of the original dwelling and lack of</i>	<b>Appeal Granted</b>  <b>16<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>

	<p><i>proportionality in relation to host dwelling would present an overly dominant feature at first floor with adverse impact on the design and appearance of the dwelling 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 Design Principles of the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed first floor side extension by virtue of its excessive depth in the context of this site would present a bulky first floor side extension with an overbearing impact on the street scene. The proposal therefore 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 Design Principles of the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010.</i></p> <p>The Inspector concluded that:</p> <p>With the guidance provided in the Residential Design Guidelines in mind, the proposal would result in a 35 percent increase in depth at first floor level, which complies with this guidance. The width of the proposed extension would be approximately 3 metres wide. This would result in an increased width of approximately 55 percent and while marginally over the indicative percentage increase, however it is clear that this is a general guide that does not take into account the local context of each proposal.</p> <p>The proposed side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the host property at first floor level and would have a lower ridge height, which complies with the guidance set out within the Residential Design Guidelines. The appeal site benefits from the generous gap to the west, which would also assist in accommodating the proposal on the appeal site. Therefore the proposal would have a sense of proportion and balance, and would not dominate the host property.</p> <p>With regard to the street scene, it is accepted that the appeal site is relatively prominent. However, the proposal would be set back from the boundary with the adjacent flats at Wexham Road by approximately 2.5 metres and a significant greater distance from the flats themselves. The proposal would also be set back at first floor level from the</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>front of the host property, a good distance back from Broadmark Road. The depth of the extension would be evident from the street scene, however given the findings above this would not result in a dominant addition to the host property or an overbearing feature in the street scene.</p> <p>In conclusion, for the reasons given above, the proposal by virtue of its width and depth would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the area. The proposal therefore complies with Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) and Policies H15 and EN1 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough (2004).</p>	
--	--	--