
Report to
Planning Committee

Report of
Head of Planning and Regulation

Ward(s) affected:
All

Title:
Appeals progress report

Is this a key decision?
No

This report is for information

Executive Summary:

The appeals progress report provides a summary of appeal decisions in order to keep Members informed about planning and enforcement appeals made against planning decisions taken by the City Council.

Recommendations:

Planning committee are recommended to note the content of the report

List of Appendices included:

None

Background papers:

N/A

Other useful documents

None

Has it been or will it be considered by Scrutiny?

No

Has it been or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?

No

Will this report go to Council?

No

Report title: Appeals progress report

1. Context (or background)

The purpose of this report is to inform Members of appeals lodged and determined in the period 1st November 2018 to 31st December 2018.

When a planning application is refused, the applicant has the right to appeal within six months of the date of decision for non-householder appeals. For householder applications the time limit to appeal is 12 weeks. Appeals can also be lodged against conditions imposed on a planning approval and against the non-determination of an application that has passed the statutory time period for determination.

Where the Council has taken enforcement action, the applicant can lodge an appeal in relation to the served Enforcement Notice. An appeal cannot be lodged though in relation to a breach of condition notice. This is on the basis that if the individual did not agree with the condition then they could have appealed against the condition at the time it was originally imposed.

Appeals are determined by Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State and administered independently by the Planning Inspectorate.

3. Recommendation

Members are requested to note the appeal decisions of either the Secretary of State or the relevant Inspector that has been appointed to determine appeals within the defined period.

In line with the parameters above the report sets out the main issues of the appeals and summarises the decisions. Where claims for costs are made and/or awarded, either for or against the Council, the decisions have been included within the report.

4. Monitoring

Monitoring of all appeal decisions is undertaken to ensure that the Council's decisions are thoroughly defended and that appropriate and defensible decisions are being made under delegated powers and by Planning Committee. The lack of any monitoring could encourage actions that are contrary to the Council's decision, possibly resulting in poor quality development and also costs being sought against the Council.

5. Financial & legal considerations

An appeal may be determined after a Public Inquiry, a Hearing or most commonly written representations. It is possible for cost applications to be made either by the appellants against the Council or vice versa if it is considered that either party has acted in an unreasonable way.

It is possible for decisions, made by Inspectors on appeal to be challenged through the courts. However, this is only if it is considered that an Inspector has erred in law, for instance by not considering a relevant issue or not following the correct procedure.

A decision cannot be challenged just because a party does not agree with it. A successful challenge would result in an Inspector having to make the decision again following the correct procedure. This may ultimately lead to the same decision being made.

It is possible for Inspectors to make a 'split' decision, where one part of an appeal is allowed but another part is dismissed.

SUMMARY OF APPEALS IN PERIOD OF 1 NOVEMBER TO 31 DECEMBER 2018

No. APPEALS PENDING	56
No. APPEALS RECEIVED	6
No. APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED	8
No. ENFORCEMENT APPEALS LODGED	0
No. ENFORCEMENT APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED	0
No. OFFICER DECISIONS ALLOWED	6
No. MEMBER DECISIONS ALLOWED	-

Site Address:	105 Far Gosford Street
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/2958
Description:	Installation of ATM Machine
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 09/01/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 02/11/2018</i>

Summary of Decision

The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Far Gosford Street Conservation Area; and whether the proposal would be likely to increase opportunities for crime.

The Inspector notes that Far Gosford Street is a terraced street characterised by a variety of ground floor commercial uses and that the significance of the Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset is drawn in part from its historic terraced buildings and often intricate architectural detailing. He considers that there are buildings in the vicinity of the application site that contribute to the Conservation Areas special interest because of their traditionally designed frontages but that there are also many modern and unsympathetic ones included within the vicinity of the appeal site.

The Inspector considers that the appeal site itself has a modern and predominantly glazed front and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area is therefore limited. The existing pane of glass would be replaced by a laminated panel incorporating the ATM machine with no other external alteration and the Inspector does not consider that the proposal would be unduly visually prominent. Whilst he acknowledges that there are currently no externally positioned ATM machines located nearby the appeal site on Far Gosford Street, in light of the varied appearances and designs of neighbouring and nearby ground floor frontages, the ATM machine would not stand out as an incongruous or discordant feature within the Conservation Area. On this matter he concludes that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Far Gosford Street Conservation Area and therefore would not cause harm.

Looking at the issue of opportunities for crime, the Inspector notes that Far Gosford Street is a busy thoroughfare with the appeal site prominently located so as to immediately face the street and is overlooked by openings contained with facing buildings. He considers that the natural surveillance on offer at the appeal site would act as a strong deterrent to any potential crime occurrences and sees little evidence to suggest that the risk of crime would necessarily increase by virtue of the proposal and concludes that the proposal would in itself not be likely to unduly increase opportunities for crime and therefore would not cause harm.

The appeal is allowed with conditions relating to: timescale for development; ensuring development is in accordance with approved plans; and ensuring materials are in accordance with approved plans.

Site Address:	72 Kenilworth Road
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/0545
Description:	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a replacement dwelling
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 23/04/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 02/11/2018</i>

Summary of Decision

The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kenilworth Road Conservation Area, with particular regard to the demolition of existing buildings, the proposed replacement development of the site, and the effect upon existing trees.

The Inspector notes that the significance of the Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset is drawn in part from its heavily wooded and landscaped character interspersed by often large and prominent residential dwellings and its general appearance is historically spacious and green. Properties are located behind significant landscaped screens and are of varied ages and styles but are typically characterised by being detached and positioned on large plots.

The appeal site contains a large detached dwelling constructed in 1914 and associated outbuildings. The Inspector notes the contribution of the dwelling and its outbuildings to the significance of the Conservation Area includes such factors as the brick buildings being intricately designed in the 'Arts and Crafts' style, generally brick building with stone detailing and considers it an impressive dwelling of considerable age, stature and importance that, particularly given the spacious and verdant grounds within which it sits, corresponds and contributes strongly to the underlying qualities and significance of the Conservation Area.

On this matter he concludes that the existing dwelling and its outbuildings therefore have heritage value in their own right, notwithstanding that the property is not nationally or locally listed. The proposed full demolition would result in the total loss of these buildings' contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area.

The redevelopment of the site would provide a large 2 and a half storey detached dwelling in a similar position to the existing dwelling and a one and a half storey wing projecting towards Cannon Hill Road and a currently undeveloped area of land. The Inspector acknowledges that the new dwelling would have a symmetrical and traditional appearance and would be imposing by virtue of its scale and massing but whilst architectural detailing and varied fenestration would be utilised, he considers the proposal does not replace the existing buildings' contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area.

The Inspector considers the proposal would erode the appeal site's spaciousness, particularly when read alongside the newly positioned projecting wing and would result in wider plot coverage and an unduly intensive redevelopment of the site when compared to the existing composition of built form on the site and the significant character of the surrounding area. On this issue he concludes that in the light of its proximity to Canon Hill Road, the scale and mass of development proposed and the notable additional plot coverage when compared to the existing buildings on the appeal site, the proposal would have an unduly urbanising effect upon the Conservation Area.

The proposal would necessitate a number of tree removals, the majority of which would be located towards the Cannon Hill Road boundary of the appeal site. The Inspector considers the proposed tree removals along the Cannon Hill Road boundary of the site would have the effect of significantly reducing the strong green buffer currently in place and whilst he acknowledges that the trees earmarked for removal are individually categorised as being of low quality they sit alongside a veteran Pedunculate Oak that contributes to that character and appearance of the Conservation Area as it is large, visually imposing and prominently located adjacent to Cannon Hill Road so as to offer a strong contribution to its heavily wooded character and appearance.

Looking at planning balance, in the Inspectors view, the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation area and as set out in the NPPF, any less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The appellants cite benefits of: providing a more energy efficient dwelling; maximising the benefit of solar gain; provision of enhanced living arrangements for future occupiers; and a classically styled

proposal but the Inspector does not consider the these factors cumulatively outweigh the harm identified in this case.

He concludes that the proposal would cause harm through failing to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kenilworth Road Conservation Area, with particular regard to the demolition of existing buildings, the proposed redevelopment of the site and the effect upon existing trees, failing to comply with policies H3, DE1, HE2, GE3 and GE4 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016. Furthermore, the proposal also fails to comply with the SPG contained within the Kenilworth Road Control Plan which states that redevelopment entailing the intensification of land use along Kenilworth Road will not generally be permitted and that redevelopment should not be located so as to necessitate the removal of or cause damage to trees or associated ground cover.

Site Address:	88 Poppleton Close
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/2059
Description:	Change of use from C3 residential to 7 bedroom HMO for 7 occupiers (sui generis) (retrospective)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 20/10/2017
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 12/11/2018</i>

Summary of Decision

The Inspector states that he is dealing with three other retrospective appeals for neighbouring properties 85, 86 and 87 Poppleton Close and that these have been taken into account when considering the appeal in isolation and cumulatively. The decision has been made with regard to Policies H11 and AC3 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016 which was adopted after the application was refused by the LPA.

The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on: the safety and convenience of highway users having regard to the provision of parking; and living conditions of neighbouring residents in relation to noise and disturbance.

The Inspector notes the appeal property forms part of a row of seven similar properties (No.84-90) in Poppleton Close which is a residential cul-de-sac close to the University and the city centre. The appeal property has a driveway for the parking of one vehicle and a single garage.

Looking at the parking standards set out in Appendix 5 of the CLP, the Inspector notes that as the proposal is 'sui generis' and not a C4 HMO, there are no adopted parking standards and that in such cases parking requirements are to be assessed on a site-by-site basis. He considers the need to provide evidence to justify a departure from the parking standards to be ambiguous and that the requirements appear to be more applicable to larger scale developments rather than individual HMO's. It is accepted that the site is in an accessible location and within walking distance of the railway station with bus stops outside it and therefore the Inspector considers that residents would not need to rely on a car for day to day requirements which is likely to reduce parking demand. He notes a recent appeal

decision for 84 Poppleton Close where a parking survey demonstrated there was sufficient on-street parking available and sees no reason to require further information on this issue or reach a different conclusion.

On the issue of highway safety the Inspector concludes that the use of No.88 or any one of the other individual appeal properties as a HMO has not had a significant adverse impact on the safety and convenience of highway users as a result of inadequate provision of parking and that there is no harm arising from the combined use of No.88 together with the neighbouring three appeal properties.

The Inspector notes that there is no meaningful evidence to suggest that the use of the appeal property by seven residents is detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents and considers the recent appeal for 84 Poppleton Close to be of relevance. This property had been occupied as an HMO for around five years with no evidence of noise or disturbance. Whilst in his experience, HMOs can generate different activity patterns compared to single family accommodation, in this instance he is not persuaded that the impact of a 7-person HMO or indeed the cumulative impact with other appeal properties, is significantly different from either a 6-person HMO or large family home in the area.

The Inspector concludes that there is no harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents arising from unacceptable noise and disturbance from No.88 of any of the other appeal properties before him, either individually or together. The appeal is allowed with no conditions as the HMO is already operating.

Site Address:	86 Poppleton Close
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/2010
Description:	Change of use form C3 residential to 8 bedroom HMO for 8 occupiers (sui generis) (retrospective)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 02/10/2017
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 16/11/2018</i>

Site Address:	87 Poppleton Close
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/2011
Description:	Change of use from C3 residential to 8 bedroom HMO for 8 occupiers (sui generis) (retrospective)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 02/10/2017
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 16/11/2018</i>

Site Address:	85 Poppleton close
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/2012
Description:	Change of use from C3 residential to 8 bedroom HMO

	for 8 occupiers (sui generis)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 02/10/2017
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 16/11/2018</i>

Summary of Decisions

The appeal decision relates to three appeals on adjoining properties by the same appellant and the Inspector deals with them all in the same decision letter. He considers the common issues together but comes to individual decision on each appeal. The appeal at 88 Poppleton Close is also taken into consideration.

The main issues in each appeal are the effect of the use of the property as an HMO on: the safety and convenience of highway users having regard to the provision of parking; and living conditions of neighbouring residents in relation to noise and disturbance.

The Inspector notes the appeal property forms part of a row of seven similar properties (No.84-90) in Poppleton Close which is a residential cul-de-sac close to the University and the city centre. The appeal property has a driveway for the parking of one vehicle and a single garage.

Looking at the parking standards set out in Appendix 5 of the CLP, the Inspector notes that as the proposal is 'sui generis' and not a C4 HMO, there are no adopted parking standards and that in such cases parking requirements are to be assessed on a site-by-site basis. He considers the need to provide evidence to justify a departure from the parking standards to be ambiguous and that the requirements appear to be more applicable to larger scale developments rather than individual HMO's. It is accepted that the site is in an accessible location and within walking distance of the railway station with bus stops outside it and therefore the Inspector considers that residents would not need to rely on a car for day to day requirements which is likely to reduce parking demand. He notes a recent appeal decision for 84 Poppleton Close where a parking survey demonstrated there was sufficient on-street parking available and sees no reason to require further information on this issue or reach a different conclusion.

Taking these factors into consideration the Inspector concludes on this matter that the use of any one of the individual appeal properties as an HMO has not had a significant impact on the safety or convenience of highway users as a result of inadequate provision of parking and that there is no harm arising from the combined use of all three properties and No.88 as HMOs and consequently the developments do not conflict with Policies AC3 and H11 of the CLP.

In looking at living conditions, the Inspector notes that there is no meaningful evidence to suggest that the use of the appeal property by seven residents is detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents and considers the recent appeal for 84 Poppleton Close to be of relevance. This property had been occupied as an HMO for around five years with no evidence of noise or disturbance. Whilst in his experience, HMOs can generate different activity patterns compared to single family accommodation, in this instance he is not persuaded that the impact of an 8-person HMO or indeed the cumulative impact

with other appeal properties, is significantly different from either a 6-person HMO or large family home in the area.

The Inspector concludes that there is no harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents arising from unacceptable noise and disturbance from any of the appeal properties before him, either individually or together with the other HMO appeal properties and is satisfied that the development complies with Policy H11 of the CLP. All three appeals are allowed with no conditions as the HMOs are already operating.

Site Address:	3 Eacott Close
Reference Number:	HH/2018/2199
Description:	Erection of a single storey rear extension
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 24/09/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 05/12/2018</i>

Summary of Decision

The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Eacott Close with particular regard to visual impact and light.

The appeal property is a modern detached house within a residential estate of similar properties. The proposal is for a single storey rear extension to the rear that would be longer and taller than the existing conservatory that it will replace. There are windows in the rear elevation of the attached property No.1 which currently has an open sided canopy structure which the Inspector considered appeared temporary in nature and therefore the assessment is made on the basis that views from the main house are unhindered.

The Inspector considers that oblique views of the proposal would be evident from the rear windows of No.1 but the flank wall would be set back from the shared boundary and given its modest height only the upper section of wall and roof would be seen projecting above the boundary fence leaving the main direction of outlook across the rear garden largely unaffected. On this, he concludes that the appeal scheme would not overbear or unduly dominate the outlook from the rear of No.1 and as the extension would be located broadly to the north there would also be no appreciable loss of natural light to the rear of the adjacent property.

The Inspector recognises that the proposals conflict with the SPG in that it would impinge a 45-degree line and exceed 3.3m in depth, but also takes into account that the SPG acknowledges that each site is unique and proposals should be determined on their own individual merits and in this instance considers a breach of the guidelines insufficient reason to withhold planning permission as he concludes that the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.1 and would not conflict with Policy DE1 of the CLP.

