
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 July 2019 to 31 August 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. Equality implications

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, known as the Public Sector Equality Duty, requires the Council to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people. The appeal decisions summarised in this report do not raise any equality issues for the Council.

SUMMARY OF APPEALS IN PERIOD OF 1 SEPTEMBER TO 31 OCTOBER 2019

No. APPEALS PENDING	45
No. APPEALS RECEIVED	10
No. APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED	8
No. ENFORCEMENT APPEALS LODGED	0
No. ENFORCEMENT APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED	0
No. OFFICER DECISIONS ALLOWED	1
No. MEMBER DECISIONS ALLOWED	1

Site Address:	89 Windmill Road
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/3452
Description:	Change of use of former public house to 11 Bed House in Multiple Occupation
Decision Level:	Planning Committee
Officer Recommendation:	Approval
Decision:	Refused on 15/02/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 11/09/2019</i>
Costs Decision:	<i>Allowed on 11/09/2019</i>

Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the effect of the proposal on local community facilities; and whether the proposal makes adequate provision for parking off-road and the effect of any lack of provision on the amenity of the area and highway safety.

The site is a locally listed, disused public house, located on the corner of Windmill Road and Recreation Road in a predominantly residential area. The proposal would result in the creation of 11 en-suite rooms, an office and communal kitchen to create a HMO along with provision of 9 off-road parking spaces. The Inspector confirms that the uses of the premises would be as an eleven bedroom HMO for ordinary residential purposes.

In looking at the issue of community facilities the Council's objection to the proposal is that there is insufficient information to justify the loss of the pub causing a detrimental impact on the sustainability of the community. The Inspector notes that a detailed community use report (CUR) submitted with the application outlines declining sales over a 10 year period and changes in the pub market with which the Old Crown Inn was unable to compete. The CUR also identified 8 nearby public houses or social clubs within 1km of the appeal site. Policy CO2 of the CLP seeks to prevent the loss of community facilities where there is an outstanding local need and the Inspector considers that the social element of a public house does provide such a facility and that it is reasonable to apply moderate weight to the principles of this policy. However, the Inspector notes that the building is empty and no longer in use as a pub and that there are other similar facilities reasonably nearby and sees no evidence that these remaining facilities would be any less accessible to the local community other than having to walk a slightly greater distance, or that there would be a harmful effect on the viability of local facilities and services. In this regard she finds no conflict with Policy CO2 of the CLP as the proposal would result in more people living locally which would be more likely to contribute to the local area being sustained. Given the location of the building in a residential area with easy links to public transport the Inspector finds no conflict with Policy DS3 of the CLP.

On parking provision the Inspector notes that there are no highway objections to the proposals and gives this significant weight. She considers that as the site is in a sustainable location the use of sustainable transport should be encouraged and that it has not been demonstrated that even if there was a material deficiency in car parking it would have a harmful effect on highway safety. The Inspector notes that there are few parking restrictions along Windmill Road or the surrounding streets and is mindful of the extant use of the building for a pub and the existing access point and that no evidence is provided by the Council as to how parking on the street could have a harmful effect on amenity and concludes on this matter that there would be no harm to highway safety. She concludes that as the site lies in a sustainable location, the proposed nine parking spaces are adequate to accommodate the scale of HMO use proposed and this level of parking provision would be unlikely to harm highway safety and local amenity in accordance With Policy H3 and AC1 of the CLP.

The appeal is allowed with conditions regarding: a time limit on the commencement of development; conformity with approved drawings; requirement for bin and cycle storage to be provided; requirement for sample materials to be

submitted; requirement for boilers and electric vehicle charging; restrictions on works to windows; and laying out of car parking.

Costs decision

The National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes it clear that a local planning authority is at risk of an award of costs if it fails to produce evidence to substantiate each reason for refusal on appeal and/or makes vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal's impact which are unsupported by any objective analysis. The Inspector notes that while the Council is not duty bound to follow the advice of its professional officers, if a different decision is reached, the Council has to clearly demonstrate on planning grounds why a proposal is unacceptable and provide clear evidence to substantiate that reasoning.

