SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE **DATE:** 16th June, 2016

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 |
|----------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 2011/00135/ENF | 58 Blandford Road South, Slough, SL3 7RY | Appeal |
| | | Dismissed |
| | Without planning permission, the material change of use | 4 Oth A! |
| | of the land from use as a single residential dwelling to a mixed use of residential and commercial office. | 12 th April 2016 |
| | Thixed use of residential and commercial office. | 2010 |
| P/14980/004 | 1 Granville Avenue, Slough, SL2 1ND | Appeal |
| | _ | Dismissed |
| | Change of use from single family dwelling (C3) to special | |
| | needs school (D1) and new front first floor window | 13 th April |
| | (temporary period of 3 years). | 2016 |
| P/14231/009 | 244-248, High Street, Langley, Berks | Appeal |
| | , 3 , , | Granted |
| | Retrospective application for retention of out building to | |
| | rear of 244-246 High Street, Langley for use as stores. | 15 th April 2016 |
| | The inspector considered the main issues are the effects | |
| | of the development on (1) the character and appearance | |
| | of the area and (2) the living conditions of the occupiers of | |
| | the adjacent neighbouring property in Elmhurst Road with | |
| | particular regard to outlook | |
| | The Inspector concluded that "whilst the appeal building is | |
| | visible from Elmhurst Road, within the context and | |
| | character of the surrounding area described above, and | |
| | taking account of its low height, I do not consider that it is | |
| | of a bulk, massing or appearance that appears as | |
| | unacceptably dominant or obtrusive within the street | |
| | scene. | |
| | Although the development has reduced the | |
| | garden/amenity space at the rear of the existing | |

properties, I am satisfied that sufficient useable space remains for the occupiers. Moreover, the separation distance between the rear elevation of the existing properties on the site and the development is not such that results in an unacceptably cramped appearance within the surrounding area.

The building runs along the entire rear boundary of the appeal site which is shared with the side boundary of the adjacent dwelling. However, due its modest height and massing, I do not consider that it amounts to an unacceptable sense of enclosure or is overbearing in appearance in the outlook for the occupiers of this neighbouring property.

It satisfactorily accords with the design and amenity aims of Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026, EN1 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004, the Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 and the National Planning Policy Framework".