

Meeting: Planning and Development
Committee

Agenda Item:

Date: Tuesday 4 April 2023

INFORMATION REPORT - APPEALS / CALLED IN APPLICATIONS

Author – Linda Sparrow 01438 242242

Lead Officer – Zayd Al-Jawad 01438 242257

Contact Officer – James Chettleburgh 01438 242242

1. APPEALS RECEIVED

- 1.1 22/00769/HPA, 6 Badgers Close. Appeal against refusal of prior approval for a single storey extension which will extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 metres, for which the maximum height will be 3 metres and the height of the eaves will be 3 metres.

2. DECISIONS AWAITED

- 2.1 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.
- 2.2 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.
- 2.3 21/00717/ENFAPL, 134 Marymead Drive. Appeal against the serving of an Enforcement Notice relating to the unauthorised erection of an outbuilding and front extension.
- 2.4 21/01025/ENFAPL, 7 Boxfield Green. Appeal against the serving of an Enforcement Notice relating to the development not in accordance with approved plans under planning permission reference number 17/00734/FPH.
- 2.5 22/00307/ENF. Car park to side of 8 Aintree Way. Appeal against the serving of an enforcement notice to remove the structure built around the car parking space and return the communal parking spaces to their original condition.
- 2.6 22/00471/FP, 48 Made Feld. Appeal against refusal of planning permission for a two-storey side extension, single-storey front extension, part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension, rear dormer window, 2 no. front dormer windows, 2 no. roof lights to facilitate enlargement of existing property and to create 2 no. 1 bedroom flats, associated parking and ancillary works.
- 2.7 22/01001/FPH, 67 Siddons Road. Appeal against refusal of planning permission for the raising of the ridge height to the main roof of the existing dwellinghouse and enlargement of existing rear dormer window.

3. DECISIONS RECEIVED

- 3.1 21/01101/FP, 303 Ripon Road. Appeal against refusal of planning permission for the conversion of 1 no. 4 bedroom dwelling to 3 no. studios, single storey front and rear extensions and conversion of garage including the change of use from public amenity land to residential use and associated parking.
- 3.1.1 The appeal was allowed.
- 3.1.2 The inspector felt that in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the proposal would not adversely impact the residential mix of the area and would therefore comply with Policies HO9 and SP7 of the Local Plan.
- 3.1.3 With regards to the impact on the character and appearance of the area, the Inspector stated that, given the limited scale and depth of the extensions and the retention of the majority of the front garden and part of the rear garden, the development would not be an overdevelopment of the site.
- 3.1.4 He went on to say that there is no evidence before him to suggest that the development would harm the quiet character of the residential area nor that the proposal would lead to a material change in the character of the area.
- 3.1.5 In terms of the effect on crime, while the proposal would result in the loss of the lamppost from the rear of the property, the Inspector agreed that a condition can be imposed to require it to be relocated and, whilst he agreed that the concerns resulting from the amended illumination of the street are genuine, there is no evidence before him to show that the relocation would increase crime or fear of crime.
- 3.1.6 The Inspector noted concerns raised regarding the proposal setting an undesirable precedence, however we made it clear that each application must be determined on its own merits and he found the proposal acceptable.
- 3.1.7 The Inspector noted concerns raised regarding noise and disturbance but went on to say that the number of bedrooms will decrease from 4 to 3 and whilst occupiers could live independently to each other, which is different to a single dwellinghouse, the activity generated would not be likely to be significantly different and there is no evidence that night-time noise would increase.
- 3.1.8 The Inspector noted the parking provision and layout and both internal floorspace and external amenity space were all acceptable.