

---

**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 May 2019 to 30 June 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 MAY TO 30 JUNE 2019**

<b>No. APPEALS PENDING</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>No. APPEALS RECEIVED</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>No. APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>No. ENFORCEMENT APPEALS LODGED</b>	<b>1</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>-</b>

Site Address:	2 Pennington Way
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/2432
Description:	Erection of 2 flats
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 16/10/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 09/05/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the erect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future occupiers, with particular regard to outlook.

No.2 Pennington Way is a detached dwelling within a spacious corner plot being set back from the street and in keeping with development on Pennington Way. Adjacent to the site are more compact terraced houses which front onto Queen Marys Road, the appeal site adjoining No.91 Queen Marys Road. The appeal site is part of the garden of No.2 where it adjoins the shared boundary with No.91 Queen Marys Road. The Inspector notes that the site contributes positively to the open setting of No.2 and provides a degree of separation between the different forms of development in Pennington Way and Queen Marys Road.

The proposed development would occupy the gap between No.2 and No.91 and the Inspector notes that the separation of development on Queen Marys Road and Pennington Way would be lost. Furthermore, because it would be further forward of the front building line of No.2, combined with the exposed gable wall of the development he considers the proposal would appear overly dominant and that the proposed open frontage would appear incongruous alongside the existing boundary walls that define the front boundaries of the terraced houses. On the matter of character and appearance the Inspector concludes that the development would appear as a cramped and overly prominent form of development that would be harmful to the open and spacious character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy De1 of the CLP.

In looking at living conditions, the Inspector notes that the proposed flats would overlook the rear garden and although views would be at an oblique angle to No.2, the side wall of this property would be obvious in views down the garden. Given that the wall is two storey and would be on the shared boundary, the Inspector considers it would have an overbearing impact on and therefore create an oppressive environment for future occupiers which would not provide a high-quality residential environment in accordance with Policy H3 of the CLP and the guidance in the NPPF.

Although it is accepted that a residential development in this location would be acceptable in principle, the Inspector concludes that the benefits would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of future occupiers.

Site Address:	89 Far Gosford Street
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/3282
Description:	Erection of second storey to existing building and the creation of 1 No 3-bedroomed residential flat
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 06/02/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 04/06/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issue is whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Far Gosford Street Conservation Area.

The appeal site is a two storey building within the For Gosford Street Conservation Area and Local Centre. The building has a flat roof behind a decorative parapet and although it is not listed, the Inspector notes that the building is attractive and retains many original features. It is within a group of two storey buildings overlooking an area of landscaped open space and small car park and the inspector considers the building holds a prominent location, both sitting in a row of buildings of a similar scale and being part of a grouping that is read together over some distance and as such makes a positive contribution to towards the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposal would add a second floor onto the building in an otherwise two-storey row, which the Inspector considers would contrast with the existing pattern where the roof eaves on each building and the parapet edge of the appeal site, generally follow the contour of the land. He considers the proposal would sever the rhythm of building heights that gradually step up the gradient as the row approached Far Gosford Street and would therefore introduce a discordant feature into this important and prominent view.

The Inspector notes that there are limited examples of three-storey buildings in sight of the appeal site; notably a landmark building on a corner site which gives emphasis on a key location. However in contrast, he considers the proposal would draw unwelcome attention to an innocuous building within a row and would be out of keeping and proportion with the scale of its two-storey neighbours and out of character with the local area.

Although the extension proposes matching materials that seek to repeat the existing design style and materials evident at first floor, the Inspector considers that this would be at odds with the historic integrity and proportions of the original building creating a bulky addition and concludes that the proposal would be contrary to policies HE1 and HE2 of the CLP which seek for development to conserve and enhance the historic environment. He also considers the proposal would be contrary to the Far Gosford Street Management Plan 2013 which includes the need for development to reflect the height and scale of structures within the surrounding area.

Site Address:	62 Northumberland Road
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/1549
Description:	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)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 03/09/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 19/06/2019</i>

### Summary of Decisions

The main issues are: the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; the effect of the development on the occupiers of 60 Northumberland Road with particular regard to sunlight and daylight; and whether the proposed use would cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents having regard to general disturbance and car parking.

