

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 1st July 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/04215/004	<p>70, Seacourt Road, Slough, SL3 8EW</p> <p>CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE AND PART SINGLE / PART DOUBLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.</p> <p>Planning permission was refused for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The proposed first floor rear extension due to its excessive width and bulk would not appear subordinate to the original house thereby detracting from the appearance of the original house and that of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore is 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 Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010. <p>The Inspector allowed the appeal subject to following conditions and concluded that the main issue was the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.</p> <p>Conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Drg. No. 70SR/1.	<p>Appeal Granted</p> <p>1st May 2015</p>

	<p>Supporting reasons:</p> <p>The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached house. It is situated in a predominantly residential area which is characterised by semi-detached, two-storey houses of generally similar scale and design. The appeal proposal includes construction of a two-storey, side and rear extension.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal appears subservient to the existing house when viewed from the street. 2. To the rear the extension is similar to the adjoining property's rear projection and would have a hipped roof with a ridge height set significantly lower than the main house roof, which would help to limit the visual bulk of the extension. 3. Overall the side and rear extensions would have a design which would be subservient to and in keeping with the host property. Whilst the rear projection would occupy slightly more than half of the width of the extended house, overall the development would have a sense of proportion and balance. 4. The side of the extensions would stand close to the boundary with No 68, reducing the visual gap between the two properties at first floor level to about a metre. Whilst most of the pairs of semi-detached properties on this part of Seacourt Road have wider spaces between them at first floor level, the neighbouring pairs of houses at Nos 68-66 and 64-62 are built close to each other and the relatively narrow space between the appeal property and No 68 would be in keeping with the pattern of development on this small part of Seacourt Road. <p>Conclusions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the local area and it would comply with the aims of good design sought by Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies EN1 and H15 of the Local Plan for Slough. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. <p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the proposed extensions, a condition requiring the materials used in the external surfaces of the extension to match those of the host building would be reasonable and necessary and, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning, I impose a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. 	
P/07222/001	<p>86, London Road, Slough, SL3 7HR</p> <p>ERECTION OF A PAIR OF TWO STOREY SEMI DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH ROOMS IN ROOF SPACE FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING.</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>29th May 2015</p>

<p>P/15963/000</p>	<p>323, Goodman Park, Slough, SL2 5NW</p> <p>RETENTION OF A SINGLE STOREY FRONT INFILL EXTENSION</p> <p>Planning permission was refused for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existing full width front extension particularly when viewed in conjunction with the neighbouring unauthorised full width front extension at no. 321 Goodman Park results in a development which appears overly dominant and overbearing in the street, detracting from the character and appearance of the original house and that of the surrounding area. The development is thereby contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, 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 Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted January 2010. 2. The Inspector allowed the appeal and concluded that the main issue was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. <p>Supporting reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Common themes in the three development plan policies cited in the Council’s refusal reason include the need to ensure high quality design and the need to respect and reflect the design and character of existing buildings and street scenes. In these respects they are broadly consistent with national policy guidance in the <i>National Planning Policy Framework</i>. 4. One SPD guideline states that front extensions will normally be restricted to front porches only and that full width front extensions are considered overly dominant and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the original house. Bearing in mind the wide range of different factors and site circumstances, that assertion appears at odds with the well-established approach (acknowledged in the SPD) of judging each application on its own individual merits. 5. In this case Goodman Park is a residential estate very similar in overall design and form. The single storey flat-roofed front porch features, which appear to have been part of the original design, are subsidiary features and many around the estate have been altered or extended in various ways and remain as subsidiary features in the terraces and most do not detract to any significant degree from the character and appearance of the terraces and street scenes. 	<p>Appeal Granted</p> <p>13th April 2015</p>
--------------------	---	---

	<p>6. No. 323 is within a terrace of seven dwellings where several of the open porches have been infilled, but the original flat-roofed form has been retained. At no. 323 and neighbouring no. 321 a pitched roof has been added across the full width of the dwelling's frontage. The original depth of the projection has however been retained and the extension sits well back from the public footpath. I find it to be a proportionate feature in relation to the dwelling and the terrace as a whole, notwithstanding that it adjoins a similar extension at no. 321. I conclude therefore that the appeal proposal does not appear overly dominant in the street scene and it does not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling, terrace or street scene.</p> <p>7. It follows that I find no material conflict with the development plan policies cited in the refusal reason or with the <i>Framework</i>. Thus the appeal succeeds and, as this is a retrospective application, no conditions are necessary.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>The appeal is allowed for the reasons above and no condition is considered to be necessary.</p>	
P/05798/002	<p>7, Baylis Road, Slough, SL1 3PH</p> <p>ERECTION OF CANOPIES IN REAR GARDEN (RETROSPECTIVE).</p> <p>The Inspector assessed the appeal on 2 main issues:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The effect of the canopies on the character and appearance of their surroundings. 2) The effect of the canopies on the living conditions at No: 7 and adjacent properties. <p>Even though the wall height has been increased to 2.7m and the canopies on top take the height to 3.2m when considered against other rear garden buildings the Inspector thought they were acceptable. Given that the rear gardens were south facing the Inspector considered that the canopies would not have an adverse impact on living conditions and approved the application subject to 2 conditions which are as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The spaces below the canopies hereby permitted shall not be used at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the property known as 7 Baylis Road. 2) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), there shall be no extensions or additions to the existing residential property known as 7 Baylis Road, its existing outbuilding or the canopies hereby permitted. 	<p>Appeal Granted</p> <p>5th June 2015</p>

P/01913/010	9-10, Chapel Street, Slough, SL1 1PF Erection of 5 storey building plus basement to provide a mixed use development comprising; a) Gymnasium, hair salon / beauticians and sauna / aerobics room at basement level b) 126 sq metres of class a2 offices at ground floor level c) 2 no. one bedroom flats and 19 no. bedsit flats on four upper levels together with on site cycle and refuse storage at ground floor level (outline application with appearance and landscaping reserved for subsequent approval).	Appeal Dismissed 11 th June 2015
-------------	--	--