



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 12 JULY 2018

REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND TRANSPORTATION.

Address: 18 WALSTEAD ROAD WALSALL, WS WS5 4LX
Reference no. E18/0169

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To advise Members of ongoing issues and to request authority to pursue planning enforcement action against:
- a) The unauthorised single storey front extension, two storey side extension, loft conversion with rear dormer window and changing the hipped roof to a gable that has been built not in accordance with the approved plans of planning application 17/1689 (approved plans - proposed layout (100/669-02).
 - b) Structure built in the rear garden is 3.48m deep and 5.8m wide and at the highest point was approximately 3.1m high

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 **That authority is granted to the Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation to issue an Enforcement Notice** under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). To require remedial actions to be undertaken as shown in 3.2.
- 2.2 **To authorise the Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation to institute prosecution proceedings** in the event of non-compliance with an Enforcement Notice.
- 2.3 **To authorise the Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation, to amend, add to, or delete from the wording** set out below stating the nature of the breaches, the reasons for taking enforcement action, the requirements of the Notice, or the boundaries of the site, in the interests of ensuring that accurate and up to date notices are served.

3.0 DETAILS OF THE ENFORCEMENT NOTICE

- 3.1 The Breach of Planning Control
- a) Two story side extension
 - b) Loft conversion with rear dormer window

S. PRETTY - Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation.

- c) Single storey front extension
- d) The roof has been changed from a hip to a gable
- e) Rear garden building

3.2 Steps required to remedy the breach:

- a) Incorporate the 0.5m set back from front elevation for the first floor element of the two storey side extension
 - b) Reduce the size of the rear dormer to the approved measurements (2 metres in height and 2.2 metres wide and 3.25 metres deep) and reposition the dormer to its approved position 20cm set in from the boundary with 20 Walstead Road .
 - c) Demolish the front single storey extension
 - d) Demolish the roof extension and reinstate the hipped roof incorporating the 0.5m set back from front elevation and roof slopes to match original dwelling house .
 - e) Reduce the outbuilding to a maximum of 2.5m in height
- OR**
- f) Demolish all works entirely
- AND**
- g) Remove all waste materials to an approved site licensed to accept such materials.

3.3 Period for compliance:

3 months from when the notice takes effect - to undertake the works as set out in paragraph 3.2 parts a to e and g **OR** f and g

3.4 The reasons for taking enforcement action:

- a) Planning permission was granted for application 17/1689 on the 14 February 2018 with the approved plans labelled (100/669 – 02). The works that have been built do not reflect these plans and the development as built is uncharacteristic of the building and surrounding area, creating an incongruous feature, which has a detrimental impact on the local amenity, and has an inappropriate terracing effect and is contrary to planning policies, CPS4 of the Black Country Core Strategy, 'saved' policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Walsall UDP, Supplementary Planning Guidance Designing Walsall and National Planning Policy Framework..

4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

An appeal against an enforcement notice could be subject to an application for a full or partial award of the appellant's costs in making an appeal if it was considered that the Council had acted unreasonably. Planning applications may also be submitted that require an application fee.

5.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The report recommends enforcement action in order to seek compliance with planning policies. The following planning policies are relevant in this case:

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) www.gov.uk

The NPPF sets out the Government's position on the role of the planning system in both plan-making and decision-taking. It states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, in economic, social and environmental terms, and it emphasises a "*presumption in favour of sustainable development*".

All the core planning principles have been reviewed and those relevant in this case are:

- Always require high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
- Find ways to enhance and improve places in which people live their lives
- Take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas
- Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has previously been developed

Key provisions of the NPPF relevant in this case:

- NPPF 7 - Requiring good design
- NPPF 8 - Promoting healthy communities

NPPF Consultation

In March 2018 the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government issued consultation proposals for revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework. The consultation ends on 10 May 2018. The text has been revised to implement policy changes previously consulted upon and further changes to planning policy announced in the Budget 2017. Whilst proposals should be considered in light of this draft consultation at this stage it can be afforded little weight as a material consideration in the determination of the application.

5.2 Local Policy

Black Country Core Strategy

- ENV2 Historic Character and Local Distinctiveness
- ENV3 Design Quality

Saved Unitary Development Plan policies

- GP2 Environmental Protection
- ENV32: Design and Development Proposals
- T7: Car Parking
- T13: Parking Provision for Cars, Cycles and Taxis

