# **REPORT FOR DECISION**



Agenda Item 9

DECISION OF:	PLANNIN	G CONTROL COMMITTEE	
DATE:			
	22 <sup>nd</sup> MAY 2012		
SUBJECT:	PLANNING APPEALS		
REPORT FROM:	DEVELOPMENT MANAGER		
CONTACT OFFICER:	JOHN CUMMINS		
TYPE OF DECISION:	COUNCIL		
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION/STATUS:	This paper is within the public domain		
SUMMARY:	The report lists:		
	<ul><li>Recent Planning Appeals Decided</li><li>Recent Appeal Lodged</li></ul>		
OPTIONS & RECOMMENDED OPTION	The Committee is recommended to the note the report and appendices.		
IMPLICATIONS:			
Corporate Aims/Policy Framework:		Do the proposals accord with the Policy Framework? Yes	
Statement by the S151 Officer: Financial Implications and Risk Considerations:		Executive Director of Resources to advise regarding risk management N/A	
Statement by Executive Director of Resources:		N/A	
Equality/Diversity implications:		No (see paragraph below)	
Considered by Monitoring Officer:		N/A	

Wards Affected:	All listed
Scrutiny Interest:	N/A

#### TRACKING/PROCESS

DIRECTOR:

Chief Executive/ Strategic Leadership Team	Executive Member/Chair	Ward Members	Partners
Scrutiny Committee	Committee	Council	

### 1.0 BACKGROUND

This is a monthly report to the Committee of the Planning Appeals lodged against decisions of the authority and against Enforcement Notices served and those that have been subsequently determined by the Planning Inspectorate.

## 2.0 ISSUES

> None to be considered by the Committee as this is an item for noting only.

### 3.0 CONCLUSION

That the item be noted.

#### List of Background Papers:-None

Contact Details:-John Cummins Development Manager Environment and Development Services 3 Knowsley Place Bury BL9 0EJ

Tel: 0161 253 6089 Email: j.cummins@bury.gov.uk

# Planning Appeals Decided between 03/04/2012 and 10/05/2012



Applicatio	n No.: 53891/FUL	Appeal Decision: Dismissed			
Decision le	evel: DEL	Date: 04/05/2012			
Recomme	nded Decision: Refuse	Appeal type: Written Representations			
Applicant:	icant: Ms Sharon L'Amie				
Location:	49 Bury New Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 9JY				
Proposal:	Disabled access ramp and security shelter to front (retrospective)				
Applicatio	n No.: 54311/ADV	Appeal Decision: Dismissed			
Decision level: DEL		Date: 04/05/2012			
Recomme	nded Decision: Refuse	Appeal type: Written Representations			
Applicant:	Wilson Fink				
Location:	tion: 468 Bury New Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1AX				
Proposal:	<b>Proposal:</b> 2 No. non-illuminated fascia signs and 1 no. flagpole sign (retrospective)				
Application No.: 54401/ADV         Appeal Decision: Dismissed					
Decision le	evel: DEL	Date: 19/04/2012			
Recomme	nded Decision: Split Decision	Appeal type: Written Representations			
Applicant:	Rockstar Tattoos				
Location:	4 The Rock, Bury, BL9 0NT				
Proposal:	A: 1 No. Non-illuminated fascia sign; Window graphic B: 1 No. Internally illuminated fascia sign; 1 No. Internally illuminated projecting sign				
Applicatio	n No.: 54528/FUL	Appeal Decision: Allowed			
Decision le	evel: DEL	Date: 30/04/2012			
Recomme	nded Decision: Refuse	Appeal type: Written Representations			
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Spencer				
Location:	2 Hey House Mews, Holcombe Old Road, Holcombe, Bury, BL8 4QS				
Proposal:	Installation of 10 panel solar photo voltaic system to the front elevation of the roof (Retrospective)				
<ul> <li>Comment.</li> <li>49 Bury Old Road – This was an application for a shelter and a disabled ramp in front of the Shefa Mahadrin Jewish Deli.</li> <li>The Inspector agreed that the shelter caused unacceptable harm to the character and</li> </ul>					

The Inspector agreed that the shelter caused unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In making the decision she did consider the support from local residents, the MP and Councillors, but concluded that the poor appearance of the shelter outweighed any benefit that it may have created by way of a shelter and the prevention of crime.

They did, however, consider that the ramp for people with disabilities could be modified to make it acceptable and this has been conditioned and a revised scheme must be submitted within 2 months.

We will now contact the owner and pursue the changes to the ramp and see if we can get a design of shelter that is appropriate to the location.

**2 Hey House Mews** – These solar panels had been erected on a property in a Conservation Area and close to a Listed Building. While the Inspector accepted that there was harm to the character of the area it did not meet the standard of 'substantial' as now set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and as<sup>3</sup>such dismissed the Appeal.

# Planning Appeals Lodged between 03/04/2012 and 10/05/2012



Application No.: 54377/FUL Decision level: DEL		Appeal lodged: 13/04/2012		
	ded Decision: Refuse	Appeal Type: Written Representations		
	Forts of India			
Location	Forts of India, 5-11 Radcliffe New Road, Whitefield, Manchester, M25 7QX			
Proposal	Proposal Alterations to the front facade (Re submission)			
Application No.: 54450/FUL Decision level: COM		Appeal lodged: 16/04/2012		
Decision level: COM       Appeal Type: Written Representations         Recommended Decision: Refuse       Appeal Type: Written Representations				
Applicant:	Oak Lodge Care & Nursing Home			
Location	Whitefield House, Pinfold Lane, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 7JS			
Proposal	Variation of condition no. 1 of planning permission 53354 (Conservation Area Consent) to extend the time limit for the demolition of the existing facade to be completed			
Total Number of Appeals Lodged: 2				

#### Comment:

**Whitefield House** – Members may recall that this was a decision made by the PCC on an officer recommendation to refuse the request for and extension of time to demolish the former Whitefield Town Hall and that the Committee supported the recommendation.