

## **APPEAL PROGRESS REPORT**

### **PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to inform Members of appeals lodged and determined in the period 1<sup>st</sup> September 2018 to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2018.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the report is noted.

### **INTRODUCTION**

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.

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

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.

### **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.

### **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 SEPTEMBER TO 31 OCTOBER 2018**

<b>No. APPEALS PENDING</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>No. APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>No. ENFORCEMENT APPEALS LODGED</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>No. ENFORCEMENT APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>No. OFFICER DECISIONS ALLOWED</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>No. MEMBER DECISIONS ALLOWED</b>	<b>0</b>

Site Address:	24, 26, 26a and 28 Lockhurst Lane
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/1899
Description:	Change of use of 24-28 Lockhurst Lane from a nursery to a mixed use development comprising an A1 (shop), A2 (financial and professional services), a hair and beauty salon (sui generis) and a mixed B1/B8 use (office/storage)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 20/06/2017
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 03/09/2018</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issue is whether the appeal premises are a suitable location for the uses proposed having regard to local and national policies concerning proposals for retail uses. The Inspectors decision is taken with regard to Coventry Local Plan Policies and the revised NPPF.

The appeal site is 260m from the edge of Folehsill District Centre which allows it to be considered an edge-of-centre site under Policy R4. The Inspector notes that no sequential assessment has been undertaken to identify if the appeal premise could be accommodated within any defined centre and that there are vacant units within the Folehill District Centre. He considers none of the businesses appear to have special locational needs and that as the proposal does not satisfy the sequential assessment it conflicts with Policy R4.

The Inspector notes that the assertion that the properties are only suitable for commercial use is unsupported by any evidence and considers that this is an unconvincing argument given the building has been used for other purposes in the past. He concludes that there are no material consideration which would justify a decision contrary to the provisions of the development plan or outweigh the conflict with the CLP and NPPF.

Site Address:	6 Innis Road
Reference Number:	TP/2017/2277
Description:	Oak (T1) – 20% crown reduction
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 06/11/2017
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 26/06/2018</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality; the impact of the proposed crown reduction on the health of the tree; and whether the reasons given for the pruning are sufficient to justify the proposed course of action.

Innis Road is a cul-de-sac serving a mix of one and two storey dwellings set in generous, well landscaped plots. The mature oak tree is to the rear of No.6, several metres from its rear elevation and close to the common boundary with No.4. It is a tall tree and well above the height of the bungalows and consequently can be seen from the road where the Inspector considers it forms an impressive backdrop to the dwellings and makes a significant positive contribution to the leafy character and appearance of the area. He considers that the 20% crown reduction proposed would have only moderate impact on the character and appearance of the area given the trees present size.

The Inspector notes that consent was granted for works in 2017 and that due to its potentially negative effects, crown reduction should not usually be carried out in addition to other crown pruning operations. Furthermore, he considers the specifications of the proposed works are imprecise and that there is no evidence that the work would not damage the health of the tree.

The Inspector concludes that the proposal would result in moderate harm to the character and appearance of the area and moreover, on the limited evidence would cause significant harm to the health of the tree. Whilst he accepts that the tree needs to be managed to prevent undue harm to the living conditions of the

occupiers of number 4, particularly in respect of light to the rear windows of the property, insufficient justification to reduce the crown by 20% has been provided.

Site Address:	7 Hasilwood Square
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/2864
Description:	Erection of detached bungalow
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 17/07/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 10/10/2018</i>

### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to its relationship to the surrounding pattern of development and its implications for existing landscaping; the effect of the proposal upon highway safety, with particular regard to increased vehicular movements along Hasilwood Square and increased vehicular use of the junctions of Hasilwood Square with Coombe Street; and the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of its future occupiers, with particular regard to outlook and availability of private garden space and the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to outlook and loss of privacy.

Looking at character and appearance, the Inspector notes that Hasilwood Square is characterised by detached bungalows positioned within relatively large individual plots with significant soft landscaping in rear gardens. The proposals would involve sub-division of the appeal site and necessitate removal of landscaping and trees including a protected Blue Spruce tree which is widely visible due to its height. The Inspector considers that whilst the scale and design of the proposed built form in itself would be reflective of other properties, when considered as a whole, it would result in the infilling of an undeveloped area of garden land and the proposed dwelling would appear cramped by virtue of the context of its surroundings and its close positioning to neighbouring dwellings. On this issue he concludes that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to its relationship to the surrounding pattern of development and its implications for existing landscaping, in conflict with Policies DE1, GE4 and H3 of the CLP.

