

---

**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 1 March 2019 to 30 April 2019.

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 MARCH TO 30 APRIL 2019**

<b>No. APPEALS PENDING</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>No. APPEALS RECEIVED</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>No. APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED</b>	<b>15</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>1</b>
<b>No. MEMBER DECISIONS ALLOWED</b>	<b>0</b>

Site Address:	Land Between 57 and 71 Berry Street
Reference Number:	OUT/2017/3159
Description:	Erection of 22 self-contained student apartments with en-suites and associated parking. Outline application discharging access with all other matters reserved.
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 14/03/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 08/03/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the effect of the proposal on the character or appearance of the surrounding area; whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for its future occupiers and for the occupiers of neighbouring properties with regards to outlook and privacy; and the effect of the proposal on highway safety with regards to parking provision.

In looking at character and appearance, the Inspector notes that the appeal site is located between modest two-storey residential properties in an area characterised by residential properties of traditional pitched roof form. The Inspector considers the design of the proposed building with a flat roof would be out-of-keeping, its large bulky appearance appearing dominant between the neighbouring properties,

which would have a detrimental effect on the pattern of development in the area. On this matter he concludes the proposal would be an incongruous feature and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policies DE1 and H9 of the CLP.

In looking at living conditions, the Inspector notes that the neighbouring properties have windows which overlook the appeal site and these would be in close proximity to the proposed building. He considers there would be a loss in outlook to neighbouring occupiers as the proposed building is large and would create a dominant expanse of built development which would appear overbearing. Furthermore, he notes that the proposals would have windows to habitable rooms which would overlook windows in neighbouring properties which would compromise privacy for existing and future occupiers and on this matter the Inspector concludes the proposal would have harmful effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and future occupiers of the apartments in respect of outlook and privacy, contrary to policies DE1 and H9 of the CLP.

In looking at highway safety, the Inspector notes that 5 parking spaces are proposed within the site. He considers that these would be provided as a convoluted arrangement with angled spaces and insufficient turning space to allow vehicles to exit the site in a forward motion. On this matter the Inspector concludes that the parking area would not be of sufficient size to allow for adequate vehicle manoeuvring which would be likely to result in motorists reversing onto the highway to the detriment of the safety of highway users, thus having a harmful effect on highway safety contrary to Policies AC3 and H10 of the CLP.

The Inspector was not provided with details of a previous permission on the site and considered the proposal on their own merits. Whilst he notes the appellants comments with regard to the sustainable location of the site and viability of the scheme, these matters do not outweigh the harm already identified.

Site Address:	14 John McGuire Crescent
Reference Number:	FUL/2017/3029
Description:	Erection of one dwelling house, with associated landscaping and vehicular access
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 27/03/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 14/03/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issue is the effect of the proposed dwelling on: the character and appearance of the area; and highway safety having particular regard to visibility and public safety.

No.14 is a two storey dwelling at the end of a terrace of 4 properties. The estate is largely open-plan with few front boundaries and punctuated by areas of open space. The Inspector considers these open spaces and general absence of front

boundaries create gaps in the built form, which contribute positively to the general green, spacious and open character of the estate. The Inspector notes that the appeal site is currently incidental open space that is laid to grass and occupies a prominent corner location between the side of No.14 and the public footpath that leads to Princethorpe Way. The proposal is for a two-storey dwelling on the area of incidental open space to the side of No.14 and would extend the existing terrace, being designed to complement the existing row of houses and estate in general. The Inspector notes that there would be approximately 8m separation distance between the side of the proposed dwelling and the side of the bungalow on the other side of the footpath (No.12) and considers that the siting of the proposed dwelling and associated timber fence would result in the loss of an area of incidental open space that positively contributes to the overall spacious character of the street scene and setting of the public footpath. He considers that the proposal would result in the loss of a valuable visual gap in the built form of the estate and would project beyond the prevailing building line of properties fronting the footpath, concluding that the proposal would result in the loss of an area of visually important incidental open space that would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies GE1 and GE2 of the CLP.

In looking at public safety, the Inspector recognises that the proposed timber fence along the side of the appeal site would have the effect of visually narrowing the public footpath, making it look and feel more enclosed. However, he does not consider that pedestrian safety would be at risk or significantly worsened or that the footpath would be enclosed to an unacceptable degree to create a safety risk to pedestrians and in this respect he concludes that the proposal would not be contrary to Policy DE1 of the CLP.

Site Address:	2 Queensland Avenue
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/1805
Description:	Change of use to a 9 bed house in multiple occupation
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 22/08/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 14/03/2019</i>

### Summary of Decisions

The main issues are: whether the proposal would amount to over-intensification of use and its impact upon the occupiers of neighbouring properties in respect of noise and disturbance; the effect of the development upon on-street car parking demand; and whether sufficient provision would be made for secure and covered cycle storage. The Inspector gives little weight to the appellant's arguments regarding student accommodation as this is not specifically what was applied for.

In looking at living conditions the Inspector notes the fall-back position as a 6-bed HMO which would be permitted development although notes that even this would result in increased comings and goings over that of a similar property occupied by a single family. The Inspector notes that the proposed 9-bed HMO would be a 50% increase in residents compared to the fall-back position and considers that this level of occupancy of an end of terrace dwelling, in an area of high-density

development, on a busy road, would represent over-intensification, mainly due to its already busy location. On this matter the Inspector concludes that the intensified use and occupation of the property by 9 individuals would have a significant detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties from noise and disturbance which would be contrary to Policy H11 of the CLP.

The Inspector notes that on the basis of their site visit, there was evidence of high car parking demand in the immediate area. The appellants argue that in an already busy area, the coming and goings generated by the proposal would be insignificant but the Inspector considered that due to the busy, high density location it is even more important to control further changes which would contribute to further on-street parking pressures. Whilst reference was made to a car parking report, this was not submitted with the appeal so given that there was no justification provided for a departure from the Council's parking standards, on the matter of car parking the Inspector concluded that the proposals failed to accord with the car parking management aims of Policy AC3 and appendix 5 of the CLP.

The appellant argued that the site is close to a bus stop and that a cycle shelter could be provided but the Inspector considered that whilst some residents may use the bus this may not always be the case and it cannot be assumed that residents would be students. Details of cycle parking were not submitted with the application and the Inspector considered that such a matter could not be dealt with by condition in this instance as it could lead to significant loss of outside amenity space.

Site Address:	100 & 102 Hawkes Mill Lane
Reference Number:	HH/2018/1173
Description:	Loft conversion and extended roof at two dwellings (100 & 102 Hawkes Mill Lane)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 06/07/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 14/03/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are the effect of the development upon: the character and appearance of the area; and the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 104, 106 and 108 Hawkes Mill Lane in respect of light and outlook.

The application site is a pair of semi-detached bungalows located near the junction with Browns Lane in an area characterised by different types of residential properties. The proposals would retain the existing eaves height to the front elevation with an overall ridge height increase of just over 2m. The Inspector noted that the increase to the roof height as well as the dormer windows would alter the street-scene but given the differing house designs in the area did not consider that this would be unsatisfactory. Furthermore, whilst the extensions would result in substantial alteration to the rear and would dominate the existing property, this would not be visible and therefore the Inspector concludes the proposal would accord with the design, character and appearance aims of Policy DE1 of the CLP.

In looking at the impact on living conditions, the Inspector notes that at the rear of the property the eaves height would increase dramatically, resulting in substantial development in close proximity (around 11m) to primary habitable windows in the adjacent property, 106 Hawkes Mill Lane. She notes that the windows at No.106 that face the appeal site are the only source of light and outlook and the proposal would cause a shading effect and severely limit outlook as well as having a significant enclosing effect. On this matter the Inspector concludes the height and proximity of the proposal to the neighbouring property would have an adverse impact on their living conditions in terms of loss of outlook and a sense of enclosure which would not accord with the amenity aims outlined in the SPG, which seeks to ensure an acceptable degree of outlook and visual amenity is maintained and to prevent extensions being overbearing to occupiers of neighbouring properties.

The appellant offered to amend the proposed ridge height of the development but that was not what was considered at the application stage and whilst it was noted that there were no objections to the scheme from neighbouring occupiers, this does not alter the Inspectors conclusion that the proposal would have a significant detrimental impact on current and future occupiers of the neighbouring property.

Site Address:	4 Thimbler Road
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/0488
Description:	Change of use of a dwellinghouse into 8 bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO, sui generis) (retrospective application) revised submission
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 17/04/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 21/03/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issue is whether the proposal represents over-intensification of the use of the property, which would in turn cause detriment to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The house has been used as an HMO since August 2017 but there are some discrepancies over the descriptions and details and the appeal is considered on the basis of the plans which show an 8-bed HMO.

The appeal site is a two-storey, extended, semi-detached property in a residential area characterised by open landscaped frontage set back from the highway with limited direct vehicular access. The Inspector does not consider, that based on the occupancy of 8 people, this would increase noise and disturbance through separate 'comings and goings' although does acknowledge that the pattern of behaviour of occupants of HMO's is generally different from families. However, HMO's of up to 6 occupants are permitted development and the Inspector does not consider that an additional 2 people are likely to create a notable difference in activity and on this matter concludes that the use would not cause material harm to neighbours and therefore would not be contrary to Policy H11 of the CLP.

The Inspector considers the character of the area and is satisfied that a cycle store can be accommodated at the rear of the property and whilst not in a prominent or accessible location does not consider this matter carries sufficient weight to warrant refusal. She also gives little weight to the Council's comments that the lack of parking could result in parking on landscaped verges in the area as a parking survey demonstrates sufficient parking and there are no highway objections to the development.

The Inspector concludes that there is no conflict with Policy H11, AC3 and appendix 5 of the CLP and the appeal is allowed with conditions imposed in respect of: development being maintained in accordance with the plans; restriction in the number of occupants to 8; and a requirement to provide cycle parking.

Site Address:	4 Queensland Avenue
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/1638
Description:	Change of use to nine bedroom HMO
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 13/08/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 27/03/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The appeal is considered on the basis that the proposal is for an open 9-bed HMO and not specifically student accommodation. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on: the living conditions of existing neighbouring occupiers; on street car parking demand; and whether sufficient provision would be made for secure and covered cycle storage.

In looking at living conditions the Inspector notes the fall-back position as a 6-bed HMO which would be permitted development although notes that even this would result in increased comings and goings over that of a similar property occupied by a single family. The Inspector notes that the proposed 9-bed HMO would be a 50% increase in residents compared to the fall-back position and considers that this level of occupancy of an end of terrace dwelling, in an area of high-density development, on a busy road, would represent over-intensification, mainly due to its already busy location. On this matter the Inspector concludes that, despite that lack of objection, the intensified use and occupation of the property by 9 individuals would have a significant detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties from noise and disturbance which would be contrary to Policy H11 of the CLP.

The Inspector noted that on the basis of their site visit, there was evidence of high car parking demand in the immediate area. Due to the busy, high density location, she considers it is even more important to control further changes which would contribute to further on-street parking pressures. Whilst reference was made to car parking report, this was not submitted with the appeal so given that there was no justification provided for a departure from the Council's parking standards, on the matter of car parking the Inspector concluded that the proposals failed to accord with the car parking management aims of Policy AC3 and appendix 5 of the CLP.

The appellant argued that the site is close to a bus stop and that a cycle shelter could be provided but the Inspector considered that whilst some residents may use the bus this may not always be the case and it cannot be assumed that residents would be students. Details of cycle parking were not submitted with the application and the Inspector considered that such a matter could not be dealt with by condition in this instance as it could lead to significant loss of outside amenity space.

Site Address:	74a Nailcote Avenue
Reference Number:	OUT/2018/1290
Description:	Outline application for erection of a new dwelling (with access and layout submitted)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 18/07/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 01/04/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt; the effect of the proposal on the character of the area; and if the proposal is inappropriate, whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

The NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. New buildings should be regarded as inappropriate development unless falling within the exceptions list within para.145.

The appeal site is an area of land to the rear of properties on Nailcote Ave, currently occupied by a detached garage with access track onto Duggins Lane, with the rest of the appeal site being primarily open land and rural in character. The Inspector notes that whilst there is some dispute as to whether the proposed dwelling would be located within the Green Belt, it is clear that the access and most of the proposed residential curtilage would be in the Green Belt. He notes that the proposed access and residential curtilage would not fall within one of the exceptions in para.145 but the material change of use of the land requires assessment in terms of whether openness would be preserved.

The Inspector considers that visual impact forms part of the concept of openness in the Green Belt and the site is visible from Duggins Lane and that domestic paraphernalia along with more comings and goings and vehicles parked within the curtilage would have a more intense visual impact on the openness of the area and therefore on this matter concludes that the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt in conflict with Policy GB1 of the CLP.

In looking at character, the Inspector notes that the immediate area to the appeal site is characterised by residential properties which front onto roads and whilst individual properties vary in design and size, the pattern of development in the area

remains uniform in linear fashion. He considers that the proposed dwelling to the rear of 74A would be at odds with the existing pattern of development in the immediate area as although there are a number of single storey incidental buildings to the rear, the proposed two storey development would be a large incongruous feature not in keeping with other structures and would be harmful to the character of the area contrary to Policies DE1, DS3 and H3 of the CLP.

The Inspector concludes that the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the NPPF establishes that substantial weight should be given to any harm to Green Belt land. In addition, the scheme would also have a harmful effect on the character of the area. The proposal for a new dwelling would not adversely compromise living conditions or highway safety and would be the development of previously developed land in a sustainable location which are benefits. However, in balancing these considerations against the harm identified he considers that the benefits would not clearly outweigh the harm that the scheme would cause and the very special circumstances necessary to justify inappropriate development do not exist.

