

**Meeting: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item:

7

Date: 31 OCTOBER 2017

INFORMATION REPORT - APPEALS / CALLED IN APPLICATIONS

Author – Linda Sparrow 01438 242838

Lead Officer – Zayd Al-Jawad 01438 242257

Contact Officer – Dave Rusling 01438 242270

1. APPEALS RECEIVED

- 1.1 17/00224/FP. 8 Windsor Close, appeal against refusal of planning permission for a two storey rear extension.

2. DECISIONS AWAITED

- 2.1 None.

3. CALLED IN APPLICATIONS

- 3.1. None

4. DECISIONS RECEIVED

- 4.1. 17/00084/FPH. 10 Lodge Way, appeal against refusal of planning permission for a first floor side extension.

- 4.1.1 Issues

The main issues for consideration are the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of 12 Lodge Way and car parking provision.

- 4.1.2 Conclusions

The appeal is for a first floor side extension above an existing single storey extension. The front extension would be set back from the front elevation and project 1.5m beyond the rear elevation. The ridge line would be below the ridge of the existing dwelling and the extension would have a large flank wall at first floor level with no windows or other distinguishing features to break up its appearance.

The extension would be approximately 1.6m from the boundary with No.12, which is a single storey dwelling with habitable room windows directly overlooking the side elevation of the appeal property. The extension would be approximately 6.0m from these windows which is significantly less than the minimum separation distance in the Stevenage Design Guide (2009).

The appeal property lies to the north of No.12 so that the extension would not appear unduly dark from No.12. However, its height, width and close proximity would result in it dominating the outlook from No.12 and being overbearing when viewed from within the dwelling and the garden. This would be harmful to the living conditions contrary to policy TW8 of the adopted Local Plan. It would also not comply with the general thrust of policy GD1 of the emerging Local Plan.

The emerging Local Plan is at an advanced stage and the appeal proposal's failure to comply with it does not weigh in favour of the development.

The extended dwelling would have four bedrooms and the Stevenage Parking Provision SPD (2012) indicates a minimum provision of 2.5 spaces rounded up to 3 spaces. IN addition to the two spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling, the appellants also own a garage en-bloc adjacent to the property. Accordingly there are three spaces available to the appellants. However, the garage is not integral to the dwelling and could be used independently therefore leaving the dwelling with just two spaces.

However, there is space within the curtilage to create further off-street parking and provision could be secured by way of condition. The Inspector considered that the failure of the proposed development to fully meet policy T15 of the adopted Local Plan and policy IT5 of the emerging Local Plan not to be reason enough to dismiss the appeal on car parking issues.

In conclusion, the Inspector felt that whilst the design of the proposed development was in keeping with the character and appearance of the area, it would result in significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property. In this respect the development would fail to represent sustainable development as sought by the National Planning Policy Framework, and, on balance and for the reasons above, he concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

4.1.3 Decision

Appeal dismissed (decision notice attached).

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Relevant Internal Planning & Development Files