



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2017

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/17/3166726

33 Meadowbrook Close, Poyle, Slough, SL3 0PA.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr George Sanda against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/16739/000, dated 31 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as *erect metal garage self standing 5m by 3m and build gazebo on back garden 3.2 by 2.4 by 2.9.*
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal in so far as it relates to gazebo on back garden 3.2 by 2.4 by 2.9.
2. I allow the appeal and planning permission is granted in so far as it relates to the metal garage self standing 5m by 3m at 33 Meadowbrook Close, Poyle, Slough, SL3 0PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/16739/000, dated 31 August 2016, and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - b) its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 32 Meadowbrook Close.

Reasons

4. The property the subject of the appeal, 33 Meadowbrook Close, is one of a block of six dwellings. Due to the unusual layout of the dwellings the property does not have a traditional rear garden. The amenity space is therefore located to the front and side of number 33, which in turn is sited at the rear north east corner of the block. The occupier of number 32 also takes access to their property across the amenity space to the front of number 33.
5. The appellant proposes a detached garage and gazebo. As both these structures had been constructed on the occasion of my visit, I had the opportunity to view them in situ. As I saw there are a number of garden structures and sheds open to public view in the surrounding development.

Character and appearance

Garage

6. The garage has a prefabricated roof and is clad externally in colour coated profile metal sheeting. It is of a simple mono-pitched roof form. Although the building is described as a garage, I understand from the evidence before me that it is more of a store for tools and other equipment. This is borne out by reason of its limited size and access. The appellant has erected a close-boarded timber fence around part of the structure.
7. Although the garage itself is a relatively utilitarian structure, it is nevertheless typical of sheds and store buildings that can be found in any number of sub-urban and urban gardens. Due to its limited size, and the fact that it is partially screened by a timber fence, I consider, on balance, that it does not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Gazebo

8. The gazebo, which is located in the narrowest part of the garden immediately adjacent to the common boundary to number 32, is a more traditional garden structure and in itself is relatively attractive. However, its west elevation is open so that anybody using it and the items stored in it are also open to public view.
9. Due to its location, its overall size in the context of the small garden area in which it is sited and the open aspect to the east, I consider that it would appear as an overly large building in this location and thereby would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area by reason of that loss of openness.

Conclusion-First main issue

10. I conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposed garage would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and therefore would accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), Core Strategy Policy CP8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 Development Plan Document (December 2008) (CS DPD), saved Policy EN1 of The Local Plan for Slough (Adopted 22 March 2004) (LP) and the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted January 2010) (SPD) as they relate to, amongst other things the quality of design, visual relationship and the need to respect the development's location and surroundings.
11. However, the gazebo would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to the foregoing policies and objectives of the Development Plan.

Living conditions

Garage

12. Given the location of the garage structure and its limited height I am not persuaded, based on the evidence before me and from my observations on site, that it would impact in any significant way on the living conditions of the

occupiers of number 32 Meadowbrook Close so as to result in a loss of light or to appear overbearing.

Gazebo

13.I consider that the gazebo due to its size and location would not result in a loss of light to the windows in the main façade of number 32. However, having regard to these considerations it would, in my judgement, nevertheless appear as an overbearing form of development.

14.Furthermore, the gazebo would be a natural place for people to gather even if the weather were inclement. Accordingly, due to it being open sided and located close to the front of number 32, I believe that there is the potential for any noise or disturbance that would result from its occupation being amplified and thereby impacting on the living conditions of the residents of number 32.

Conclusion-Second main issue

15.I conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposed garage would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 32 Meadowbrook Close. It would therefore accord with the Framework and CS DPD Policy CS8, saved LP Policy EN1 and the advice in the SPD as they relate to the protection of residential living conditions.

16.However, the gazebo would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 32 Meadowbrook Close and therefore would be contrary to the foregoing policies and objectives of the Development Plan.

Conditions

17.As the garage has already been erected in accordance with the submitted plans I do not consider that any conditions are necessary in this case.

Overall Conclusion

18.I consider that the two parts of the proposal are clearly severable, being physically and functionally independent and a split decision is therefore appropriate. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in so far as it relates to the erection of the gazebo, but should be allowed in so far as it relates to the garage structure

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR