

## Report to Planning Committee – 21 July 2016

### Planning Appeals

1. There were 7 appeals determined between April and June 2016. Two appeals were against a decision of the Planning Committee and the remainder against delegated decisions.

Four of the decisions were upheld and the appeals dismissed. The 3 successful appeals were against delegated decisions

2. Members have been issued with the full decisions, but in brief the reasons were

#### 2.1 Willow Manor

The application was for the extension of the garage outbuilding to accommodate more cars and for upper floor modifications to the building

The Officer considered that the proposal would amount to a new dwelling in the countryside and the effect of the proposal would have an impact on the AONB

The Inspector concluded that the increase in living accommodation was not sufficient to consider it the creation of a new dwelling and the screening and use of materials ensured that it did not adversely affect the AOND.

#### 2.2 College Road

The application was for the replacement of wooden windows with UPVC. The Officer felt the proposal had a negative effect on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene.

The Inspector pointed out that the building was not listed and was not in a conservation area. Given other recent improvements to the building, the new windows would not have a negative effect and brought additional benefits of energy conservation.

#### 2.3 Mill Hill

The application was a garden development for the erection of 2 dwellings and was refused due to its impact on the character and appearance of the area and the effect on the living conditions of neighbours.

The Inspector considered that neither of these concerns was sufficiently harmful to refuse the application

### 3. Learning Points

There was a review of the Willow Manor application and whilst there were concerns raised that a small number of our proposed conditions were not supported by the Inspector, it was concluded that Officers had taken a balanced decision when recommending refusal.

4. The annual target is that a maximum of 15% of appeals are upheld. The overall performance is 42% - significantly over target.

Year to date	All appeals	Number Upheld	Number Dismissed	% Upheld
2016	7	3	4	42

**Quarter 1**

**2016**

Case	Address	Delegated/Committee	Dismissed/Upheld
15/00634	Agester lane	DEL	Upheld
15/00895	Beech Tree Ave	DEL	Dismissed
15/01065	Bewsbury Crescent	COM	Dismissed
15/00971	College Road	DEL	Upheld
ENF/DOV/12/109	London Rd	Enforcement	Dismissed
13/01106	Engine Shed Field	COM	Dismissed
15/00926	105 Mill Hill	DEL	Upheld

Quarter	Committee Appeals	Number Upheld	Number Dismissed	%Upheld
1	2	0	2	0
2	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0

Quarter	Delegated Appeals	Number Upheld	Number Dismissed	%Upheld
1	5	3	2	60
2	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0

Dave Robinson  
 Planning and Delivery Manager