

Planning Services

COMMITTEE REPORT

APPEAL UPDATE (DURHAM CITY AREA OFFICE)

APPEALS RECEIVED:

Appeal by Miss A Mosley

Site at 5 Church Row, West Rainton, Durham, DH4 6NR

An appeal has been lodged by Miss A Mosley against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission for the erection of detached single, flat roofed garage at 5 Church Street, West Rainton, Durham, DH4 6NR.

The appeal is to be dealt with by way of written representations and the Committee will be advised of the outcome in due course.

Recommendation:

That the report be noted.

APPEAL DECISIONS:

Appeal by Mr McKay

Site at 18 Hawthorn Terrace, Durham, DH1 4EL

An appeal was lodged by Mr McKay against the Council's refusal of planning permission for the erection of three storey pitched roof extension and 1 no. pitched roof dormer to rear and erection of 1 no. pitched roof dormer to front of existing dwelling at 18 Hawthorn Terrace, Durham DH1 4EL.

The appeal was **dismissed** and planning permission refused for the development.

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace in general and the Durham (City Centre) Conservation Area.

The Inspector concluded that the changes to the front of the property alone would be subordinate to the existing house and would not be unacceptably detrimental to the appearance of the terrace.

He considered however, that the rear extension when viewed against the existing, would visually overpower the simple rear elevation and the traditional character of the modest Victorian house. The character would change and little of the original rear elevation would remain visible. The rear extensions and dormer would, in combination, unduly dominate and fail to look subordinate in scale, mass and appearance to the host property. The presence of a recent infill development at 21-25 would not justify allowing a harmful scheme at the appeal site. The visually harmful effects would be apparent from rear gardens and along the elevated back lane from a number of rear elevations of dwellings in The Avenue.

The proposed development was considered to cause significant harm to the appearance of the rear elevation of the host property and the character of the house and would harm the appearance and character of the terrace and Conservation Area.

Recommendation:

That the appeal decision be noted.

APPEAL UPDATE (EASINGTON AREA OFFICE)

APPEALS RECEIVED:

Appeal by Mr Paul Bell

Site at Former Bookmakers, Mickle Hill Road, Blackhall, TS27 4DF

An appeal has been lodged against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission for the change of use from a bookmakers to a hot food takeaway at the former bookmakers, Mickle Hill Road, Blackhall. The appeal will be dealt with by way of written representations and the committee will be informed of the outcome in due course.

Recommendation:

That the appeal be noted.

Appeal by Mr A Collins

Site at Salters Lane, Haswell, DH6 2AT

An appeal has been lodged against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission for the erection of a bungalow at land at Salters Lane, Haswell. The appeal will be dealt with by way of written representations and the committee will be informed of the outcome in due course.

Recommendation:

That the appeal be noted.

APPEAL DECISIONS:

Appeal by Mr Donoghue

Site at land to the South West of Heath View, Station Town, Wingate, TS28 5ED

An appeal was previously lodged against the refusal of planning permission for calf rearing sheds and general purpose agricultural buildings which was dismissed by the inspectorate. However, the applicant had already constructed three separate roadways and three separate areas of hardstanding on the site. As such, an enforcement notice was served which required the permanent removal of the three roadways and the three areas of hardstanding and to reinstate the land to grassland, and to permanently remove from the land any rubble, excavated material and debris resulting from the development. An appeal was lodged against the enforcement notice.

The inspector has dismissed the appeal and upheld the enforcement notice stating that the works must be carried out within 12 weeks of the date of the appeal decision.

The inspector noted that the roads and hardstandings had a regimented and urban appearance which, visually, had more in common with an industrial estate than with traditional agricultural development. In this setting they appeared both incongruous and inappropriate.

It was also concluded that the development was a serious source of harm to the character and appearance of the rural area and that there was no evidence of an agricultural need for the development. Moreover, to grant planning permission for the development in the absence of such need would make it difficult for the Council to resist other such development in the area.

Recommendation:

That the appeal decision be noted.