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 30 July 2018 to 21 September 2018

1.0 Introduction
1.1 This report advises on the outcome of planning appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate from Appeal decisions from 30 July 2018 to 21 September 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 Privacy Impact Assessment
6.1 There are no privacy implications.

7.0 Corporate Outcomes
7.1 The report supports priority outcomes set out in the Corporate Plan - Effective Management; and Value for Money.
7.2 The report is submitted for information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Power: Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other considerations: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background Papers:** Office Files

**Person Originating Report:** Rosalind Johnson, Planning Development Manager

📞 01832 742045 📧 rjohnson@east-northamptonshire.gov.uk

**Date:** 26 September 2018
Marzena Johnson
Householder Appeal
18/00657/FUL Mr & Mrs Hazell 4 Lakeside, Irthlingborough, Wellingborough Against Refusal

Two storey rear extension, new side window & balcony 13/09/2018 Dismissed
The main issue for consideration was the impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.6 Lakeside. No 6 has a bedroom window positioned at the first floor level on the side elevation. This window is obscurely glazed and faces the application site. The proposed extension would have been positioned less than 3.5 metres from this opening.

The inspector concluded that the proposed two storey side extension would cause unacceptable harm on the aforementioned window by reducing the levels of daylight and sunlight reaching the bedroom. They also noted that by replacing the current glazing with clear glass (as suggested by the appellant) would in turn result in unacceptable harm to the outlook of the occupiers of No.6 and the appeal scheme would be overbearing. For these reasons the appeal was dismissed.

Wayne Cattell
Householder Appeal
18/00815/FUL Mr Basson 2 Farnham Drive Rushden Northamptonshire Against Refusal
Single storey rear extension with roof lantern 13/09/2018 Dismissed
This was an application for a long rear extension to the property. It was refused because it was considered the proposal would have resulted in the plot being over developed and the design would have been out of character with the surroundings. The Inspector agreed with situation from a character point of view and dismissed the appeal.

Decided Appeals Dismissed : 2 100.00%
Decided Appeals Allowed : 0 0.00%
Decided Appeals Withdrawn : 0 0.00%
Decided Appeals Total : 2 100.00%