The appeal is allowed with conditions relating to: time limits for the commencement of development; conformity with approved plans; and a requirement for matching materials.

Site Address:	373 Ansty Road
Reference Number:	HH/2018/0826
Description:	Proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 01/08/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 28/12/2018</i>

Summary of Decision

The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The appeal property (No.373) is an end of terrace house and the junction of Ansty Road and Norton Hill Drive. The flank gable of No.373 aligns with the building line of a row of shops behind on Norton Hill Drive.

The Inspector notes that the proposal would comply with the Council's policy and guidance in respect of the use of matching materials, set-backs from the front and side and the detailed design of its elevations. However, she notes that the flank wall of the extension would be close to the side boundary and would considerably breach the Norton Hill Drive building line and there would be a loss of openness above the boundary fence and at the corner, both of which are typically found in the locality. Furthermore, the closeness of the two-storey flank wall to the roadside boundary would emphasise the mass of the extension and would not respect its context and therefore the Inspector considers the extension would create an incongruous feature in the streetscene and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The Inspector notes that the proposed extension would conflict with the SPG in that it would breach a building line and extend to within 2m of the boundary and in view of the above concludes that the proposals would be contrary to Policy DE1 of the CLP.

Whilst the appellant argues that further reductions in size suggested by the Council would make the internal space unusable, the Inspector is not convinced that the appeal proposal is the only way to create a larger property and to meet the personal requirements of the appellants family and notes that personal circumstances change over time and that the private benefits of the extension would not outweigh the harm to the public interest.

Reference is made to a similar extension on the opposite side of Norton Hill Drive but the Inspector did not have sight of the full details of this scheme and notwithstanding notes that each proposal should be determined on its own merits.

It is accepted that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on daylight or sunlight to the rear of neighbouring properties but this does not outweigh the harm identified by the Inspector.

PLANNING APPEAL PROGRESS REPORT – SUMMARY TABLE

CURRENT APPEALS LODGED

Application Reference & Site Address	Case Officer	Type	Proposal	Progress & Dates
TP/2017/1283 3 Staircase Lane	<i>Robert Penlington</i>	Written Representations	Oak tree – shorten x12 low branches by 4m from dwellings 1 & 3 Staircase Lane	Lodged date: 04/01/2018 Start date: 04/01/2018 Questionnaire: 31/01/2018
LDCE/2018/0743 62 Northumberland Road	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the existing use of the site as a 7 bedroom House in Multiple Occupancy (HiMO)	Lodged date: 05/06/2018 Start date: 06/07/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 22/08/2018
OUT/2017/3159 Land between 57 And 71 Berry Street	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Erection of 22 self contained student apartments with en suites and associated parking. Outline application discharging access with all other matters reserved	Lodged date: 29/06/2018 Start date: 09/10/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 26/10/2018
FUL/2017/3029 14 John McGuire Crescent	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Erection of one dwelling house, with associated landscaping and vehicular access	Lodged date: 10/07/2018 Start date: 08/10/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 10/10/2018
S73/2018/0667 Unit C, Earl Place Business Park Fletchamstead Highway	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Submission of details to remove condition 4 (restriction to trampoline centre) imposed on application reference FUL/2017/1935, granted on 7 th November 2017 for change of use from use classes B1(c) - light industrial and B2 – general industrial to use classes B1(c), B2 and D1 – assembly and leisure	Lodged date 12/07/2018 Start date: 08/10/2018 Questionnaire: 10/10/2018 Statement: 12/10/2018 Appeal withdrawn

