



Planning Management Committee – 25 January 2017

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 21 November 2016 to 6 January 2017

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This report advises on the outcome of planning appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate from Appeal decisions from 21 November 2016 to 6 January 2017 and analyses the decisions made by the Planning Management 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.

Legal	Power: Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004				
	Other considerations: None				
Background Papers: Office Files					
Person Originating Report: Rhys Bradshaw, Planning Development Manager ☎ 01832 742180 ✉ rabradshaw@east-northamptonshire.gov.uk					
Date: 11 January 2017					
CFO		MO		CX	

East Northamptonshire Council

DC Appeal Results

For Period from: 21 Nov 2016 to : 06 Jan 2017

Officer

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

Rosalind Hair

Written Representations

15/01503/ADV	Lidl - Ms D Commock	25 Newton Road Rushden Northamptonshire	Against Refusal 12/12/2016	Dismissed
--------------	---------------------	---	-------------------------------	------------------

This application for 2 free standing 6m high internally illuminated totem signs and 2 projecting internally illuminated building signs for the new Lidl store in Rushden, was amended by the applicant during the application process to omit 1 of the totem signs and relocate the other, however this did not fully address officers concerns and the application was reported to Planning Management Committee with a recommendation for refusal. Members voted for a split decision to approve the building signs and refuse the totem sign on the grounds that it would adversely affect the character and visual amenity of the area, including views into/out of the Conservation Area. Shortly afterwards, the totem sign was installed on site and the Council served an enforcement notice. In determining appeals lodged against both the enforcement notice and the refusal to grant advertisement consent; the Planning Inspector agreed that *'the sign does harm the setting of the conservation area and the character and appearance of the surrounding area'* and consequently dismissed the appeals.

Wayne Cattell

Written Representations

16/00651/FUL	Mr Malcolm Silvester	21 Oakleigh Close Raunds Wellingborough	Against Refusal 24/11/2016	Dismissed
--------------	----------------------	---	-------------------------------	------------------

The application was refused under delegated powers because it was considered that the type of dwelling and the proposed location for it would have been out of character with the prevailing built form in the immediate area. Following on from the refusal, Policy 30 in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy became adopted. This confirms we now have to consider the national space standards in assessing applications for new houses. The proposal was contrary to this and the Inspector had to take this into account in considering this matter. Following a site visit, the Inspector disagreed that the proposal was out of keeping with the surroundings but accepted it did not meet the national space standards. The appeal was therefore dismissed on this basis.

Decided Appeals Dismissed :	2	100.00%	M Denotes Member Decision against Officer advice
Decided Appeals Allowed :	0	0.00%	
Decided Appeals Withdrawn :	0	0.00%	
Decided Appeals Total :	2	100.00%	