Site Address:	1A Brandon Lane
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/0943
Description:	Change of use of the land to create additional car parking space and erection of boundary fence (retrospective application)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 24/07/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 08/04/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: whether the appeal scheme is inappropriate development in the Green Belt; and if the development is inappropriate, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

The NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. New buildings should be regarded as inappropriate development unless falling within the exceptions list within para.145. Para. 146 states that certain other forms of development, which include material changes in the use of land, are not inappropriate provided they preserve openness and do not conflict with the purpose of including land within the Green Belt.

The appeal site is a rectangular parcel of land that has been surfaced with loose stones to accommodate car parking and bounded by a timber fence. The hardstanding and fence are operational development that do not fall within one of the exceptions and therefore the assessment is whether the openness of the Green Belt is preserved.

The Inspector notes that although the car park is modest in size and not visible from wider public views, it is prominent when viewed in closer proximity and the fence is a solid man made structure where one did not previously exist, thus reducing openness to a limited degree. Furthermore, The Inspector considers that the hardstanding facilitates the parking of vehicles that, whilst not constituting an act of development in itself, adds to the loss of openness on an intermittent basis when the car park is in use. He concludes that the development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and as such conflicts with Policy GB1 of the CLP and Para. 145 of the NPPF.

Whilst it is suggested that the additional car parking is required by the Penderel Trust who occupy the offices, the Inspector notes that there is no robust evidence to demonstrate how many spaces are genuinely required or the implications of having insufficient on-site parking and therefore there are no very special circumstances that would outweigh the Green Belt harm.

Site Address:	51 Bulls Head Lane
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/0613
Description:	Erection of a dwelling
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 25/06/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 09/04/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with particular regard to siting and design; and whether the proposal would provide an adequate standard of living accommodation for future occupiers.

The appeal site is a narrow triangular plot of land to the side of 51 Bulls Head Lane which is currently used as a hot food takeaway. The site forms a gap between no. 51 and no.49, which is a two storey detached house. The Inspector considers that given the shape of the appeal site the proposed two storey house would have a very uncomfortable relationship with no.49 as it would be built up to the common boundary and forward of the building line of no.49. Although he recognises that the proposed dwelling has been set back from 51 with a lower ridge height, he considers the design to be contrived filling all the available space, which is particularly evident at the rear where the elevation is little more than the width of a door opening. The Inspector notes that on this corner at the junction of Bulls Head Lane and Biggin Hall Crescent, properties are generally detached with reasonable gaps between them and although there are terraced properties in the surrounding area, in this corner location he considers it would be in incongruous form of development and have an adverse impact on the spacious character.

On the matter of design the Inspector concludes that the proposed development would be very prominent, particular when viewed from the Bulls Head Lane corner and whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the siting and design

would be to have an adverse impact on the street scene and therein the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies DE1 and H9 of the CLP.

In looking at living conditions, the Inspector notes that due to the triangular shape of the site, the internal layout would be compromised and considers room sizes would be small and cramped, providing an unsatisfactory standard of living accommodation. Furthermore, both front and rear gardens would be unusually close to the adjoining takeaway and the garden in particular would be directly overlooked.

The Inspector does not consider that restricting occupancy to a person engaged in the operation of the takeaway would overcome his concerns regarding the standard of residential accommodation and concludes that the proposal would be contrary to policy H3 and DE1 of the CLP as it would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and would not provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers.

Site Address:	5 Davenport Road
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/0776
Description:	Extension to detached garage and change of use to create single bedroom house
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 18/05/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 10/04/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The appeal is determined on the basis of the plans considered by the Council and not the revised redline location submitted with the appeal. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kenilworth Road Conservation Area.

The Inspector notes a previous appeal decision which recognised that the site lies within the Kenilworth Road Conservation Area where the majority of housing comprises substantial detached dwellings set in large gardens giving the area a spacious and varied appearance and concurs with these observations.

In looking at the appeal, the Inspector notes that the building to be converted is a modest detached gable roof garage, subservient to the adjacent host property which is large detached inter-war dwelling which has since been converted to 2 apartments although still appears as a large single dwelling sitting in a generous plot.

There is no issue with the design of the rear garage extension, but notwithstanding this, the Inspector notes the proposal would still result in the creation of a small dwelling in a subservient garage building that lacks the height, size and scale of the prevailing larger dwellings in the immediate vicinity.

