

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

20th December 2005

PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT

Contact Officer: John Hearn/Simon Finch Tel No: 01962 848354/848271

RECENT REFERENCES:

Report PDC593 – Planning Appeals - 5 October 2005

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report provides a summary of appeal decisions received during November 2005. Copies of each appeal decision are available in the Members Room if required.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1 That the report be noted.

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE20 December 2005PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONSREPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENTDetail:

A summary of appeal decisions received during November 2005 is set out below:

1.1 November 2005 Appeal Decisions

Date	Site	Decision	Proposal	Issues
15/11/05	W04367/19A: Weeke Manor Malmesbury Gardens Winchester	Dismissed	Display of 5 non-illuminated board signs	The four smaller signs are fixed to a short stretch of residential boundary wall the excess of signage gives a cluttered appearance. The larger sign is on the dwelling itself and is an overlarge and wholly inappropriate addition to this modest domestic property. All of the signs are readily visible and stand out as unduly intrusive advertising features in this pleasant residential setting. DEL WR
30/11/05	WTPO/121/1 75: 4 Down Gate Alresford	Dismissed	Fell 1 Horse Chestnut	This tree has appreciable amenity value and is clearly visible from a number of viewpoints and its removal would have a negative effect on the visual amenity of the area. The tree is healthy and is not posing a danger to neighbouring properties. Loss of light to the garden of the adjacent property, 4 Downgate, is not sufficient justification for felling the tree. DEL WR
15/11/05	W08964/06 St Johns Hoads Hill Wickham Fareham Hampshire PO17 5BX	Dismissed	Erection of 1 no. two bedroom detached dwelling with attached single garage	This proposal was considered to be contrary to countryside policies that restrict the erection of residential dwellings unless required for the purposes of agriculture/forestry. The appeal dwelling did not fall into any of these categories. The Inspector also felt the proposal would be detrimental to highway safety and the visual amenities of the area. DEL WR

16/11/05	W18511/01 4 Parklands Wangfield Lane Curdrige Southampton Hampshire SO32 2DA	Allowed	Two storey side extension	It was considered that, although the proposal was a large extension, it was of a reasonable design and suitably screened and that it would not be visually intrusive. Despite the fact the extension is larger than the existing dwelling; the Inspector considered that it would not be overly dominating. The Inspector also commented that "Proposal C22 (of the emerging WDLP) is confusing as it does not define what is meant by the original dwelling, the method of measurement (e.g. gross or net), or whether garages and outbuildings should be included." DEL WR
28/11/05	Deeside Kiln Hill Soberton Southampton Hampshire SO32 3QE	Allowed	Single storey rear extension	It was considered that this proposal would not be visually detrimental to the surrounding area as the roof of the extension was no higher than that of the existing and also considered that the insertion of rooflights would not be detrimental. 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