



Planning Committee

Astwood Bank and Feckenham Ward

2nd March 2010

INFORMATION ITEM

(Report of Acting Head of Environment & Planning)

1. Summary of Report

To receive an item of information in relation to an outcome of an appeal against a planning decision.

2. Recommendation

The Committee is asked to **RESOLVE** that
the item of information be noted.

3. Financial, Legal, Policy, Risk and Climate Change Implications

There are no financial, legal, policy risk or climate change implications for the Council.

Report

4. Background

Planning Application file.

5. Consultation

There has been no consultation other than with relevant Borough Council Officers.

6. Other Implications

Any Asset Management, Community Safety, Human Resources, Social Exclusion and Sustainability/Environmental will be detailed in the attached separate report.

7. Author of Report

The author of this report is Ruth Bamford (Acting Head of Planning & Building Control), who can be contacted on extension 3219 (email: ruth.bamford@redditchbc.gov.uk) for more information.

8. **Appendices**

Appendix 1 - Outcome of Appeal against a Planning Decision – 2009/112/FUL

OUTCOME OF APPEAL AGAINST A PLANNING DECISION

Reference: 2009/112/FUL

Proposal: ERECTION OF 2 DWELLINGS
LAND TO THE REAR OF 23 NEW ROAD
ASTWOOD BANK

(Astwood Bank & Feckenham Ward)

This appeal was against the Council's decision to refuse full planning permission (under delegated powers afforded to officers) for the above development. The proposal was to erect two houses, arranged as a pair of semi-detached dwellings in a back of garden land position to the rear of number 23 New Road. Access to the dwellings was to be from Tookey's Drive, to the South.

The planning application was refused for two reasons. The first reason concerned the perceived incongruous appearance of the proposed development which was considered to be out of keeping with the prevailing character and appearance of the surrounding area. Secondly, due to the increased use of Tookey's Drive, a private track leading to and terminating at Tookey's Farmhouse to the west, Officers considered that an increased detrimental impact upon nearby amenity would result by granting consent and raised concerns on highway safety grounds due to poor visibility at the junction of Tookey's Drive with Evesham Road.

The Inspector noted that the existing long rear gardens in this area are a feature of properties on this side of New Road, and while there are a number of sheds and other buildings to the rear of existing dwellings, he considered that the open nature of the gardens makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, reinforced by the open playing field opposite (to the south). He considered that the development would relate poorly to other development in the area failing to respect the context and local distinctiveness of the streetscene. As such the Inspector agreed with Officers that the development proposed would be harmful to the existing character and appearance of the area, being contrary to Policies B(HSG).6 and B(BE).13 of the Local Plan.

Turning to the issue of highway safety, the Inspector noted that visibility to the north along Evesham Road for vehicles emerging from the access is generally poor with no realistic prospect of improvement. He considered that the appeal development would generate increased use by vehicles, and that due to the very poor visibility at the Tookey's Drive / Evesham Road junction, even a small further increase in movements would give rise to unacceptable danger for users of the access and other road users, conflicting with the emphasis placed on safety in PPG13 (Transport).

The Inspector took into consideration the amenity of neighbours, (which formed part of your officers' second reason for refusal) but considered that the number of additional vehicle movements would not cause material harm in this respect. Notwithstanding this, he did not consider that this matter would outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area and to highway safety.

The appeal was therefore DISMISSED.