There is some discrepancy over the front elevation treatment and the Inspector considers this matter of the front elevation design to be too fundamental to the proposals to be dealt with by way of condition. Moreover, he notes this does not address the issue of the subdivided plot, which results in an uncharacteristic narrow plot which would not be in keeping with the prevailing pattern of large houses on spacious plots. He agrees with the previous Inspector that the proposal would “erode the spacious character and the predominant plot pattern of the CA” and gives little weight to the conversion of a detached outbuilding at no.10 as considers this has less significance in the street scene and is not directly comparable.

The Inspector concludes that the proposal conflicts with Policy DE1 of the CLP which seeks to ensure development proposals respect and enhance their surrounding and physical context, positively contributing to the character of the area. It is also in conflict with Policy HE2 which expects development proposal to conserve and where appropriate enhance the distinctive elements of Coventry’s recognised historic environment, including its designated Conservation Areas.

Site Address:	651 Foleshill Road
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/0930
Description:	Erection of a new shop canopy and security shutters
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 26/06/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 17/04/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issue is the design of the proposed development and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

The application site is a traditional built semi-detached property with grocers shop at ground floor, which currently has a retractable canopy over the forecourt that is used for the display of fruit and vegetables. The other half of the semi (no.649) is also a shop unit at ground floor. Either side of these two retail units are residential houses (no.’s 653-655 and 645-647) with the Foleshill Road designated shopping centre located further to the south.

The Inspector notes that the character and appearance of the area is that of a densely built urban setting with most properties being of traditional design, typically set back from the street behind forecourts with the building frontages generally forming a uniform line running parallel to the street and considers that the character of this stretch of Foleshill Road between Queen Mary’s Road and Ransom Road differs from the character of the designated shopping centre to the south.

The proposed extension would be a flat roofed canopy supported by two pillars to the front and with roller shutters to form the front and side, extending out 3.1m and spanning the full shop width. The Inspector notes that there are no similar forward extension in this stretch of Foleshill Road and considers the crude, boxy design

would appear as an incongruous feature in the street scene. He accepts that during trading hours the shutters would be retracted to allow for produce displays but at other times when the shutters are closed considers the structure would appear unattractive and severe. Whilst there are similar forward extensions within the defined Foleshill Road centre, the Inspector does not consider these directly comparable to the appeal proposal, which would stand out as an isolated and prominent feature in this section of the street and concludes that the appeal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy DE1 of the CLP.

Site Address:	8 Station Avenue
Reference Number:	S73/2018/0583
Description:	Variation of condition 2 – to extend opening hours: imposed on planning permission FUL/2016/2113 for change of use from retail (A1) to café-take-away (A3 and A5), external extraction flue, alterations to shop front and raised planter granted on 30/09/2016
Decision Level:	Planning Committee
Officer recommendation:	To refuse to grant planning permission
Decision:	Refused on 14/06/2018
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed on 17/07/2019

#### Summary of Decision

The main issue is the effect that varying the opening hours would have on the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 Station Avenues with regard to noise and disturbance.

The premises are trading as a hot food takeaway with restricted hours up until 18:00 hrs Mon—Sat and up to 16:00 hrs on a Sunday. The appeal seeks to extend these hours until 22:00 Mon-Sat and 22:30 on Sundays and Bank Holidays. The premises are in the middle of a terrace of 3 properties. No.10 at the end of the terrace is a dwellinghouse and no.'s 6 and 8 are within a defined local centre.

The inspector notes that no.10 is a relatively small dwelling with comparatively large windows in its front elevation and considers that the close proximity with No.10 means that there would be potential for the occupiers to be disturbed by noise associated with comings and goings, particularly during the evening period when background noise levels would be expected to be lower and that the only practical way of ensuring the occupiers of no.10 would not be subjected to unacceptable levels of noise disturbance would be to preclude use of the premises after 18:00 hours.

Furthermore, the Inspector notes that the rear kitchen door of the appeal premises is close to ground floor patio doors and first floor windows at no.10 and considers there would be potential for the kitchen's use during the evening to be a source of noise disturbance, particularly if the kitchen door were left open and that a condition requiring the door to be kept closed could create unacceptable working conditions within a commercial kitchen. The potential for a home delivery service

does not address the Inspectors concerns as he considers that this would generate its own delivery driver disturbance and activity and noise arising from the use of the kitchen would be unaffected by a delivery service.

The Inspector concludes that although the appeal site is within a defined local centre where Policy R6 of the CLP allows hot food takeaways, this is only where they would not result in significant harm to the amenity of nearby residents. He considers that extending the opening hours would result in significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of no.10 and whilst there are other commercial uses within the local centre with later opening hours, none have such a close relationship with a dwellinghouse and therefore are not directly comparable. The Inspector considers the proposals to extend the opening hours would unacceptably affect the living conditions of the occupiers of no.10 because of the noise and disturbance they would experience which would be contrary to Policy R6 as the extended opening hours would result in significant harm to the living conditions of nearby residents.