Looking at highway safety, the Inspector notes that Hasilwood Square is a narrow single lane access road. Given its narrow and turning nature which is likely to result in naturally slow speeds, and the opportunities for vehicles to pass, the intensification of use of Hasilwood Square itself does not cause him any undue concerns. However, he does have concerns with regard to the intensified use of Hasilwood Square's junction with Coombe Street as this junction has limited visibility. The Inspector acknowledges that these junction arrangements are already in place but on this matter concludes that the proposal would cause harm to highway safety, with particular regard to the increased vehicular use of the junctions of Hasilwood Square with Coombe Street, in conflict with Policy H3 and AC1 of the CLP.

Looking at living conditions, the Inspector considers that a garden provided across the full width of the plot would be appropriate and would not cause harm to the living conditions of future occupiers with regard to outlook and availability of private garden space. Nor does he consider that the outlook for neighbouring occupiers would be unduly affected as it is likely that only the roof form of the proposal would be visible and consequently does not consider that the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

The Inspector concludes that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to its relationship to the surrounding pattern of development and its implications for existing landscaping; and to highway safety, with particular regard to the increased vehicular use of the junctions of Hasilwood Square with Coombe Street.

Site Address:	9 Hasilwood Square
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/0370
Description:	Erection of rear extension, patio and loft conversion
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 16/04/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 10/10/2018</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

The appeal property is a detached dwelling in an area characterised by dwellings of different size and styles giving a mixed residential character and appearance. The proposal would extend the existing hipped roof slopes but introduce a section of flat roof and gable end to the rear with glazed doors at ground and first floor.

The Inspector notes that the development would be visible from the entrance to Hasilwood Square and neighbouring properties and acknowledges that the flat roofed element would not strictly be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling. However, he considers the proposed flat roof would be relatively discreet and positioned between two roof slopes of similar pitch to the existing and would not appear out of place viewed in the varied context of dwellings in Coombe Street and consequently concludes that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.

The appeal is allowed with conditions relating to time limits and conformity with approved plans, also in respect of materials.

Site Address:	Land between 19 and 19a Hendre Close
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/2559
Description:	Erection of one dwelling
Decision Level:	Delegated

Decision:	Refusal on 18/12/2017
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 12/10/2018</i>

### Summary of Decision

A daylight assessment was submitted with the appeal which overcame the second reason for refusal and concerns in respect of loss of light and overshadowing.

The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surrounding area, with particular regard to the scale and design of the proposed scheme and its relationship to the surrounding pattern of development; and the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 19 Hendre Close, with particular regard to outlook.

The appeal site is located within Hendre Close which is characterised by modest two-storey terraced dwellings. The Inspector considers there is a strong sense of identity in place within the Close, which is quite tight in terms of its urban grain. At one end of the Close to the other side of the appeal site are 3 detached dwellings which reflect the tight urban grain in terms of dwelling and plot size but differ in appearance from other properties. The appeal site was formerly the rear garden of 39 Broad Lane which is a large detached residential property set in a spacious plot.

The Inspector notes that the proposal would address Hendre Close but the form proposed would be reflective of the typically larger properties that face Broad Lane and considers the scale of the proposals would mean it would appear discordant with its surroundings creating a visually imposing structure that would be at odds with the character and appearance of its surroundings. On this issue he concludes that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the site and its surrounding area, with particular regard to the scale and design of the proposed scheme and its relationship to the surrounding pattern of development, in conflict with Policies H9 and DE1 of the CLP.

Looking at the impact on the living conditions of No.19, the Inspector notes that the proposal would extend beyond the rear building line of No.19 and would be readily visible from internal areas, although he does not consider this would have an undue negative effect on outlook. However, he considers there would be a pronounced effect upon the outlook available from the small private garden area of No.19, most particularly from the proposed side-facing gable end that would be situated in close proximity to the side boundary of the appeal site and would have an overbearing and oppressive effect because of its height, extent and close proximity relationship with the private rear garden of No.19.

The Inspector concludes that identified harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surrounding area, with particular regard to the scale and design of the proposed scheme and its relationship to the surrounding pattern of development; and to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 19 Hendre Close, with particular regard to outlook.

Site Address:	1 The Laurels Fairlands Park
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/2683
Description:	Extension and conversion of existing garage to form 1 bed house
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 02/03/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 12/10/2018</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.

The Inspector notes that the majority of the site is within the Kenilworth Road Conservation Area which is characterised by large detached dwellings positioned on spacious plots with the general appearance being leafy and green.