In this case she notes "the planning and policy officers concluded that there was overwhelming evidence provided that there are viability issues with the existing public house use and that a positive re-use should therefore be considered. There is no substantive evidence to counteract the material provided by the appellants which concludes on the viability of the use of the site as a public house. Despite the inaccuracies in the appellants' documents found by Committee Members, the inherent conclusions of the Community Use Report and Marketing Report remain uncontested."

Additionally, highway officers raised no concerns with regard to the degree of on-site parking proposed in this sustainable location and that the proposal would not result in severe impact with regard to highways, but the Inspector notes that little evidence was put forward by the Council to support the reasons for refusal and establish that there is an existing parking problem and how it would be made worse on highway safety grounds.

The Inspector concludes that, in the planning judgement it appears that having regard to the provision of the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations that the development should reasonably been permitted and that the refusal of planning permission constitutes unreasonable behaviour. She therefore finds that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense as described in the PPG has been demonstrated and that a full award of costs is justified.

It has been agreed that an award of costs of £6375 will be made to the appellant.

Site Address:	110 Hugh Road
Reference Number:	FUL/2019/0712
Description:	Extension and conversion of detached garage to created one bed dwelling
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 16/05/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 19/09/2019</i>

Summary of Decision

The main issues are: whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Stoke Green CA; the impact of the proposed development on the living conditions of the future occupiers of the garage conversion and the occupiers of the neighbouring properties; and the impact of the proposed development on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the vicinity of the appeal site.

No. 110 and its immediate neighbours front Stoke Green with Hugh Road running immediately along their rear boundaries are located within the Stoke Green CA. They are likely to have been built at the same time and have similar sized gardens and outbuildings to the rear on Hugh Road. The Inspector notes that none of the neighbouring gardens appear to have been subdivided and considers that doing so would be out of keeping with the settlement pattern and would result in overdevelopment of the plot.

The Inspector considers the proposed part hip, part flat roof design of the garage would not match the main dwelling which would weaken its connection to the host dwelling and appear out of character with the other outbuildings. Whilst he recognises the garage has little architectural merit, the Inspector considers the loss of the garage door and inclusion of a small window on the frontage would break the visual cohesion of the row of garages. Regarding this issue he concludes that the proposals would cause visual harm to the CA and although this harm is less than substantial it must still be given considerable importance and weight and the benefits of the conversion would not outweigh the harm identified, making the proposal contrary to Policies H3, DE1 and HE2 of the CLP.

In looking at the issue of impact on occupiers, the Inspector notes that the garage would extend into the garden of No.110 and as such the gap between the properties would be reduced. He also notes that the proposals fail to meet the minimum garden depth and sizes recommended in the SPG and consequently would not provide acceptable outdoor amenity space for the occupiers of both properties. Furthermore, the minimum recommended window to window distances would not be met which would result in overlooking of the garage from existing properties which would cause unacceptable harm to the privacy and outlook for the future occupiers of the conversion. In addition to this, a fence is proposed between No.110 and the garage conversion, which the Inspector considers would have a detrimental impact on occupiers outlook and daylight and on this matter concludes that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the future occupiers of the garage conversion and the occupiers of the three existing properties to the rear, contrary to Policies H3 and H5 of the CLP.

In looking at highway safety, the Inspector notes that properties on Hugh Road do not typically have off-street parking spaces with occupiers having to park on the road. Whilst the garage is below the minimum standards required to accommodate a car, he considers the dropped kerb in front of the garage is currently available to the occupiers of No.110 and as a result of the development they would lose this parking space which would result in vehicle displacement. In the Inspectors view, this displacement would increase the number of cars parked on the road which would reduce the amount of usable highway to the detriment of pedestrians and vehicle users. Furthermore, he notes that no cycle parking has been identified. On

this matter the Inspector concludes that although the site is in an area well served by public transport, the proposals do not meet parking requirements and would result in increased parking on Hugh Road which would have a detrimental impact on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network within the vicinity of the site, contrary to Policies DE1, AC1, AC4 and H3 of the CLP.

