

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 26th November 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
S/00710/000	<p>Land adjacent to 1 The Cherries, Slough SL2 5TS</p> <p>CONSTRUCTION OF A DETACHED TWO STOREY DWELLING WITH LANDSCAPING AND PARKING.</p> <p>The Appeal Inspector concluded the main issues to be firstly, the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and, secondly, whether satisfactory provision would be made for off-street parking.</p> <p>In respect of the first of these issues, the Appeal Inspector concluded that The Council contends that the proposal would fail to respect the general pattern of development in the area. However, there is no evidence before me which explains why a modest detached dwelling would be unacceptable in this particular location when it is evidently an established form of development elsewhere on The Cherries.</p> <p>The Appeal Inspector noted the Council's concern that the development would be cramped. However, he concluded that the site plan shows that both the proposed dwelling and No 1 would have sufficient outdoor circulation and living space to serve the needs of the occupants of each dwelling. In this regard, the size of the proposed dwelling in relation to its plot would not be dissimilar to that which prevails locally. Consequently, the dwelling would not appear unduly cramped.</p> <p>In respect of the second of these issues the Appeal Inspector concluded that although not indicated on the submitted plans, he considered there is scope to reduce</p>	<p>Appeal allowed</p> <p>9th November 2015</p>

	<p>the length of the crossover shown on the submitted drawing by retaining a small length of full height kerbs mid-way along the frontage. This would differentiate the parking for No 1 from the new dwelling and could be secured by a planning condition similar to that suggested by the Council. The appellant has confirmed that there is no objection to such a condition which would enable the parking arrangements to be clarified. I do not therefore consider that the interests of any party would be prejudiced by me dealing with the matter in this way.</p> <p>He therefore concluded that subject to minor amendments, the proposed layout would be workable and provide satisfactory provision for off-street parking. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy T2 of the LP as well as advice in paragraph 32 of the Framework which seeks safe and suitable access for all.</p>	
<p>P/11372/002</p>	<p>32 St Johns Road, Slough SL2 5EZ</p> <p>CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO BUNGALOW.</p> <p>The Appeal Inspector concluded that the main issue in the consideration of this appeal is the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings at 30 and 34 St Johns Road, with regard to whether the extension would appear overbearing.</p> <p>In respect of this issue the Appeal Inspector concluded, the addition would not project beyond the rear of the adjacent dwellings to this extent. The dwelling only currently extends to a fairly minimal degree beyond the rear of no. 34 and by 2.3m past the back of no. 30. The extension now proposed would have a depth of 4.25m. In consequence, the degree of rearward projection beyond the back of no. 34 would not materially exceed the suggested maximum depth of such extensions. The additional depth beyond the rear of no. 30 exceeding this guidance would be 2.3m.</p> <p>In any event, the roof would slope down to the sides, with the height of the nearest part to the neighbouring dwellings being fairly modest at only single storey eaves level. Furthermore, the roof would also slope down towards the rear with its highest point being significantly lower than the existing main roof. The Council indicates that the extension would be 0.85m back from the adjacent side boundaries.</p> <p>The combined effect of the above characteristics would be to significantly limit the perceived bulk of the addition, with there being no undue sense of enclosure or</p>	<p>Appeal allowed</p> <p>24 September 2015</p>

	<p>reduction in outlook. The extension would not therefore appear overbearing from the neighbouring properties, despite its depth in conjunction with that previously built. As a result, the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings would not be harmed.</p>	
<p>P/15867/002 & P/15868/002</p>	<p>298 & 300 Wexham Road</p> <p>CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION WITH PITCHED ROOF.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the main issue is the effect on the character and appearance on the locality.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the front full width extensions would appear subservient to the terrace as a whole, rather than be overly dominant due to factors such as depth, width and design. Furthermore, by dividing the lower half of the host dwelling from the upper part, the extension would add visual interest.</p> <p>The Inspector noted that there is some variation within the street scene with front porches and front additions although no full width extensions with the exception of the nearby terrace at 306. However, he concluded that despite full width front extensions not being an especially wide spread or characteristic feature, he considered that the development would fit comfortably into the street scene, be compatible with its wider context and the host terrace, while not disrupting any significant regularity. As a result concluded that the character and appearance of the locality would not be harmed.</p>	<p>Appeals Allowed</p> <p>8th October 2015</p>