The proposal involves extension of the garage along with 2 side facing dormers and a porch to facilitate its conversion to a dwelling and the Inspector considers that these extensions and the proposed access would have limited visual impact. However, he notes that the proposal would involve subdivision of the appeal site and intensification of the residential use of the site which would not be reflective of the pattern of development of the Conservation Area or the general surroundings of the appeal site.

The Inspector further notes that the proposed dwelling to the rear of the appeal site would be dependent upon land to its frontage to provide the majority of garden space which he considers would be an incongruous arrangement with the main garden facing the front of the site and Fairlands Park, which would provide for an uncharacteristic form and unduly constrained layout inconsistent with the relatively open and spacious character and appearance of the Conservation Area that is typified by large dwellings and lower density development.

Although the Inspector accepts that the garden size proposed would exceed the Council's minimum standards and is satisfied the proposed roof lights would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy, he concludes that the proposed development would cause harm to the Kenilworth Road Conservation Area by virtue of failing to preserve or enhance its character and appearance, in conflict with Policies DE1 and HE2 of the CLP.

Site Address:	37 Acorn Street
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/2906
Description:	Subdivision of existing retail shop and part change of use from retail shop (Use Class A1) to hot food takeaway (Use Class A5)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 09/05/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 15/10/2018</i>

### Summary of Decision

The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties with regard to noise and disturbance, and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Further information was provided to the Inspector regarding the proposed extraction equipment, but he could not conclude from that, that the noise and odour from the unit would be appropriately controlled such that the living conditions of the occupiers of the nearest properties would not be unacceptably harmed and therefore does not consider that the development would accord with Policies R6 and R3 of the CLP.

The Inspector notes that the site comprises part of an A1 retail unit within a small shopping parade and the proposed frontage would be comparable with other units in the parade. The proposed flue to the rear would project above the roof but the Inspector does not consider it would unacceptably harm the appearance of the building and consequently the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. However, he concludes that this does not outweigh the failure of the proposal to demonstrate it would not harm the living conditions of nearby residents.

Site Address:	16 Chadwick Close
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/0168
Description:	Proposed new dwelling within the land of 16 Chadwick Close
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 15/03/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 17/10/2018</i>

### Summary of Decision

The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the design of the proposed scheme and its relationship to the surrounding pattern of development.

The appeal site is located within a residential area and contains a semi-detached dwelling that forms the end of a row of similar properties. The site is a corner plot bounded by Chadwick Close to the front and side and has a spacious and enclosed side and rear garden with an open area to the front of the site. The floor level of No.16 is higher than Chadwick Close where it bounds the front boundary.

The Inspector notes that the proposals form and detailed design would closely align with the properties it would be attached to but he considers it would be prominently located on an exposed and elevated corner plot. Presently the side building line of No.16 corresponds with the front building line of the neighbouring terrace (No.18-24) and the Inspector considers that the proposal would jut out substantially and appear unduly prominent in the street scene and at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the area. He also considers that the



change in ground level would further accentuate the visual prominence of the proposal and consequently the proposal would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development.

The Inspector concludes that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the design of the proposed scheme and its relationship to the surrounding pattern of development, in conflict with Policy DE1 of the CLP.

Site Address:	42 Harefield Road
Reference Number:	HH/2018/0464
Description:	Erection of single storey rear extension (retrospective) and erection of replacement garage
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 12/07/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 18/10/2018</i> <i>Award of costs:Refused</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issue is the effect of the rear extension and garage on the living conditions of the occupier of the host property and the neighbouring No.40 Harefield Road, by way of light, outlook and amenity space.

The proposed garage would replace an existing structure; on this matter the Inspector concurs with the Council's view that it would be an acceptable structure. The rear extension projects 3.4m and fills the full width of the plot. The Inspector notes that the Council's SPG would allow for a 3.3m maximum depth and that height differences and the potential for tunnelling should be taken into account. However, he considers that the extension projects only 0.1m beyond the maximum allowed by the SPG and although a small amount above the level of No.40 and creating a slight tunnel effect these are relatively minor issues.

The Inspector has regard to the fall-back position that could be built under permitted development if the extension were 0.4m less deep. He does not consider that the additional 0.4m of extension as built results in significant additional impact on the outlook from the rear of No.40. He notes that the extension results in a reduction of the private amenity space at the rear, especially given the increased scale of the accommodation but that the fall-back position would result in a similar situation.

