

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

6 APRIL 2005

PLANNING APPEALS –SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Contact Officer: John Hearn Tel No: 01962 848354

RECENT REFERENCES:

Report PS 56 to Principal Scrutiny Committee - Performance Report Concerning Planning Appeals (9.12.02).

Report EN 8 to Environment and Access Performance Improvement Committee - planning appeals analysis of decisions (12.03.03).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report provides a summary of appeal decisions received during January 2005, as requested by members at the Environment and Access Performance Improvement Committee meeting in March 2003. Copies of each appeal decision are available in the Members room if required.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1 That the report be noted.

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

6 APRIL 2005

PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

DETAIL:

A summary of appeal decisions received during February 2005 for sites within Development Control Area East is set out below:

1.1 February 2005 Appeal Decisions for Development Control Area East

Date	Site	Decision	Proposal	Issues
01/02/05	W18942: Quarry Wood West Street Hambleton	Dismissed	Erection of detached four bedroom dwelling with detached double garage	The site contains trees which are of high visual amenity value, but these would not appear to be affected by the proposals. Although the proposed single dwelling would only achieve a density of less than 10 dwellings per hectare, it would nevertheless be compatible with the informal, spacious character of the surrounding development, while a higher density development would be dominant and incongruous in relation to the host dwelling and neighbouring properties. A group of dwellings housed within a single building and designed to look like a single detached house would also harm the character of the area due to the associated domestic paraphernalia, ancillary buildings and movement of people and vehicles. However, the proposed house would share an existing access which has severely restricted visibility in both directions. This increased use would be seriously prejudicial to highway safety. Furthermore the rear garden of the proposed house would be

				<p>overlooked by existing windows in the host dwelling and this would be harmful to the living conditions of future occupiers.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>
02/03/05	W04155/03: 15 Sparkford Road Winchester	Alterations to form a chalet bungalow	Allowed	<p>The proposal would affect the neighbouring house to the north by reducing the amount of natural light in the kitchen and by altering the outlook, but in neither case to the extent that it would unacceptably harm the living conditions of this adjacent house.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>
24/02/05	W18834/01: 29 Fordington Avenue Winchester	Dismissed	Raising of roof to create glazed roof to replace existing flat roof; dormer window to side and velux window to front	<p>The proposed glazed roof, due to its scale and materials would be a visible and incongruous addition to this traditionally built dwelling. It would unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached house and be a dominant feature in the street scene where the dwellings are of relatively uniform appearance.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>
28/02/05	W07639/02: East Cottage Sarum Road Winchester	Allowed	Two storey side extension, the insertion of rooflights in the front and rear elevations and replacement of an area of flat roof with a new pitched roof	<p>This cottage is smaller than 120m² and the proposed extension would result in a percentage increase in floor area of 42%. This would be contrary to local plan policy C19 which seeks to retain the number of smaller, affordable dwellings in the countryside. However, this property cannot be regarded as affordable, and its extension would not therefore reduce the stock of affordable dwellings available to rural communities or workers. Furthermore, the proposal does not involve increasing the number of bedrooms in the house so there would be no reduction in the number of three-bedroom houses available in the area.</p> <p>DEL WR</p>

DEL Delegated decision
CTTE Committee decision

WR Written representations
IH Informal hearing
PI Public inquiry

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

2 CORPORATE STRATEGY (RELEVANCE TO):

- 2.2 Success on appeal is a measure of quality. It demonstrates that the policies of the development plan and the decisions reached by officers and Members can be successfully defended.

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 3.1 The number of appeals received and the success of appeals has an impact on staff time and legal costs.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

None

APPENDICES:

None