Site Address:	6 Harvest Hill Cottages
Reference Number:	HH/2018/1181
Description:	Erection of wooden outbuilding for use as a home office (retrospective)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 19/07/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/04/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: whether the development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the NPPF and any relevant development plan policies; the effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it; the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and if the development does constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify development.

No.6 is a semi-detached dwelling which is one of four pairs of similar properties that form a small ribbon of development within the Green Belt. The Inspector notes that there are other properties in the vicinity but considers the character of the area to be distinctly rural. The development is a timber outbuilding used as a home office and located just behind the front boundary. Para. 143 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is by definition harmful. The construction of new buildings is inappropriate unless one of the specified exceptions. Exception e) allows for the 'extension or alteration of a building' provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and the Inspector notes that although new ancillary buildings are not specifically covered by this exception, case law has established that domestic outbuilding may be regarded as an extension to a dwelling provided it forms a normal and domestic adjunct. However, in this case the Inspector considers the siting and nature of the

building, along with its spatial and functional separation from the house, is such that it cannot be treated as being an extension to the dwelling and he concludes that the development is therefore inappropriate.

In looking at openness, the Inspector notes that the development is located in the front garden of the house which is otherwise open and free of development, with the front of neighbouring properties also being substantially free of development thus contributing to the openness of the Green Belt. Although the structure is relatively modest and screened from public views the Inspector concludes that due to its size and location unrelated to existing built development, it would materially reduce the openness of the Green Belt.

In looking at character and appearance the Inspector notes that the development currently has a limited effect on the streetscene as it is screened from most public viewpoints by boundary hedges. However, he sees no guarantee that existing boundaries would be retained and a condition could not be imposed to ensure this as the hedging is outside the application site. The Inspector considers that if the screening were to be reduced or removed, the building would appear prominent and a rather out of place intrusion. He concludes that its prominent forward siting and relatively utilitarian design would not conform with the principles of good design required by policy DE1 of the CLP and although the development presently causes limited harm to the character and appearance of the area, that harm could increase if existing boundary treatments were reduced or removed.

The Inspector concludes that the development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would erode its openness, contrary to Policy GB1. He finds that there would be some limited harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy DE1 and that development would not deliver and significant social, economic or environmental benefits that would constitute the very special circumstances to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt identified.

Site Address:	9 Queen Isabels Avenue
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/1582
Description:	Proposed conversion of single property to two properties (Retrospective)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 25/09/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 29/04/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the effect of the development upon on-street car parking demand; whether sufficient provision could be made for secure and covered cycle storage; and whether sufficient private amenity space can be provided for both dwellings.

The appeal site is a semi-detached property at the corner of Queen Isabels Avenue and Lichfield Road that has a former garage which benefits from consent

for its use as an annex. The main property has been converted into two flats. The Inspector notes that there is a large volume of vehicular activity on Queen Isabels Avenue with relatively high demand for on road parking and restrictions on Lichfield Road to permit holders only. The appellant contends that for 9A there is sufficient space for 3 vehicles to park but the Inspector notes that the plans fail to demonstrate how vehicles could manoeuvre into the site and park and that vehicles would have to enter the site at angle between the corner of the annex and the brick boundary wall and considers that this, combined with a busy pedestrian area by a bus stop would pose a risk to pedestrian safety.

The Inspector notes that on a previous appeal it was accepted that vehicles could park safely in this location and that there were no highway objections, but considers this to be a materially different scheme as the subdivision of no.9 would increase, arguably double, the demand for parking in this location and concludes on this matter that the based on the evidence, the proposal fails to comply with parking standards within Appendix 5 and Policy AC3 of the CLP.

Details of cycle storage were not provide and the Inspector considered in this instance that the matter could not be dealt with by condition it would not allow for consideration as to whether cycle storage would lead to further loss of outdoor amenity space. The plans show no more than 20 sq.m of amenity space for no.9 and no private amenity space for no.9A and therefore on this the Inspector concludes that the proposal would offer future occupiers no private garden space due to the over-intensive use of the site, resulting in unacceptable subdivision contrary to Policy H3 of the CLP.

Site Address:	214 London Road
Reference Number:	HH/2018/0609
Description:	Proposed installation of footway crossing for vehicular access and driveway
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 29/05/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 30/04/2019</i>

### Summary of Decision

The main issues are the effect of the development on: highway safety; and the character and appearance of the area.

