

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

9th November 2010

Appeal Outcome Report for Information

Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

Planning application details	2009/249/FUL
Proposal	Erection of a single dwelling
Location	Land adjacent to No. 31 Wheatcroft Close, Brockhill
Ward	Batchley & Brockhill
Decision	Refusal 3rd February 2010

Decision made by Planning Committee on 2nd February 2010

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: steve.edden@redditchbc.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

The proposal was to erect a three bed end of terrace dwelling with associated parking arrangements.

The Planning Committee's three reasons for refusal were firstly relating to the proposed dwelling's siting and appearance being out of character with the pattern of development in the area, having regard to its closer proximity to a sound attenuation bund; secondly the perceived inadequacies of the proposed ingress and egress to parking areas resulting in a danger to highway safety and conflict between existing vehicle users of the communal parking area; and thirdly the perceived overdevelopment of the site having regard to the resultant loss of garden area to no.31 Wheatcroft Close.

The Inspector noted that the parking court to the front of No's 29-31 dominated the frontage, relieved only to a limited degree by the small gravelled landscaped area to the front of No.31. The Inspector commented that adding a parking space to the front of No.31, reducing the area for landscaping would result in an area almost completely dominated by cars to the frontage, giving a cramped appearance to the area. He considered that such an arrangement would not respect the context of the surrounding dwellings.

Whilst the Inspector considered that the design of the proposed additional dwelling would match that of the adjoining buildings, he considered that its location would intrude into the area at the foot of the sound attenuation bund. Re-grading of the bund was considered by the Inspector to give a contrived appearance contributing to the cramped appearance of the development.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

9th November 2010

The Inspector commented that although the Highway Authority had not objected to the proposal on highway safety grounds, and while it might be possible, with multiple manoeuvres to turn a car so that it could enter and leave the shared access area in a forward gear, he considered that additional vehicle movements in the tight and constrained space to the front of numbers 29 to 31 would be hazardous to pedestrians and especially children and would certainly cause significant inconvenience to existing and future residents.

Of assistance to officers and members in this case are the Inspectors comments with respect to the recent reissuing and amendment of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 – Housing which amended the definition of previously developed land to exclude ‘garden land’ from within this definition and removing the indicative minimum housing density. The Inspector considered that the changes to PPS3 had little effect in this case and did not alter his reasoning on the main issues.

Costs application

No application for costs was made.

Appeal outcome

The appeal was DISMISSED.

Recommendation

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