The inspector concludes that by virtue of the relevance and significance of the fall-back position in this case, he finds that the proposed replacement garage and existing rear extension would not be significantly harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the host property or No.40 by way of light, outlook, or amenity space and would not conflict with Policy DE1 of the CLP.

The appeal is allowed with conditions relating to: time limits for implementing the garage; conformity with approved plans; and use of materials to match existing.

### *Costs Decision*

The appellant contends that the Council did not consider any of the material considerations set out in the planning statement and were not helpful in their approach to try and avoid the appeal. However, the Inspector notes that the rear extension was already in place giving little scope for discussion on alternatives. He notes that the SPG indicates that each site is unique and proposals will be determined on their own merits and that any 'tunnelling' effect on neighbouring properties will be considered.

The Inspector concludes that the council has taken these issues into account and it is reasonable for them to have done so and therefore finds that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not been demonstrated. The award of costs is refused.

Site Address:	Unit 10 Westmede Centre Winsford Avenue
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/0670
Description:	Installation of hand car wash on part of NISA car park
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 08/05/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 19/10/2018</i>

### Summary of Decision

The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, the effect on water quality, and the effect on the living conditions of the nearby occupiers with respect to noise and disturbance.

The site is located at the front of a car park of a small supermarket with a cluster of shops to the north with residential flats above and some community uses opposite giving the area a commercial character. The Inspector notes the car wash is enclosed on three sides by green metal mesh fencing with white plastic panels attached to the inside face and considers that as a result of these, the development appears as an unattractive enclosing feature, incongruous in the context of the generally open surroundings, detracting from the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy DE1 of the CLP.

The Inspector notes that water from the operation drains into a channel at the southern edge of the wash area and whilst he understands that the water passes through an interceptor, there are no details demonstrating that this is appropriate and therefore there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the development would not harmfully affect the quality of surface water, contrary to Policy EM6 of the CLP.

The Inspector noted the use of pressure washers but did not consider the noise generated by the equipment to be any more disturbing than other noise sources, in particular the regular movement of cars in and out of the NISA car park and consequently he does not consider the development unacceptably disturbs the occupiers of the nearest dwelling and affects their living conditions.

He concludes that the development does not harm the living conditions of nearby residents but these matters are outweighed by the developments effect on the character and appearance of the area, and its failure to demonstrate that it would not harm water quality.

Site Address:	25 Humber Road
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/2362
Description:	Change of use from dwelling (C3) to 7 bed house in multiple occupation (sui generis) for 7 occupants, loft conversion and front and rear extensions (retrospective)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 14/11/2017
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/10/2018</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issued are: the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with regard to noise, disturbance and their outlook; and whether the development provides satisfactory living conditions for its occupiers in respect of outdoor amenity space.

Looking at character and appearance, the Inspector notes that the site is located on a busy road with retail use at ground floor on either side. It is proposed that the front extension at the site be extended over the door to provide a store and the Inspector notes that no other properties in the terrace have front projections and whilst there are some opposite, these do not project forward of the building line in the same way that the development does, making it appear incongruous in this context.

In looking at the rear extensions, the Inspector notes that the dormer covers the whole roof slope of the house and although it is proposed to reduce its size on the outrigger this would likely still be visible from the road and from neighbouring properties and changing the materials to match those used on the rest of the building would do little to address its excessive scale. He concludes the dormer appears as an excessively large extension which adds a full additional storey to the building, relating poorly to the form of the building and detracting from its appearance, failing to accord with Policy DE1 of the CLP.

In terms of the impact on neighbouring occupiers the Inspector considers that the outlook from the rear window in the outrigger at No.23 would be compromised to an unacceptable degree from the extension. He notes that the property is to remain as an HMO for 7 persons which is an increase over the previous use and what could be allowed under permitted development, but given that the site is on the busy Humber Road with a public house directly opposite does not consider that the noise and disturbance generated by the proposal would be significant and unlikely to unacceptably disturb neighbouring residents.

The ground floor rear extension occupies much of the rear of the site resulting in no usable outdoor recreation area but the Inspector notes it is unlikely to be required by occupiers of an HMO and there is a large open space at Stoke Green so does not consider the development would fail to provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers.

The Inspector concludes that the use of the property as a 7 person HMO would not be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring residents and the occupiers have satisfactory living conditions. However, this is outweighed by the harm to the character and appearance of the area which results from the dormer extensions and alterations to the front, and the harm to the living conditions of the adjacent occupier in terms of their outlook.

Site Address:	Friars House Manor House Drive
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/0082
Description:	Display of 2 vinyl signs (retrospective)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 07/03/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 24/10//2018</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity having regard to its location within the Greyfriars Green Conservation Area.

The signs are being displayed; the larger on the southern elevation facing the station and the smaller on the west elevation facing Greyfriars Green Conservation Area. The Inspector notes that Conservation Area is relatively small and characterised by open space with older buildings around the edge and the area to the south towards the Station undergoing regeneration. The signs are located on a modern high rise building. The larger sign facing the Station is located approximately half way up the building and the Inspector considers it to be visually prominent when walking toward the City Centre, with its elevated position and large sized lettering making it conspicuous and intrusive and at odds with the neatly grassed area and trees in front of the building. He considers this is exacerbated by the absence of other similar commercial advertisements and concludes that the large sign would have a harmful effect on amenity.

The smaller sign is at a lower level and opposite the Greyfriars Green Conservation Area. The Inspector notes that whilst views of the sign are more limited when the trees are in leaf, in winter when the trees are bare the sign would be sufficiently visible, intrusive and incongruous; compounded by the area being free of signs of this size and nature. He concludes that the smaller sign would be materially harmful to the amenity of the area and the setting of the Conservation Area.

Issues of public safety have not been raised and the Inspector saw nothing that would lead him to disagree, but this is not a reason for refusal and does not outweigh the harm to amenity that is identified.



## PLANNING APPEAL PROGRESS REPORT – SUMMARY TABLE

### CURRENT APPEALS LODGED

Application Reference & Site Address	Case Officer	Type	Proposal	Progress & Dates
<b>TP/2017/1283</b> 3 <b>Staircase Lane</b>	<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
<b>LDCE/2018/0743</b> 62 <b>Northumberland Road</b>	<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
<b>OUT/2017/3159</b> Land between 57 And 71 <b>Berry Street</b>	<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
<b>FUL/2017/3029</b> 14 <b>John McGuire Crescent</b>	<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
<b>S73/2018/0667</b> Unit C, Earl Place Business Park <b>Fletchamstead Highway</b>	<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 <sup>th</sup> 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: 12/11/2018

<b>FUL/2018/0776</b> 5 <b>Davenport Road</b>	<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
<b>OUT/2018/0756</b> 56 <b>Craven Street</b>	<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
<b>FUL/2018/0943</b> 1A <b>Brandon Lane</b>	<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
<b>S73/2018/0583</b> 8 <b>Station Avenue</b>	<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
<b>FUL/2018/0613</b> 51 <b>Bulls Head Lane</b>	<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
<b>HH/2018/0826</b> 373 <b>Ansty Road</b>	<i>Nigel Smith</i>	Written Representations	Proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension	Lodged date: 24/09/2018 Start date: 14/11/2018
<b>HH/2018/1173</b> 100 & 102 <b>Hawkes Mill Lane</b>	<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

<b>HH/2018/1181</b> 6 Harvest Hill Cottages <b>Oak Lane</b>	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Erection of wooden outbuilding for use as a home officer (retropective)	Lodged date: 27/09/2018 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>HH/2018/2199</b> 3 <b>Eacott Close</b>	<i>Pavan Flor-Choda</i>	Written Representations	Erection of a single storey rear extension	Lodged date: 02/10/2018 Start date: 17/10/2018 Questionnaire/Statement: 24/10/2018
<b>FUL/2018/0488</b> 4 <b>Thimble Road</b>	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Change of use of a dwellinghouse into 8 bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO, sui generis) (retrospective application) revised submission	Lodged date: 12/10/2018 Start date: 16/11/2018
<b>OUT/2018/1290</b> 74a <b>Nailcote Avenue</b>	<i>Ayesha Saleem</i>	Written Representations	Outline application for erection of a new dwelling (with access and layout submitted)	Lodged date: 15/10/2018 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>FUL/2018/1638</b> 4 <b>Queensland Avenue</b>	<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
<b>FUL/2018/1805</b> 2 <b>Queensland Avenue</b>	<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
<b>FUL/2018/0895</b> Abbeyfield House <b>Durham Crescent</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>FUL/2018/0930</b> 651 <b>Foleshill Road</b>	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Erection of a new shop canopy and security shutters	Lodged date 23/10/2018 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>FUL/2018/0906</b> 84a <b>Kenilworth Road</b>	<i>Peter Anderson</i>	Written Representations	Erection of car port, new access and new boundary wall	Lodged date 26/10/2018 <b>Awaiting start date</b>