The appeal site is a mid-terraced property fronting London road which is a dual carriageway. It has a foregarden with pedestrian access to the front and vehicular access via a shared private drive to the rear. London Road is subject to parking restrictions and there is a line of bollards to prevent vehicles crossing onto the footpath and grass verge. The Inspector notes that the foregarden is of sufficient size to accommodate a vehicle but not deep or wide enough to allow such a vehicle to turn and leave in a forward direction. Consequently, he considers drivers would have to reverse either into or out of the site which would be a hazardous manoeuvre due to the curve of this busy main road and interference with visibility from trees. The appellants comments about the existing rear access lane are noted

but the Inspector concludes that the provision of a new access onto a heavily trafficked main road would impact on the safety of road user, contrary to Policy AC2 of the CLP.

On the matter of character and appearance, the Inspector notes that although there have been individual changes in other parts of the road, these have not eroded the overall appearance of an area defined by the consistent line of housing with pedestrian accessed foregardens enclosed by dwarf brick walls. He considers that these frontages, combined with the wide footway and grassed verge with trees contribute to the essentially suburban character of the location and that this would be harmed by the loss of fabric (the wall) and the introduction of additional hard paved surfaces which would be contrary to Policy DE1 of the CDP.

The Inspector does not consider that the reference to health as a justification of need is sufficient to outweigh the harm 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 <i>Staircase Lane</i>	<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>ADV/2018/2010</b> OS The Richard Crossman Building <i>Jordan Well</i>	<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 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>ADV/2018/2011</b> OS Cosy Club <i>Cathedral Lanes Shopping Centre</i>	<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 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>ADV/2018/2012</b> Lady Godiva News <i>Broadgate</i>	<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 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>ADV/2018/2013</b> Primark Stores <i>Broadgate</i>	<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 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>AVI/2018/2014</b> 2-10 <i>Trinity Street</i>	<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 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019

<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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<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>	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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>ADV/2018/2025</b> 30 <b>Market Way</b>	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 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TELO 2018/1993</b> Outside The Richard Crossman Building <b>Jordan Well</b>	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 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>TELO/2018/1994</b> Outside Cosy Club <b>Cathedral Lanes</b> <b>Shopping Centre</b>	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 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>TELO/2018/1995</b> Os Lady Godiva News <b>Broadgate</b>	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 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>TELO/2018/1996</b> Adj Primark <b>Broadgate</b>	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 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>TELO/2018/1997</b> Adj The Flying Standard <b>Trinity</b> <b>Street</b>	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 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>TELO/2018/1999</b> 3 <b>Trinity Street</b>	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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>TELO/2018/2000</b> Os Blue Arrow <b>Cross</b> <b>Cheaping</b>	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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>TELO/2018/2001</b> Os JD Sports 40-44 <b>The Precinct</b>	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 <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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<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>
<b>ADV/2018/2026</b> 36-42 <b>Corporation 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: 01/11/2018 Start date: 23/04/2019

<b>TELO/2018/1998</b> Opp pool Meadow Bus Station <b>Hales 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: 01/11/2018 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>FUL/2018/1549</b> 62 <b>Northumberland Road</b>	<i>Shamin 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: 05/11/2018 Start date: 08/02/2019 Questionnaire/Statement: 15/01/2019
<b>FUL/2018/1796</b> 76 <b>Bransford Avenue</b>	<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 Questionnaire/statement: 03/01/2019
<b>FUL/2018/1423</b> 1 <b>Grenville Avenue</b>	<i>Ayesha Saleem</i>	Written Representations	Erection of a dwellinghouse	Lodged date 02/01/2019 Start date: 23/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 29/04/2019
<b>OUT/2017/1071</b> 28 and land to rear <b>Tallants Road</b>	<i>Nigel Smith</i>	Written Representations	Demolition of 28 Tallants Road, new access and erection of 11 dwellings on land to rear 9outline application with access and layout submitted)	Lodged date 03/01/2019 Start date:18/01/2019 Questionnaire/Statement: 24/01/2019
<b>FUL/2018/2432</b> 2 Pennington Way	<i>Ayesha Saleem</i>	Written Representations	Erection of two flats	Lodged date 17/01/2019 Start date: 06/02/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 18/02/2019
<b>FUL/2018/3298</b> 77 <b>Humber Avenue</b>	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Change of use from existing retail (use class A1) to hot food takeaway (use class A5), new shopfront and extraction flue	Lodged date 01/02/2019 Start date:25/02/2019 Questionnaire/Statement: 04/03/2019

