

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

REPORT TO CITY CENTRE,
SOUTH & EAST PLANNING &
HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE
25 FEBRUARY 2013

1.0 RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS SUBMISSIONS AND DECISIONS

This report provides a schedule of all newly submitted planning appeals and decisions received, together with a brief summary of the Secretary of State's reasons for the decisions.

2.0 NEW APPEALS RECEIVED

(i) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission, under delegated powers, in respect of an application for planning permission, under Section 191, to establish the lawful development of a telecommunications mast, Orange Telecommunications Mast, Adjacent Bailey Bridge, Effingham Street (Case No 12/03522/TEL).

(ii) An appeal has been submitted against an Enforcement Notice served by the City Council in respect of unauthorised alterations, roller shutters and vehicle access points at the site at Meersbrook Garage, 1 to 7 Meersbrook Road.

3.0 APPEALS WITHDRAWN

(i) An appeal against the decision of the City Council to refuse advertisement consent at Clan House, Turners Lane (Case No 12/02714/ADV) has been withdrawn

Officer Comment:- The appeal was withdrawn after the applicant secured consent for alternative signage.

4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS - DISMISSED

(i) An appeal against the decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission, under delegated powers, for the construction of a dormer window at 2 Meersbrook Avenue (Case No 12/02020/FUL) has been dismissed

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issue in this case to be the impact of the proposed dormer upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding street scene.

He noted that 2 Meersbrook Avenue was a prominent dwelling in the street scene, and that the proposed dormer would cover approximately 50% of the width of the roof slope.

He considered the dormer would substantially detract from the original design of the house, failing to respect its symmetry and clearly vertical emphasis, and the receding hierarchy of windows. As such features were common within the street scene he felt the dormer would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene.

He did not give any weight to similar structures on neighbouring properties, considering that they were older structures, and could not set a precedent.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted

David Caulfield
Head of Planning

25 February 2013