S. PRETTY - Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation.

Designing Walsall SPD

Policies are available to view online:

http://cms.walsall.gov.uk/planning_policy

- DW3: Character
- Appendix D

6.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Pursuant to section 171A (a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) the carrying out development without the required planning permission or failing to comply with a condition or limitation subject to which planning permission has been granted constitutes a breach of planning control.
- 6.2 Section 171B adds that where there has been a breach of planning control consisting in the carrying out without planning permission of building, engineering, mining or other operations in, on, over or under land, no enforcement action may be taken after the end of the period of four years beginning with the date on which the operations were substantially completed. In respect of any other breach (such as change of use or breach of condition) no enforcement action may be taken after the end of the period of ten years from the date of the breach except where the breach of planning control consists of a change of use of any building to use as a single dwelling house, in which case a four-year period applies.
- 6.3 Officers consider that the breach of planning control occurring at this site commenced within the last 4 years,
- 6.4 Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that the local planning authority may issue an Enforcement Notice where it appears to them:
- (a) that there has been a breach of planning control; and
 - (b) that it is expedient to issue the notice, having regard to the development plan and to any other material considerations.
- 6.5 The breach of planning control is set out in this report. Members must decide whether it is expedient for the enforcement notice to be issued, taking into account the contents of this report.
- 6.6 Non-compliance with an Enforcement Notice constitutes an offence. In the event of non-compliance, the Council may instigate legal proceedings. The Council may also take direct action to carry out works and recover the costs of those works from the person on whom the Enforcement Notice was served. Any person on whom an Enforcement Notice is served has a right of appeal to the Secretary of State.

S. PRETTY - Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation.

7.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Article 8 and Article 1 of the first protocol to the Convention on Human Rights state that a person is entitled to the right to respect for private and family life, and the peaceful enjoyment of his/her property. However, these rights are qualified in that they must be set against the general interest and the protection of the rights and freedom of others. In this case, the wider impact of the development and its use overrules the owner's right to the peaceful enjoyment of his property.
- 7.2 The Equality Act 2010. The Council has had regard to its duties under the Equality Act 2010 and considers that the issue of the notice will not affect the exercise of those duties under S149 to (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (b). Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c). foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

8.0 WARD(S) AFFECTED

- 8.1 Palfrey

9.0 CONSULTEES

- 9.1 None

10.0 CONTACT OFFICERS

- 10.1 Sheila Denison Enforcement Officer

11.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1 Enforcement file E18/0169 not published.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
DATE:12 JULY 2018

12.0 BACKGROUND AND REPORT DETAIL

- 12.1 A plan showing the location of the site is attached to this report.
- 12.2 The Local Planning Authority received a complaint on 21st May 2018 that the dwelling house was not being built in accordance with the approved plans. In particular the roof type as built is very different to the approved plans. Other neighbouring properties have had this design of roof line refused. This was investigated and a site visit was made.
- 12.3 Officers from both planning enforcement and building control met the owner on site on 31st May 2018; we could see the extent of the building works not built to the approved plans.
- 12.4 The owner was written to on the 1st June 2018 advising that the works were unauthorised, as the development was not in accordance with the approved plans. The letter noted that a planning application could be submitted to seek retrospective planning consent as a means to regularise the works, however it was unlikely that such an application could be supported.
- 12.5 A new application has been received from the agent on 13th July 2018, however this is invalid and whilst the agent has been written to regarding the documents needed to ensure validation, these have not been forthcoming.
- 12.6 The front extension due to the depth of the projection is an uncharacteristic and incongruous feature on the dwelling and not in keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene. It should be noted that the depth of the extension does not breach the 45- degree code, and therefore does not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupier of the neighbouring property.
- 12.7 There have been other dwellings in this street that have applied for planning permission to change the roof to a gable from the hipped and permission has been refused. On the grounds that the alteration from a hipped roof to a gabled roof would unbalance the pair of semi-detached house and create a jarring effect against the neighbouring properties roof and as such represents poor design contrary to saved policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Walsall UDP. This is directly comparable to this case and would equally represent a poor design solution to extending the property, contrary to policy.
- 12.8 The garden structure is approximately 3.1 metres high and would need planning permission as it exceeds the 2.5m height restriction, within 2 metres of a boundary as set out within the permitted development rights.
- 12.12 Enforcement action should be commensurate with the breach of planning control to which it relates. It will normally be inappropriate to take formal enforcement

action against a trivial or technical breach of control which causes no harm to amenity. This is often referred to as the **expediency** test.

12.13 When assessing whether to instigate enforcement action the committee are advised that the following needs to be considered:

- i. the proposed action must be in the public interest
- ii. the breach must be sufficiently harmful to justify taking action
- iii. the proposed action must be reasonable and commensurate with the breach in planning control to which it relates
- iv. the action undertaken should be cost effective
- v. whether or not the development is in accordance with planning policies

12.14 It is considered that the harm from the unauthorised development has an unbalancing impact on the pair of semi-detached properties, creating an uncharacteristic building, which is an incongruous feature and adversely impacts on the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to Policy ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy, 'saved' policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Walsall UDP, Supplementary planning document Designing Walsall and guidance in the NPPF. Therefore, action is expedient as it is sufficiently harmful. The action is reasonable and commensurate with the breach, cost effective and in accordance with planning policies.



S. PRETTY - Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation.