



## Planning Management Committee – 14 March 2018

### 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 29 January 2018 to 23 February 2018

#### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 This report advises on the outcome of planning appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate from Appeal decisions from 29 January 2018 to 23 February 2018 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.

<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> 28 February 2018					
<b>CFO</b>		<b>MO</b>		<b>CX</b>	

## East Northamptonshire Council

### DC Appeal Results

For Period from: 29 January to 23 Feb 2018

Officer

Procedure

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

Jennifer Wallis

#### Householder Appeal

17/01302/FUL	Mr A Bailey	13 High Street Easton On The Hill Stamford	Against Refusal 20/02/2018	<b>Allowed</b>
New extension with glazed link and new dormer to existing roof				

The proposal involved an extension attached to the main dwelling with a glazed link. The extension would be visually subservient to the main dwelling and constructed using matching materials. The dwelling is set back from High Street and positioned perpendicular to the road, behind boundary walls, a hedge and a garage. The main issue in the appeal was the effect of the proposal in the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposed extension would only be visible from High Street from limited viewpoints and through the front boundary hedge when it is not in leaf. The inspector concluded that the proposed extension would not be visible from the public realm or intrusive, and the character and appearance of the conservation area would not be harmed.

Anna Lee

#### Householder Appeal

17/01422/FUL	J Foster	Cotton Farm House Station Road Ringstead	Against Refusal 29/01/2018	<b>Allowed</b>
Two storey extension to front elevation with side and rear extension to existing				

The application was refused as the proposed extensions by reasons of scale and massing would detract from the form and appearance of the original property and, in accumulation, would result in substantial additions to the existing property detracting from the rural landscape setting. The proposal would be contrary to the Council's adopted Householder Extensions and Alterations SPG.

The Inspector noted that the proposed extension would be large and would represent substantial additions to the host dwelling, however, he felt that the resulting scale of the dwelling would still remain comfortable within the plot and would not appear overdeveloped. Furthermore, the Inspector was of the opinion that the existing landscaping would soften the overall appearance of the proposal and would ensure that the proposed development would not be visually intrusive or dominant to the character and appearance of the area.

Wayne Cattell

#### Written Representations

17/01267/PDU	Mrs L Brawn	Barn Opposite New Lodge Farm Slipton Lane	Against Refusal 08/02/2018	<b>Allowed</b>
Change of use from agricultural building to dwelling				

The application was refused because it was considered that the building would feature a significant number of incongruous, irregularly sized and spaced domestic openings distributed over two floors. As such, it was felt that the proposed conversion would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area

The Inspector considered the building would not be overly prominent on approach to the site from the east and mainly only visible as the site is reached. As such, he considered the design would not be overly prominent nor would it result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

<b>Decided Appeals Dismissed:</b>	<b>0</b>	0.00%
<b>Decided Appeals Allowed:</b>	<b>3</b>	100.00%
<b>Decided Appeals Withdrawn:</b>	<b>0</b>	0.00%
<b>Decided Appeals Total:</b>	<b>3</b>	100.00%

**M** Denotes Member  
Decision against  
Officer advice