

RECENT APPEAL DECISIONS TO THE END OF SEPTEMBER 2010**Application Ref: S10/0507/HSH MJD****Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/D/10/2132712**Appeal Type: **Written Evidence**

Appellant:	Mr & Mrs A Haddow
Proposal:	First floor extension to dwelling
Site:	42, Gloucester Road, Grantham, NG318RJ

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal allowed with conditions - 20 August 2010
-------------------------	---

SUMMARY

The application was refused under delegated powers for the erection of a first floor extension to the front of a dwelling. It was considered that the proposal, due to its size and siting, would result in an incongruous form of development, not in keeping with the existing dwelling or surrounding properties.

The Inspector considered that, subject to the imposition of a condition requiring matching materials, the scheme would be an acceptable addition harmful to neither the host property nor the surrounding locality. The appeal was allowed.

Application Ref: S10/0366/FULL PL**Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/A/10/2128140/WF**Appeal Type: **Written Evidence**

Appellant:	Mr Anthony Jacobs
Proposal:	Erection of three bedroom dwellinghouse
Site:	Adj 21 Welbournes Lane, Long Bennington, Newark, NG235DP

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal dismissed - 01 September 2010
-------------------------	--------------------------------------

SUMMARY

To be reported to next Committee

Application Ref: S09/0894/LB NB**Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/E/09/2119400/NWF**Appeal Type: **Written Evidence**

Appellant:	Mr N Paget, Easton Bevins
Proposal:	Alterations to listed building (replacement signs and internal alterations)
Site:	7, High Street, Stamford, PE9 2AL

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal - split decision - 08 September 2010
-------------------------	---

SUMMARY

The Inspector issued a split decision on the application and allowed the internal alterations to the grade II* listed building; however, he dismissed the appeal on alterations to the signage.

The application was determined under delegated powers and refused permission on the grounds that the hanging sign was too large and obtrusive and, given the architectural attractiveness of the shop front and its category 1 designation in the Stamford Shopfront Design Guide (SSDG), lettering on the fascia should not be raised.

The Inspector agreed with the refusal and noted that the hanging sign was particularly large and prominent. Furthermore, given the attractive shop front and guidance within the SSDG, less obtrusive lettering to the fascia would be more appropriate.