FUL/2018/0776 5 Davenport Road	<i>Ayesha Saleem</i>	Written Representations	Extension to detached garage and change of use to create single bedroom house	Lodged date 20/07/2018 Start date: 08/10/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 10/10/2018
OUT/2018/0756 56 Craven Street	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Outline planning permission (matters relating to access and scale only) for the erection of a two-bedroomed dwelling house (two storey in height). All other matters reserved	Lodged date: 25/07/2018 Start date: 10/10/2018 Questionnaire: 12/10/2018 Statement: 13/11/2018
FUL/2018/0943 1A Brandon Lane	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Change of use of the land to create additional car parking space and erection of boundary fence (retrospective)	Lodged date: 04/09/2018 Start date: 18/10/2018 Questionnaire: 24/10/2018
S73/2018/0583 8 Station Avenue	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Variation of condition 2 – to extend opening hours: imposed on planning permission FUL/2018/2113 for change of use from retail (A1) to café/take-away (A3 and A5), external extraction flue, alterations to shop front and raise planters granted on 30/09/2016	Lodged date: 05/09/2018 Start date: 03/10/2018 Questionnaire /Statement: 19/10/2018
FUL/2018/0613 51 Bulls Head Lane	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Erection of a dwelling	Lodged date: 07/09/2018 Start date: 02/10/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 09/10/2018
HH/2018/1173 100 & 102 Hawkes Mill Lane	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Loft conversion and extended roof at two dwellings (100 & 102 Hawkes Mill Lane	Lodged date: 26/09/2018 Start date: 15/11/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 19/11/2018
HH/2018/1181 6 Harvest Hill Cottages Oak Lane	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Erection of wooden outbuilding for use as a home officer (retrospective)	Lodged date: 27/09/2018 Start date: 07/12/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 13/12/2018
FUL/2018/0488 4 Thimble Road	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Change of use of a dwellinghouse into 8 bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HIMO, sui generis) (retrospective application) revised submission	Lodged date: 12/10/2018 Start date: 16/11/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 19/11/2018

OUT/2018/1290 74a Nailcote Avenue	<i>Ayesha Saleem</i>	Written Representations	Outline application for erection of a new dwelling (with access and layout submitted)	Lodged date: 15/10/2018 Start date: 10/12/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 11/12/2018
FUL/2018/1638 4 Queensland Avenue	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Change of use to nine bedroom HMO	Lodged date: 16/10/2018 Start date: 15/11/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 16/11/2018
FUL/2018/1805 2 Queensland Avenue	<i>Nigel Smith</i>	Written Representations	Change of use to a 9 bed house in multiple occupation	Lodged date: 16/10/2018 Start date: 15/11/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 21/11/2018
FUL/2018/0895 Abbeyfield House Durham Crescent	<i>Nigel Smith</i>	Written Representations	Change of use from Care Home (Use Class C2) to two cluster flats with a total of 12 bedrooms (retrospective)	Lodged date: 22/10/2018 Start date: 20/11/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 27/11/2018
FUL/2018/0930 651 Foleshill Road	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Erection of a new shop canopy and security shutters	Lodged date 23/10/2018 Start date: 07/12/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 13/12/2018
FUL/2018/0906 84a Kenilworth Road	<i>Peter Anderson</i>	Written Representations	Erection of car port, new access and new boundary wall	Lodged date 26/10/2018 Start date: 28/11/2018
FUL/2018/1549 62 Northumberland Road	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Change of use from a small scale house in multiple occupation (6 bed, use class C4) to a large scale house in multiple occupation (7 bed, sui generis) and retention of rear dormer in a modified form (retrospective application)	Lodged date: 30/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2010 OS The Richard Crossman Building Jordan Well	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged Date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date

ADV/2018/2011 OS Cosy Club Cathedral Lanes Shopping Centre	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2012 Lady Godiva News Broadgate	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2013 Primark Stores Broadgate	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
AV/2018/2014 2-10 Trinity Street	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2015 Coventry Transport Museum Hales Street	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2016 3 Trinity Street	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2017 2 Cross Cheaping	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2018 40-44 The Precinct	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2019 25 Upper Precinct	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date