<b>FUL/2018/3452</b> 89 <b>Windmill Road</b>	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Change of use of former public house to 11 Bed House in Multiple Occupation	Lodged date 28/02/2019 Start date: 18/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 25/03/2019
<b>FUL/2018/3300</b> 47A <b>Mayfield Road</b>	<i>Emma Spandley</i>	Written Representations	Change of use of existing ground floor shop (Use Class A1) and existing living accommodation (Use Class C3) into 2no. houses in multiple occupation (Use Class C4) (Retrospective).	Lodged date: 01/03/2019 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>FUL/2018/3282</b> 89 <b>Far Gosford Street</b>	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Erection of second storey to existing building and the creation of 1No 3-bedroomed residential flat	Lodged date: 08/03/2019 Start date: 25/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 02/04/2019
<b>HH/2018/1867</b> 125A <b>Beechwood Avenue</b>	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of ancillary accommodation to existing bungalow	Lodged date: 14/03/2019 Start date: 04/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 15/04/2019
<b>FUL/2017/2140</b> 71 and 71A <b>Chandos Street</b>	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Timber fence installation along the front and side. (Retrospective)	Lodged date: 25/03/2019 Start date: 03/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 05/04/2019
<b>FUL/2018/1351</b> Coventry Saracens Fc <b>Bredon Avenue</b>	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Construction of hardsurface for use as car park	Lodged date: 04/04/2019 Start date: 23/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 01/05/2019
<b>HH/2019/0215</b> 70 <b>Torbay Road</b>	<i>Holika Bungre</i>	Written Representations	Erection of single storey rear extension	Lodged date: 04/04/2019 <b>Awaiting start date</b>

<b>TP/2019/0153</b> The Stables <b>Park Hill</b>	<i>Robert Penlington</i>	Hearing	Trees T1-T14 – Fell.	Lodged date: 11/04/2019 Start date: 11/04/2019 Questionnaire date: 25/04/2019
<b>HH/2019/03001</b> 1 <b>Fosseway Road</b>	<i>Joshua Veeranna</i>	Written Representations	Extension of a dropped kerb for vehicular access	Lodged date: 11/04/2019 <b>Awaiting start date</b>

## APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED

Application Reference Site Address	Case Officer	Type	Proposal	Appeal Decision & date
<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.	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>08/03/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2017/3029</b> <b>14 John McGuire Crescent</b>	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Erection of one dwelling house, with associated landscaping and vehicular access	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>14/03/2019</b> decision type: <i>Planning Committee</i>
<b>FUL/2018/1805</b> <b>2 Queensland Avenue</b>	<i>Nigel Smith</i>	Written Representations	Change of use to a 9 bed house in multiple occupation	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>14/03/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>HH/2018/1173</b> <b>100 &amp; 102 Hawkes Mill Lane</b>	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Loft conversion and extended roof at two dwellings (100 & 102 Hawkes Mill Lane)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>14/03/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>Ful/2018/0488</b> <b>4 Thimble Road</b>	<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	Decision : <b>ALLOWED</b> <b>21/03/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2018/1638</b> <b>4 Queensland Avenue</b>	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Change of use to nine bedroom HMO	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>27/03/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>OUT/2018/1290</b> <b>74a Nailcote Avenue</b>	<i>Ayesha Saleem</i>	Written Representations	Outline application for erection of a new dwelling (with access and layout submitted)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>01/04/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>

<b>FUL/2018/0943</b> <b>1A 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 application)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>08/04/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2018/0613</b> <b>51 Bulls Head Lane</b>	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Erection of a dwelling	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>09/04/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2018/0776</b> <b>5 Davenport Road</b>	<i>Ayesha Saleem</i>	Written Representations	Extension to detached garage and change of use to create single bedroom house	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>10/04/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2018/0930</b> <b>651 Foleshill Road</b>	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Erection of a new shop canopy and security shutters	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>17/04/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>S73/2018/0583</b> <b>8 Station Avenue</b>	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Variation of condition 2 – to extend opening hours: imposed on planning permission FUL/2016/2113 for change of use from retail (A1) to café-take-away (A3 and A5), external extraction flue, alterations to shop front and raised planter granted on 30/09/2016	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>17/04/2019</b> decision type: <i>Planning committee</i>
<b>HH/2018/1181</b> <b>6 Harvest Hill Cottages Oak Lane</b>	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Erection of wooden outbuilding for use as a home office (retrospective)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/04/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2018/1582</b> <b>9 Queen Isabels Avenue</b>	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Proposed conversion of single property to two properties (Retrospective)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/04/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>HH/2018/0609</b> <b>214 London Road</b>	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Proposed installation of footway crossing for vehicular access and driveway	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>30/04/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>