

Meeting: Planning and Development
Committee

Agenda Item:

Date: Tuesday 2 March 2021

INFORMATION REPORT - APPEALS / CALLED IN APPLICATIONS

Author – Linda Sparrow 01438 242837

Lead Officer – Zayd Al-Jawad 01438 242257

Contact Officer – James Chettleburgh 01438 242266

1. APPEALS RECEIVED

- 1.1 19/00474/FPM, Land West of Lytton Way. Appeal against refusal of planning permission for the demolition of existing office building (Use Class B1) and structures, and the construction of seven apartment buildings comprising 576 dwellings (Use Class C3) together with internal roads, parking, public open space, landscaping, drainage and associated infrastructure works.
- 1.2 20/00697/FP, 10 Gorleston Close. Appeal against refusal of planning permission for the erection of first floor cantilevered rear extension.

2. DECISIONS AWAITED

- 2.1 20/00228/FP, 30 Orchard Crescent. Appeal against refusal of permission for two storey front, side and rear extensions.
- 2.2 20/00384/FP, 8A Magellan Close. Appeal against refusal of permission for the Variation of condition 11 (no new windows and doors) attached to planning permission 16/00791/FP to allow insertion of a roof light and gable window to be added to the dwellings.
- 2.3 20/00146/FP, 330 Canterbury Way. Appeal against refusal of permission for the erection of 1no. one bedroom dwelling.

3. DECISIONS RECEIVED

- 3.1 Appeal decision received for 20/00175/FP for 86 Marlborough Road. Appeal against the refusal of planning permission to construct a domestic garage to the front of the property.

Main issues

- 3.2 The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area, and the safety of pedestrians using the public highway.

Reasons

- 3.3 Marlborough Road is a modern cul-de-sac of mainly detached houses with an area of open space. Houses are set back in the street with frontage parking with front boundaries generally being open in character.

- 3.4 The proposed garage would sit incongruously in the street sitting well forward of any established building pattern. It would also detract from the open and pleasant street scene. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area as it conflicts with Local Plan policies GD1 and SP8, the Stevenage Design Guide SPD and NPPF.
- 3.5 The garage would be too small to count as a parking space although there is still sufficient space in front of the house to meet parking standards. The garage has been designed and intended for a car and would likely be used for that purpose.
- 3.6 The garage, however, due to its siting and position where its door opening close to the footway, would result in drivers not having an adequate view of pedestrians on the footway. This would create a potentially dangerous situation. In addition, due to the lack of a private driveway space to the front of the garage, this would encourage cars to stop or park in a position which would block the footway. This would force pedestrians out into the road and therefore, creates an element of danger to what would be an unsatisfactory situation.
- 3.7 The proposal, given the aforementioned, would unacceptably prejudice the safety of pedestrians using the public highway. It therefore conflicts with the shared aims of Local Plan policy IT5, Roads in Hertfordshire – A Design Guide 3rd Edition, the Parking SPD, the NPPF and Manual for Streets to make provision for pedestrians.

Other matters

- 3.8 The appellant confirmed that the proposal would be for personal need and not a business, but not considered to have put forward a sufficient justification to overcome inspectors concerns as to the impact of the development.

Conclusion

- 3.9 Appeal dismissed; copy of the decision notice attached.