



## Planning Management Committee – 06 January 2016

### Appeal Decision Monitoring Report

#### Purpose of report

Update on appeal decisions from the Planning Inspectorate and an analysis of the main issues, to monitor consistency between the council's and Planning Inspectorate's decisions.

#### Attachment(s)

Appendix 1 - Appeal decisions from 19 October 2015 to 6 November 2015

#### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 This report advises on the outcome of planning appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate from 19 October 2015 to 6 November 2015 and analyses the decisions made by the Development Control Committee and officers under delegated authority. Details of costs awarded against the council (if any) are also given.

#### 2.0 Equality and Diversity Implications

2.1 There are no equality and diversity implications arising from the proposals.

#### 3.0 Legal Implications

3.1 There are no legal implications arising from the proposals.

#### 4.0 Risk Management

4.1 There are no significant risks arising from the proposals.

#### 5.0 Financial implications

5.1 There are no financial implications arising from the proposals, except for those decisions where costs have been awarded against the council.

#### 6.0 Corporate Outcomes

6.1 The report supports priority outcomes set out in the Corporate Plan - Effective Management; and Value for Money.

6.2 The report is submitted for information.

<b>Legal</b>	Power: Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004				
	Other considerations: None				
<b>Background Papers:</b> Office Files					
<b>Person Originating Report:</b> Rhys Bradshaw, Planning Development Manager ☎ 01832 742180 ✉ rabradshaw@east-northamptonshire.gov.uk					
<b>Date:</b> 16 December 2015					
<b>CFO</b>		<b>MO</b>		<b>CX</b>	

## East Northamptonshire Council

## DC Appeal Results

For Period from: 09 Nov 2015 to : 11 Dec 2015

Officer	Procedure	Appellant	Location	Appeal Type
Case Ref. No.	Proposal		Date Decided	
	Decision			

Anna Lee

**Written Representations**

14/02137/FUL	Mr Kingsley Taylor	63 Park Street Kings Cliffe Peterborough	Against Refusal
New three bedroom detached house.			20/11/2015 <b>Dismissed</b>

The application was refused because the proposed dwelling would be crampedly positioned in the side garden of the existing property and would poorly relate with the surrounding development. In addition, it was considered that proper consideration was not given to the on-site trees and hedges. The Inspector considered that the proposed development would be cramped and due to the open character of the area, the proposed dwelling would be clearly visible in the street scene. It was commented that the design would not alleviate the prominence and incongruous appearance that the dwelling would have. In addition, the Inspector noted that the proposed dwelling and parking area would impact upon a mature Silver Birch tree located on the site and was uncertain that this tree could be retained even with the imposition of conditions.

Anne Dicks

**Written Representations**

15/00589/FUL	Mr K Waller	Land Adjacent 46 Oakleas Rise Thrapston	Against Refusal
Erection of detached bungalow together with a highway crossing to provide			18/11/2015 <b>Allowed</b>

The application proposed a detached bungalow within a row of two storey dwellings which was refused by the Council as it was felt that it would be out of keeping with the established character of this part of Thrapston - by reason of its single storey nature. Officers felt that it would appear incongruous in the street scene and would fail to respect and enhance the character of its surroundings, contrary to national and regional planning policies that seek to achieve high quality design and to respect the character and appearance of areas. The Planning Inspector cited a number of bungalows within the wider "vicinity" and stated that the proposed dwelling would reflect the building line of the adjacent neighbour. He therefore concluded that the bungalow would be in keeping with neighbouring dwellings and therefore would not harm the appearance and character of the area,

Graham Wyatt

**Informal Hearing**

14/01843/FUL	Mr K Goodman	Glebe Meadow Ditchford Lock Ditchford Lane	Against Refusal
Erection of agricultural building and the change of use of staff shelter to			11/12/2015 <b>Withdrawn</b>

This appeal has been withdrawn by the appellant. Enforcement action will be taken should a further planning application not be submitted.

Rosalind Hair

**Written Representations**

15/00543/FUL Mr Graham Bell 14 Church Street Rushden Northamptonshire Against Refusal  
Rear stairs (external) to access first floor flat over shop premises and change flat 27/11/2015 **Dismissed**

The application to replace timber windows with aluminium windows and to erect an external staircase was refused by the Council as it was considered the replacement windows, by virtue of their design and materials, would adversely affect the character and significance of the Rushden Conservation Area. The Planning Inspector considered that aluminium windows would introduce a modern element to a prominent corner location and a building of value within the Conservation Area and overall would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. He categorised the level of harm as 'less than substantial' in the context of NPPF policy and concluded that it was not outweighed by any significant public benefits.

<b>Decided Appeals Dismissed :</b>	<b>2</b>	50.00%	<b>M</b> Denotes Member Decision against Officer advice
<b>Decided Appeals Allowed :</b>	<b>1</b>	25.00%	
<b>Decided Appeals Withdrawn :</b>	<b>1</b>	25.00%	
<b>Decided Appeals Total :</b>	<b>4</b>	100.00%	