

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

24 SEPTEMBER 2003

PLANNING APPEALS –SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Contact Officer: Sian Proudlock Tel No: 01962 848271

RECENT REFERENCES:

Report PS 56 to Principal Scrutiny Committee - Performance Report Concerning Planning Appeals - 9.December 2002

Report EN 8 to Environment Performance Improvement Committee - planning appeals analysis of decisions - 12 March 2003

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

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

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1 That the report be noted.

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

24 SEPTEMBER 2003

PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

DETAIL:

A summary of appeal decisions received during August 2003 is set out below:

1.1 August 2003 Appeal Decisions

Date	Site	Decision	Proposal	Issues
05/08/03	W09335/03 and W09335/04: Land Between Lilliput Cottage And Glebe Villas Trampers Lane North Boarhunt	Both Dismissed	Detached 3 bedroom house, car-port and alterations to access; Detached 3 bedroom house, double garage and alteration to access	Both proposed schemes would be too large for the narrow plot and erode the character of plot sizes and gaps between buildings on the lane and harm the appearance of the street scene. Furthermore both schemes would result in development that would be harmful to the living conditions of adjacent residents primarily by reason of overbearing DEL IH
11/08/03	W15161/02: Little Down Winchester Road Lower Upham	Dismissed	Removal of an agricultural occupancy condition	There is a realistic long term need for agricultural dwellings in the area that is sufficient to justify retain the condition. DEL IH
12/08/03	W03815/11: Kingfisher Nurseries Selworth Lane Soberton	Dismissed	Erection of 2 detached live/work units and semi-detached houses	There is no evidence that the proposals would meet any specific housing need and the site does not constitute previously developed land. Therefore the additional dwellings clearly conflict with policies which resist development in the countryside. In addition, The large size of the proposed detached houses would be out of character in this locality and visually prominent on this sloping site. DEL WR
12/08/03	W05850/02: 2 Victoria House Romsey Road Winchester	Dismissed	Boundary fence	The wall and fence arrangement proposed would be an unobtrusive and undesirable feature likely to have an adverse effect on the appearance of the conservation area. DEL WR

14/08/03	W14873/02 and W14873/03: Crossways Curdrige Lane Curdrige	Both dismissed	6 houses with garages /carports and 5 houses with garages /carports	The development would require the provision of footways. The urbanising effect of these would have an adverse impact on an area of rural character. DEL IH
15/08/03	W09047/02: Land between 50 & 54 Chesil Street Winchester	Dismissed	Single dwelling	The ground floor window in the front elevation of the proposal would be damaging to the setting of the adjoining listed buildings and would fail to preserve or enhance the appearance of the wider Conservation Area. CTTE IH
19/08/02	W17689: Heather Glen Main Road Itchen Abbas Winchester	Dismissed	Demolition of an existing dwelling and proposed replacement house	The increased size of the proposed house would result in an increased visual intrusion on an elevated site which would damage the character and appearance of the area. DEL WR

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