

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Planning Committee Report | |
| Planning Ref: | AD/2017/2803 |
| Site: | 84 Dawlish Drive |
| Ward: | Earlsdon |
| Applicant: | Mr Shuzel Khan |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment (changing colour of extraction flue) to permission FUL/2015/3518 for shopfront and extraction flue housing |
| Case Officer: | Nigel Smith |

SUMMARY

The application proposes to amend a previous planning permission by changing the colour of the render of the top section of the external flue from terracotta red to cream.

KEY FACTS

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Reason for report to committee: | Cllr Rois Ali owns the site |
| Current lawful use of site: | Restaurant |

RECOMMENDATION

Planning committee are recommended to grant the non-material amendment

REASON FOR DECISION

The amendment does not constitute a material alteration to the previous permission

BACKGROUND

APPLICATION PROPOSAL

The application proposes to amend a previous planning permission by changing the colour of the render of the top section of the external flue from terracotta red to cream.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is a restaurant located in a parade of shops to the south east of Dawlish Drive. The wider area is residential. To the rear of the parade is a service road and the application site has a flat roofed single storey rear extension with an extraction flue housed within a cream rendered enclosure.

PLANNING HISTORY

There have been a number of historic planning applications on this site; the following are the most recent/relevant:

| Application Number | Description of Development | Decision and Date |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| FUL/2015/1694 | Extraction flue to rear | Granted (2015) with condition 5 requiring details of colour coating of flue |
| FUL/2015/3518 | Shopfront (retrospective) and rear ductwork enclosure | Granted (2015) with condition 2 requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted drawings |

POLICY

Not applicable for a non-material amendment application

CONSULTATION

No consultation undertaken as the application is a non-material amendment

APPRAISAL

The only relevant issue is whether or not the amendment constitutes a material alteration to the previous permission.

The amendment relates purely to the top 1m of the extraction flue, which projects above eaves level from the surrounding ductwork. The previously approved drawing includes a notation which indicates that this section of ductwork would be colour coated Terracotta red.

The retrospective amendment would see this section of flue being colour coated a cream colour to match the ductwork enclosure and the colour of the 1st floor rear elevation of the building.

Given the fact that this is a relatively small section of ductwork and is situated in a secluded location at the rear of the site, it is considered that the amendment does not form a material alteration to the previous permission.

As the application is for a non-material amendment it does not result in the granting of a new planning permission, therefore it is not necessary to impose all the conditions attached to the original. However, as one of the drawings would be amended it is considered wise to include a revised wording for condition 2 for the avoidance of doubt.

Conclusion

The amendment does not constitute a material alteration to the previous permission

REVISED CONDITIONS:/REASON

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved documents : AL(P)00, AL(P) 01 Revision B, AL(P)02 Revision

Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt*

[Site Plan](#)
[Proposed Plans](#)