

**APPENDIX A**

	<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>DELEGATED OR COMMITTEE DECISION?</b> T= turnover of officer recommendation at committee	<b>APPEAL ALLOWED OR DISMISSED?</b>	<b>INSPECTOR'S REASONING</b>	<b>AWARD OF COSTS?</b>
1	<b>10/01613/FUL - 349A Lincoln Rd</b>  Change of use of office and store building to hairdressing and beauty salon	Delegated	Dismissed	Inspector agreed that the narrow uninviting pedestrian access would increase fear / risk of crime to existing residents, occupiers and future customers	No
2	<b>11/00160/FUL - 24 Lawrence Road Wittering</b>  Single storey rear extension	Delegated	Allowed	Inspector concluded that:  1. depth of extension would not result in a loss of outlook from the neighbouring property or be overbearing. 2. enough garden would be left for drying washing and for sitting out and for other normal domestic activities.	No
3	<b>10/01082/FUL - 10 Corfe Avenue, Walton</b>  New 1.8m wall and access gates	Delegated	Dismissed	The Inspector agreed that the height and use of metal railings the proposed wall would be out of keeping with the general street scene.	No
4	<b>10/01215/FUL - 69 Eye Road, Dogsthorpe</b>  Storage use for business - Part retrospective	Delegated	Dismissed	Inspector agreed that the development was harmful visually and to amenity of neighbours.	No

	<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>DELEGATED OR COMMITTEE DECISION?</b> T= turnover of officer recommendation at committee	<b>APPEAL ALLOWED OR DISMISSED?</b>	<b>INSPECTOR'S REASONING</b>	<b>AWARD OF COSTS?</b>
5	<b>10/00787/FUL - 54 Church Street, Northborough</b>  Construction of four-bed dwelling and detached garage	Committee (T)	Allowed	The Inspector concluded: 1. the reduction in the size of the host dwelling's rear garden would not interfere with an appreciation of the building's special interest. 2. the modest sized dwelling given its siting and local vernacular design would not intrude upon views of or from the listed building. 3. the development proposed would preserve the character and appearance of the Northborough Conservation Area	No
6	<b>10/01669/FUL - 23 Springfield Road</b>  Ground floor rear extensions	Delegated	Dismissed	The inspector agreed that: 1. the proposal would make the house disproportionately large in relation to both the plot and its neighbours. 2. the remaining outside amenity space, already much reduced by previous extensions and the outbuilding, would be inadequate for the size of the extended dwelling. 3. the extension would be overbearing on the neighbouring property.	No
7	<b>10/01171/ADV – 4 Church Street</b>  Replacement non-illuminated fascia signage, externally illuminated projecting sign and internally illuminated sign	Delegated	Split decision	The fascia sign was not allowed due to its negative impact on appearance of the Conservation Areas. Other signage considered acceptable.	No

	<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>DELEGATED OR COMMITTEE DECISION?</b> T= turnover of officer recommendation at committee	<b>APPEAL ALLOWED OR DISMISSED?</b>	<b>INSPECTOR'S REASONING</b>	<b>AWARD OF COSTS?</b>
8	<b>10/00406/LBC - Granville House, The Green, Glington</b> Moving of existing entrance and rebuilding of stone boundary wall	Committee	Dismissed	Inspector agreed the proposal would: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the significance of the wall and detract from the contribution it presently makes to the street scene.</li> <li>2. harm the special interest of Granville House (Listed Building) and its contribution to the special interest of the conservation area.</li> </ol>	No
9	<b>10/01143/FUL - 10 Peddars Way, Longthorpe</b>  Single storey side and rear extensions to bungalow	Delegated	Allowed	The inspector concluded that the extensions would not be prominent in the street scene because of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. how far set back it was the set back</li> <li>2. the secluded position and</li> <li>3. the low profile of the shallow pitched roof</li> </ol>	No
10	<b>10/00872/FUL - The Haven, Second Drift, Wothorpe</b> Erection of dwelling with detached garage and studio above	Committee (T)	Allowed	The revised proposal (alterations to garage design) would not adversely affect the character, appearance or quality of the established residential area or seriously eroding the living conditions and general amenity enjoyed by neighbouring residents.	No

	<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>DELEGATED OR COMMITTEE DECISION?</b> T= turnover of officer recommendation at committee	<b>APPEAL ALLOWED OR DISMISSED?</b>	<b>INSPECTOR'S REASONING</b>	<b>AWARD OF COSTS?</b>
11	<b>10/00933/FUL - 194 Crabtree</b>  Conversion of a three storey domestic dwelling to three self contained flats	Delegated	Allowed	Inspector thought that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Given the characteristics of many families nowadays, with adults and older children often leading more independent lifestyles, the comings and goings from the flats would necessarily be greater or have the potential to cause significant noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents.</li> <li>2. Subject to the installation of sound insulation the proposal would be unlikely to have an adverse impact on the living conditions and general amenity.</li> <li>3. A satisfactory solution could be arrived at in respect of bin storage / collection that did not harm amenity</li> </ol> <p>Comment – this decision is disappointing as the proposal results in the introduction of flat conversions into a suburban housing estate.</p>	No
12	<b>10/01209/FUL- Floor 1 Midgate</b>  Change of use from use class A1 (shops) to use class A2 (betting shop)	Delegated	Allowed	The inspector concluded that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Although Local Plan Policy seeks to restrict the amount of non retail development in the main shopping streets, National policy encourages a wide range of uses to promote town centre vitality and viability.</li> <li>2. Betting shops are an accepted town centre use and not lead to an over-concentration of non-retail uses along the main shopping frontage of Long Causeway.</li> </ol> <p>It was also noted that on n unimplemented food permission for the same unit the Council had not restricted the subsequent</p>	No

				change of use to a betting shop.  Comment – the last point highlights the importance of checking the need to remove permitted development rights when approving changes of use.	
	<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>DELEGATED OR COMMITTEE DECISION?</b> T= turnover of officer recommendation at committee	<b>APPEAL ALLOWED OR DISMISSED?</b>	<b>INSPECTOR'S REASONING</b>	<b>AWARD OF COSTS?</b>
13	<b>10/00228/FUL - Land Opposite The Nurseries, Green Road, Eye</b> Change of use from agriculture to storage of touring caravans	Delegated	Dismissed	The inspector agreed that the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of this rural area of countryside and erode the general amenity of neighbouring residents	No
14	<b>10/01185/FUL - 33 St Martins Road, Newborough</b>  Proposed double garage with store room above	Delegated	Dismissed	The inspector agreed that it would appear as an incongruous urbanising development, highly visually intrusive so close to the entrance to the village	No
15	<b>10/01184/FUL - 5 Helpston Road, Glington</b>  Demolition of existing outhouses and construction of two storey rear extension and loft conversion	Delegated	Dismissed	The inspector found that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the original property and the surrounding area and on the living conditions of neighbours	No

	<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>DELEGATED OR COMMITTEE DECISION?</b> T= turnover of officer recommendation at committee	<b>APPEAL ALLOWED OR DISMISSED?</b>	<b>INSPECTOR'S REASONING</b>	<b>AWARD OF COSTS?</b>
16	<b>10/01322/FUL - 18 Lincoln Road, Glington</b>  Construction of two storey side and rear extensions	Delegated	Allowed	The inspector: 1. noted there are no policies or guidance which requires 2-storey extensions to be subservient to the host dwelling nor is there any design guidance to this effect. 2. concluded that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the area  Comment – we are currently preparing design guidance	No
17	<b>10/00767/FUL - 27 Clement Drive</b> Construction of 1.63m high trellis fencing to front and creation of hardstanding – retrospective	Delegated	Allowed	Inspector concluded that: 1. it would not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the area. 2. that the amount of surface water running off hardstanding would be minimal  Comment: point 2 is disappointing given that the objective is to have sustainable drainage.	No
18	<b>10/01096/FUL - 328a Lincoln Road</b> Installation of new shop window and roller shutter (retrospective)	Delegated	Dismissed	Inspector agreed that the shutter would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area	No

	<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>DELEGATED OR COMMITTEE DECISION?</b> T= turnover of officer recommendation at committee	<b>APPEAL ALLOWED OR DISMISSED?</b>	<b>INSPECTOR'S REASONING</b>	<b>AWARD OF COSTS?</b>
19	<b>10/01059/FUL 1 Western Avenue and 29 Birchtree Avenue</b> Construction of single storey front extension	Delegated	Dismissed	Inspector agreed the design and layout of the proposed extension would have a damaging impact on the street scene	No
20	<b>10/00860/FUL - 8 Kennedy Street, Hampton Vale</b> Construction of first floor balcony to rear with external staircase	Delegated	Dismissed	The inspector found that anyone standing on the balcony would be able to look directly down into the garden of number 10, while anyone climbing the stairs to the balcony from the garden would be able to see into its back windows. The inspector concluded that this would have an unacceptable impact on the privacy of occupants of number 10.	No

This page is intentionally left blank