<b>FUL/2018/1549</b> 62 <b>Northumberland Road</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2010</b> OS The Richard Crossman Building <b>Jordan Well</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2011</b> OS Cosy Club <b>Cathedral Lanes Shopping Centre</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2012</b> Lady Godiva News <b>Broadgate</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2013</b> Primark Stores <b>Broadgate</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>AVI/2018/2014</b> 2-10 <b>Trinity Street</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2015</b> Coventry Transport Museum <b>Hales Street</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2016</b> 3 <b>Trinity Street</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2017</b> 2 <b>Cross Cheaping</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>

<b>ADV/2018/2018</b> 40-44 <b>The Precinct</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2019</b> 25 <b>Upper Precinct</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2020</b> W H Smith <b>Smithford Way</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2021</b> 1 <b>Bull Yard</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2022</b> 14-16 <b>Market Way</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2023</b> 10-12 <b>Market Way</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2024</b> Carphone Warehouse <b>Market Way</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2025</b> 30 <b>Market Way</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO 2018/1993</b> Outside The Richard Crossman Building <b>Jordan Well</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>

<b>TELO/2018/1994</b> Outside Cosy Club <b>Cathedral Lanes</b> <b>Shopping Centre</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/1995</b> Os Lady Godiva News <b>Broadgate</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/1996</b> Adj Primark <b>Broadgate</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/1997</b> Adj The Flying Standard <b>Trinity</b> <b>Street</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/1999</b> 3 <b>Trinity Street</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/2000</b> Os Blue Arrow <b>Cross</b> <b>Cheaping</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/2001</b> Os JD Sports 40-44 <b>The Precinct</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/2002</b> Os Clintons Cards 25- 27 <b>Upper Precinct</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/2003</b> OS WH Smith <b>Smithford Way</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>

<b>TELO/2018/2004</b> Adj Pravha <b>Bull Yard</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/2005</b> Adj Halifax 14 <b>Market Way</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/2006</b> IFO Poundland <b>Market Way</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/2007</b> Adj Carphone Warehouse <b>Market Way</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO/2018/2008</b> OS Max Mobility 30 <b>Market Way</b>	<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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>

## APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED

Application Reference Site Address	Case Officer	Type	Proposal	Appeal Decision & date
<b>FUL/2017/1899</b> 24, 26, 26a and 28 Lockhurst Lane	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Change of use of 24-28 Lockhurst Lane from a nursery to a mixed use development comprising an A1 (shop), A2 (financial and professional services), a hair and beauty salon (sui generis) and a mixed B1/B8 use (office/storage)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>03/09/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>TP/2017/2277</b> 6 Innis Road	<i>Robert Penlington</i>	Written Representations	Oak (T1) – 20% crown reduction	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>26/09/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2017/2864</b> 7 Hasilwood Square	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Erection of detached bungalow	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>10/10/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>HH/2018/0370</b> 9 Hasilwood Square	<i>Ayesha Saleem</i>	Written Representations	Erection of rear extension, patio and loft conversion	Decision : <b>ALLOWED</b> <b>10/10/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2017/2559</b> Land between 19 and 19a Hendre Close	<i>Nigel Smith</i>	Written Representations	Erection of one dwelling	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>12/10/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2017/2683</b> 1 The Laurels Fairlands Park	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Extension and conversion of existing garage to form 1 bed house	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>12/10/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2017/2906</b> 37 Acorn Street	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Subdivision of existing retail shop and part change of use from retail shop (Use Class A1) to hot food takeaway (Use Class A5)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>15/10/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>

<b>FUL/2018/0168</b> 16 Chadwick Close	<i>Pavan Flora-Choda</i>	Written Representations	Proposed new dwelling within the land of 16 Chadwick Close	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>17/10/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>HH/2018/0464</b> 42 Harefield Road	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Erection of single storey rear extension (retrospective) and erection of replacement garage	Decision : <b>ALLOWED</b> <b>18/10/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i> <b>Application for costs:</b> <b>Refused</b>
<b>FUL/2018/0670</b> Unit 10 Westmede Centre Winsford Avenue	<i>Nigel Smith</i>	Written Representations	Installation of hand car wash on part of NISA car park	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>19/10/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2017/2362</b> 25 Humber Road	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Change of use from dwelling (C3) to 7 bed house in multiple occupation (sui generis) for 7 occupants, loft conversion and front and rear extensions (retrospective)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/10/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>ADV/2018/0082</b> Friars House Manor House Drive	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Display of 2 vinyl signs (retrospective)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>24/10/2018</b> Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>