The appeal property is a mid-terraced 19<sup>th</sup> Century dwelling which has a small courtyard garden as do all houses within the terraced block. To the rear is 20<sup>th</sup> Century housing which is not orientated conventionally to the road and consequently the rear of the appeal site is visible from a shared driveway/ parking area on Cumbria Close. The extension to the property comprises a large I-shaped

flat-roof rear dormer standing above the original ridge of the outrigger, which the Inspector considers results in a dominant and obtrusive roof extension of a size which is disproportionate to the scale of the dwelling and its roof. He considers the bulky rear roof extension distorts the otherwise even form of the block and its roof profile and although it is not prominent in views from the street it is prominent to other residents in the area and passers-by on Cumbria Close.

The Inspector is not persuaded that the proposed modifications to the roof extension involving cutting back the dormer slightly, would significantly reduce the visual harm identified to the character and appearance of the area and concludes that the development fails to accord with Policies DE1, H5 and H11 of the CLP.

In looking at the issue of daylight and sunlight, the Inspector notes that the narrow access spaces formed by the outriggers already limit access to daylight for the middle rooms. He considers that the increase in height above the existing eaves will result in parts of the outdoor amenity area receiving less sunlight and on this matter concludes that with respect to overshadowing, the dormer extension conflicts with Policies DE1 and H11 of the CLP.

In looking at the use of the property, the Inspector does not consider it possible to demonstrate that the level of activity or any disturbance through 'comings and goings' or in the use of the garden would be discernibly greater than when occupied by 6 persons or a family of similar size. In looking at car parking he considers that it is likely, that given the location, levels of car ownership are lower than they would be in suburban locations and whilst he observed a moderate degree of pressure on availability, does not consider that an additional resident would create a situation of parking stress for other residents. On this matter the Inspector concludes that the conversion of a 6-person HMO into a large HMO through the addition of one bedroom would not materially harm the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties and would not conflict with Policy H11 of the CLP.

Site Address:	125A Beechwood Avenue
Reference Number:	HH/2018/1867
Description:	Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of ancillary accommodation to existing bungalow
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 21/06/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area; and the possibility of the annex becoming a separate dwelling.

125A Beechwood Avenue is one of 5 properties accessed along a single track. 125A is set back from the access road but has a brick built outbuilding fronting it separated from the house by amenity space. A neighbour's garage adjoins the

outbuilding. The proposal would replace the outbuilding with one some 4.5m longer and 0.4m higher and although this annex would be large, the Inspector does not consider it would be so different in terms of siting, scale and mass, from the existing outbuilding and would be no greater in height than the neighbouring garage. He finds that the proposed materials would be reflective of the main dwellinghouse and that the building would not adversely effect the soft landscaping of the area. On this matter the Inspector concludes that the proposed replacement building would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area and would accord with Policies DE1 and H5 of the CLP.

The LPA raised concerns regarding the potential use of the annex as an independent dwelling, but the Inspector notes that any change to an independent dwelling would require a separate planning application, the merits of which would be determined at that time. He does not consider it necessary to consider the merits or disadvantages of the proposed building becoming a separate dwelling and sees no conflict with Policies DE1 and H5 in this regard.

The appeal is allowed with conditions in respect of: A 3 year time limit for commencing development; Development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans; Submission of materials for approval; and a restriction on occupancy for purposes ancillary to the residential use of 125A Beechwood Avenue.



## 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: 09/04/2018 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: 09/04/2018 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: 09/04/2018 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: 09/04/2018 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: 09/04/2018 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>ADV/2018/2015</b> Coventry Transport Museum <i>Hales 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: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019

<b>ADV/2018/2016</b> 3 <b>Trinity Street</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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>ADV/2018/2017</b> 2 <b>Cross Cheaping</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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>ADV/2018/2018</b> 40-44 <b>The Precinct</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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
<b>ADV/2018/2019</b> 25 <b>Upper Precinct</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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
<b>ADV/2018/2020</b> W H Smith <b>Smithford 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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>ADV/2018/2021</b> 1 <b>Bull Yard</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 Start date: 27/03/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>ADV/2018/2022</b> 14-16 <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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
<b>ADV/2018/2023</b> 10-12 <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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
<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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019

<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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
<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: 09/04/2018 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>TELO/2018/1994</b> Outside Cosy Club <b>Cathedral Lanes 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: 09/04/2018 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: 09/04/2018 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: 09/04/2018 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
<b>TELO/2018/1997</b> Adj The Flying Standard <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: 09/04/2018 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 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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
<b>TELO/2018/2002</b> Os Clintons Cards 25-27 <b>Upper 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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019

