

Meeting: Planning and Development
Committee

Agenda Item:

Date: Thursday 25 May 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 None.

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 22/00769/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.

3. DECISIONS RECEIVED

3.1 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.

3.1.1 The Inspector noted that whilst there is some variation in the design, the existing dwelling along with dwellings in the surrounding area are characterised by a strong and generally consistent rhythm and appearance of two-storey built form with simple roof designs. Dormer

windows are not a prevailing feature along Made Feld or Exchange Road, in the area that the appeal site is viewed in context with.

- 3.1.2 He went on to agree with the Council that the proposed rear dormer window, whilst it would be set within the roof and would not cover more than half of the roof, due to its design, size, position and massing, it would result in a bulky and prominent addition which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. It would be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the area and given the corner position, it would be highly visible and dominant from public vantage points along Exchange Road resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
- 3.1.3 With regards to the front dormer windows, whilst the Inspector did not agree that such additions would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in and of themselves, He did conclude that they would be at odds with the prevailing character of the roof forms in this area and would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance.
- 3.1.4 The Inspector felt that as the rear dormer would be built within the confines of the roof slope and set away from the shared boundary with No.46 Made Feld, there would be no significant change to the outlook for this neighbour. However, he went on to say that whilst the dormer would be visible from the rear garden of No.46, it would be seen within the context of the existing roof slope and not protrude higher and as such would not have a significant additional effect on this neighbour.
- 3.1.5 The Inspector concluded that the proposal is contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which outweigh the harm.
- 3.1.6 The appeal is dismissed.
- 3.2 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.
 - 3.2.1 The Inspector agreed with the Council that the sloping nature of Siddons Road results in roofs and frontages being staggered which create a rhythm and gives the area a distinctive character and appearance. He went on to agree that the raising of the ridge height would erode this character and result in a dominant feature in the street scene which would harm the architectural form of the dwelling as well as erode the rhythm of the other rooflines and frontages.
 - 3.2.2 With regards to the enlargement of the existing rear dormer, the Inspector agreed that the proposal would be contrary to the adopted Design Guide (then 2009, now 2023). He agreed it would be a prominent feature with no other dormers in the terrace and its increased size would further exacerbate the change of roofline and architectural form, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be dominant, bulky and uncharacteristic.
 - 3.2.3 The Inspector therefore concluded the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies GD1 and SP8 of the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011-2031 and would also be contrary to the guidance contained within the SPD.
 - 3.2.4 The Inspector concluded that the proposal is contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which outweigh the harm.
 - 3.2.5 The appeal is dismissed.