ADV/2018/2020 W H Smith Smithford Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2021 1 Bull Yard	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2022 14-16 Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2023 10-12 Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2024 Carphone Warehouse Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2025 30 Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO 2018/1993 Outside The Richard Crossman Building Jordan Well	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/1994 Outside Cosy Club Cathedral Lanes Shopping Centre	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/1995 Os Lady Godiva News Broadgate	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/1996 Adj Primark Broadgate	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date

TELO/2018/1997 Adj The Flying Standard Trinity Street	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/1999 3 Trinity Street	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/2000 Os Blue Arrow Cross Cheaping	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/2001 Os JD Sports 40-44 The Precinct	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/2002 Os Clintons Cards 25-27 Upper Precinct	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/2003 OS WH Smith Smithford Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/2004 Adj Pravha Bull Yard	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/2005 Adj Halifax 14 Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/2006 IFO Poundland Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date

TELO/2018/2007 Adj Carphone Warehouse Market Way	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/2008 OS Max Mobility 30 Market Way	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Awaiting start date
ADV/2018/2026 36-42 Corporation Street	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 01/11/2018 Awaiting start date
TELO/2018/1998 Opp pool Meadow Bus Station Hales Street	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 01/11/2018 Awaiting start date
FUL/2018/2258 4 Thimble Road	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Change of use of a small scale house in multiple occupation (HIMO, use class C4) into a 7 bedroom house in multiple occupation (HIMO, sui generis)	Lodged date: 20/11/2018 Awaiting start date
HH/2018/0609 214 London Road	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Proposed installation of footway crossing for vehicular access and driveway	Lodged date: 26/11/2018 Start date: 18/12/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 02/01/2019
FUL/2018/1796 76 Bransford Avenue	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Proposed change of use from a dwellinghouse to five self-contained flats (four x one bedroom and one x two-bedroom) for student accommodation (retrospective)	Lodged date: 27/11/2018 Start date: 24/12/2018

FUL/2018/1582 9 <i>Queen Isabels Avenue</i>	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Proposed conversion of single property to two properties (retrospective)	Lodged date 20/12/2018 <i>Awaiting start date</i>
---	-----------------------	-------------------------	--	---

APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED

Application Reference Site Address	Case Officer	Type	Proposal	Appeal Decision & date
FUL/2017/2958 105 Far Gosford Street	Anne Lynch	Written Representations	Installation of ATM machine	Decision : ALLOWED 02/11/2018 decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
FUL/2018/0545 72 Kenilworth Road	Liam D'Onofrio	Written Representations	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a replacement dwelling	Decision : DISMISSED 02/11/2018 decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
FUL/2017/2059 88 Poppleton Close	Anne Lynch	Written Representations	Change of use from C3 residential to 7 bedroom HMO for 7 occupiers (sui generis) (retrospective)	Decision : ALLOWED 12/11/2018 decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
FUL/2017/2010 86 Poppleton Close	Anne Lynch	Written Representations	Change of use from C3 residential to 8 bedroom HMO for 8 occupiers (sui generis) (retrospective)	Decision : ALLOWED 16/11/2018 decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
FUL/2017/2011 87 Poppleton Close	Anne Lynch	Written Representations	Change of use from C3 residential to 8 bedroom HMO for 8 occupiers (sui generis) (retrospective)	Decision : ALLOWED 16/11/2018 decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
FUL/2017/2012 85 Poppleton Close	Anne Lynch	Written Representations	Change of use from C3 residential to 8 bedroom HMO for 8 occupiers (sui generis) (retrospective)	Decision : ALLOWED 16/11/2018 decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
HH/2018/2199 3 Eacott Close	Pavan Flora-Choda	Written Representations	Erection of a single storey rear extension	Decision : ALLOWED 05/12/2018 decision type: <i>Delegated</i>

HH/2018/0826 373 Ansty Road	<i>Nigel Smith</i>	Written Representations	Proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension	Decision : DISMISSED 28/12/2018 decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
--	--------------------	----------------------------	---	---