

Meeting: Planning and Development
Committee

Agenda Item: 6

Date: Tuesday 23 June 2015

INFORMATION REPORT - APPEALS / CALLED IN APPLICATIONS

Author – Linda Sparrow, 01438 242838

Lead Officer –Paul Pinkney, 01438 242257

Contact Officer – David Rusling, 01438 242270

1. APPEALS RECEIVED

1.1 None.

2. DECISIONS AWAITED

2.1 None.

3. DECISIONS RECEIVED

3.1 **14/00585/FP** 6 Shackleton Spring. Appeal against refusal of planning permission for the erection of 1no. two bedroom dwelling following demolition of existing garage

3.1.1 Issues

The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance on the area, and the impact of the proposed parking arrangements on highway and pedestrian safety.

3.1.2 Conclusions

The appeal site is within a residential cul-de-sac where the other dwellings are predominantly semi-detached and terraced houses. The appeal property is an end of terrace with front and side gardens and a double garage to the side. The garage would be replaced with a new end of terrace property.

On the Inspector's site visit he noted that there is no set pattern to the gaps between dwellings and the introduction of built form between Nos.4 and 6 would not be out of keeping with the area. The existing gap is occupied by a double garage and is therefore not wholly open or undeveloped. A more open view above the single storey structure is towards the rear of existing properties, therefore the Inspector felt the gap did not contribute significantly to the character or appearance of the area.

The proposed dwelling would be set back by 1m from the side boundary which accords with the Council's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2009). The existing footpath between Nos. 4 and 6 would provide further separation, leaving a gap of over 3m, thereby not resulting in a cramped or incongruous form of development.

The design, form and style of the proposed dwelling would reflect adjoining properties. It would be the same height, same materials and not project further forward on the frontage. As such, the resulting terrace would be uniform and a coherent group when

viewed from Shackleton Spring. The Inspector therefore concluded that the proposed dwelling would not be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area and would be in accordance with the Council's policies TW8 and TW9.

With regard to car parking, the Inspector noted that the scheme makes no provision for off-road parking and would involve the loss of existing provision at No.6. The Council objected due to the increase in on-street parking, and proposed that 4 parking spaces would be required. The Inspector agreed that this request was reasonable.

Part of the parking for the scheme would be achieved through the removal of the dropped kerb, thereby creating one on-street parking space. However, no evidence has been submitted to enable a determination to be made as to whether this is achievable. The Inspector stated that there were a significant number of available on-street spaces during his site visit. He acknowledged that the visit took place during the day and pressure for spaces may be greater in the evening but stated there would appear to be capacity, both in Shackleton Spring and nearby streets, backed up by survey evidence supplied by the appellant.

The Inspector commented that the appeal site is within an urban, relatively sustainable area, close to the town centre with a bus stop nearby. This may have an impact on car ownership levels in the area although the site is not within the accessibility zones identified in the Council's Parking Provision SPD. Furthermore, the local highways authority has advised that whilst parking provision should be off-road, the proposal would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways.

The Inspector concluded that no clear evidence had been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed parking arrangements would result in inappropriate parking on the street causing material harm to highway and pedestrian safety. The Inspector felt that there is sufficient capacity in the area and that its location within a relatively sustainable area were sufficient to accord with saved policy T15 of the Council's DLP (2004) in so far as it relates to suitable levels of parking provision in new developments.

For the reasons outlined above, the Inspector allowed the appeal subject to planning conditions.

3.1.3 Decision

The appeal is allowed. (Decision attached).