<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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
<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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
<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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
<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 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
<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 Questionnaire/statement date: 09/05/2019

<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/2018/1796</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 date: 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: 23/04/2018 Questionnaire/statement date: 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 9(outline application with access and layout submitted)	Lodged date 03/01/2019 Start date:18/01/2019 Questionnaire/Statement date: 24/01/2019
<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 date: 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 date: 25/03/2019
<b>FUL/2018/3300</b> 47A <b>Mayfield Road</b>	<i>Emma Spandley</i>	Informal Hearing	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 Start date: 20/06/2019

<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 date: 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 date: 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 Start date: 03/06/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 10/06/2019 <b>Appeal withdrawn</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/2019/0300</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 Start date: 16/05/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 21/05/2019
<b>TP/2019/0505</b> 155 <b>Broad Lane</b>	<i>Robert Penlington</i>	Written Representations	Beech (T1) – Reduce lateral western crown back by approximately 2m (in line with boundary). Chestnut (T2) – Fell. Oak (T3) – Reduce western crown by approx. 2m (in line with boundary).	Lodged date: 07/05/2019 Start date: 07/05/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 08/05/2019
<b>FUL/2019/0524</b> 55 <b>Yelverton Road</b>	<i>Ayesha Saleem</i>	Written Representations	Erection of single storey rear extension and use of existing dwelling as 3 flats	Lodged date: 14/05/2019 Start date: 21/06/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 24/06/2019

<b>ENF/2019/00003</b> <b>77 Humber Avenue</b>	<i>Marcus Fothergill</i>	Written Representations	Appeal against Enforcement Notice; without planning permission the material change of use of the land to a hot food takeaway (Use Class A5)	Start date: 21/05/2019
<b>FUL/2019/0373</b> <b>5 Rosegreen Close</b>	<i>Peter Anderson</i>	Written Representations	Erection of a two storey front extension	Lodged date: 21/05/2019 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>FUL/2019/0712</b> <b>110 Hugh Road</b>	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Extension and conversion of detached garage to create one bed dwelling	Lodged date: 28/05/2019 Start date: 12/06/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 19/06/2019
<b>FUL/2018/2914</b> <b>519 Tile Hill Lane</b>	<i>Emma Spandley</i>	Written Representations	Demolition of existing Police Station and erection of three 2 bedroomed dwelling houses; two 3 storey buildings, 1 building containing five 1 bedroom flats and 1 building containing six 2 bedroomed flats	Lodged date: 03/06/2019 Start date: 17/06/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 09/07/2019
<b>TP/2019/0732</b> <b>Binley Business Park, Compton Court Harry Weston Road</b>	<i>Robert Penlington</i>	Informal Hearing	T1 London Plane – fell and grind stump due to included fork replace with 12-14cm girth Liquidambar in same location	Lodged date: 10/06/2019 Start date: 19/06/2019
<b>TP/2019/0693</b> <b>7 South Avenue</b>	<i>Robert Penlington</i>	Written Representations	T1 Lime – Re-pollard to original pollard heads at approximately 4-5m above ground level. T2 Lime – Re-pollard to original pollard heads at approximately 4-5m above ground level	Lodged date: 11/06/2019 <b>Awaiting start date</b>
<b>TP/2019/0628</b> <b>12 Pinewood Grove</b>	<i>Robert Penlington</i>	Written Representations	6 Thuja trees – Trim heights by up to 2m, trim side growth to: club side by 1.5m, and to applicants side by up to 3m	Lodged date 12/06/2019 Start date: 12/06/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 16/06/2019

## APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED

Application Reference Site Address	Case Officer	Type	Proposal	Appeal Decision & date
<b>FUL/2018/2432</b> 2 Penington Way		Written Representations	Erection of 2 flats	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>09/05/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2018/3282</b> 89 Far Gosford Street	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Erection of second storey to existing building and the creation of 1 No 3-bedroomed residential flat	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>04/06/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>FUL/2018/1549</b> 62 Northumberland Road	<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)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>19/06/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
<b>HH/2018/1867</b> 125A Beechwood Avenue	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of ancillary accommodation to existing bungalow	Decision : <b>ALLOWED</b> <b>21/06/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>