

**Meeting:** Planning and Development  
Committee

**Agenda Item:**

**Date:** Thursday 26 May 2022

**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 21/00809/FP. 168 Fairview Road. Appeal against refusal of planning permission for the erection on 1no. two bedroom detached dwellings with parking and access.
- 1.2 21/01152/ENF. 68 Basils Road. Appeal against the serving of an enforcement notice to remove the first floor of the two storey rear extension which was refused under planning permission reference number 21/01256/FPH.
- 1.3 21/01256/FPH. 68 Basils Road. Appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the retention of a part two storey, part single storey rear extension.
- 1.4 21/01126/FP. 56 Austen Paths. Appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the change of use from a 6-bedroom House of Multiple Occupation (HMO) Class C4, to a 7-bedroom HMO (Sui Generis), 3 x car parking spaces; 8-bicycle parking spaces, and location of 7-bin storage facilities to the rear driveway

**2. DECISIONS AWAITED**

- 2.1 19/000474/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.
- 2.2 21/00681/AD, McDonalds, Monkswood Retail Park, Elder Way. Appeal against refusal of advertisement consent for 1no. internally illuminated totem sign.
- 2.3 21/01154/FPH, 40 Knights Templars Green. Appeal against refusal of planning permission for the construction of a rear dormer window and raising the ridge height.

**3. DECISIONS RECEIVED**

- 3.1 21/00308/FPH, 21 Augustus Gate. Appeal against refusal of planning permission for a part two storey, part single storey side and single storey front extensions.
- 3.2 The appeal was allowed.
- 3.3 Officers raised concerns in the officer report that the plans were not consistent and appear to show the boundary fence being moved out onto highway grass on

Fairlands way to accommodate the extension and make it appear to be set from the boundary when it won't be. The Inspector stated that the proposal appears to show all work contained within the red line plan and therefore has considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans. No consideration was given to the discrepancy in the size of the red line plan between the existing and proposed site plans.

- 3.4 The Inspector felt that despite the extension being highly visible in the street scene, its subservient appearance to the host dwelling is acceptable and as such would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or surrounding area.
- 3.5 The Inspector concluded that the extension would be subservient to the host dwelling and therefore accord with the adopted Design Guide (2009) and policies GD1 and SP8 of the Local Plan (2019).