Site Address:	5 Rosegreen Close
Reference Number:	HH/2019/0373
Description:	Erection of a two storey front extension
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 10/04/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 24/09/2019</i>

Summary of Decisions

The main issues are: the effect on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area; and the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 3 Rosegreen Close with particular regard to outlook.

The dwelling is a semi-detached house near the corner of Black Prince Avenue and William Bristow Road and is of an unusual design with mono-pitch roof and tall vertically aligned windows. The proposed extension would project forward of the main two storey front elevation of the dwelling, but due to it being set back behind the adjacent dwellings on Rosegreen Close and at a lower ground level, the Inspector does not consider that the proposal would form an incongruous or over dominant feature purely on account of its scale. Furthermore, he notes that whilst the development would remove some of the symmetry from the pair of dwellings, the forward projection would not look out of place in the context of the surrounding development. However, the Inspector notes that the chamfered design, although set back from the main front elevation, would have a design and roof structure that would not be characteristic of the dwelling or the surrounding area. He considers the resulting design would appear contrived and the splayed walls and roofline would form an awkward and incongruous feature that would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, in conflict with Policy DE1 of the CLP.

In looking at the impact on the living conditions of No.3, the Inspector considers that the chamfered design reduces the bulk of the development at its point closest to the window so as not to cause harm to outlook and on this matter concludes that the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.3.

Site Address:	55 Yelverton Road
Reference Number:	FUL/2019/0524
Description:	Erection of single storey rear extension and use of existing dwelling as 3 flats

Decision Level:	Planning Committee
Officer Recommendation:	Approval
Decision:	Refusal on 17/07/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 27/09/2019</i>

Summary of Decisions

The main issues are: whether the proposal would provide an appropriate location for the development proposed having regard to the established character of the area; and whether the proposal would amount to an intensification of the use of the property which would adversely affect the living conditions of existing neighbouring residents of the development with particular regard to noise, disturbance, and demand for on-street parking.

The property is a two-story mid-terraced property located in a relatively quiet suburban area where the Inspector finds the prevailing character of the area to be one of family housing. The Inspector notes that external alterations are limited to the provision of parking and a single storey extension to the rear but considers it likely that the flats could be occupied in separate ownership, resulting in differing approaches to repair and maintenance to the detriment of the street scene. He gives little weight to the fall back position of the property being converted to a 6-bed HMO as he does not consider that there is a likelihood or real prospect of this occurring. On the issue of character the Inspector concludes that the development would inevitably increase the density of occupation of the property and although there will be little visual harm it would result in an increase in the movement of people and changes to the patterns of movement which would be in contrast to the existing family housing character of the area, which would have a harmful effect on the character of the area in conflict with CLP Policies DE1, H3 and H5.

In looking at living conditions, the inspector is not persuaded that the number of future occupiers would generate a level of additional noise and disturbance that would cause significant harm to the adjoining occupiers given that the existing house has three bedrooms and the proposed flats would have 3 bedrooms in total. In looking at parking, the Inspector notes that the on-street parking along Yelverton Road and the surrounding streets was very near to capacity and that the provision of 2 frontage off-street spaces would be at the expense of on-street parking. The two parking spaces at the rear would be accessed between no.61 and no.63 which the Inspector notes is narrow and overgrown which suggests that there is a likelihood that the parking proposed to the rear would be underutilised. On this matter he concludes that whilst the overall demand generated by the proposal would be limited, the development would result in further parking pressures on Yelverton Road and the surrounding network to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings in conflict with CLP Policies DE1, H3 and H5.

Site Address:	36-42 Corporation Street
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2026
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-

	illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 11/09/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 02/10/2019</i>

Summary of Decision

The main issues are the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity and public safety.

The proposed advertisement would be located on Corporation Street near to the junction with West Orchard Street where there is a pedestrian crossing in close proximity to the site. The Inspector notes that looking west from the appeal site towards the nearby Belgrade Theatre there is a row of symmetrical trees forming part of a public realm scheme. There are two traditional telephone boxes and a single illuminated display board on the pavement beyond the trees and to the east of the site a further illuminated display board. The Inspector considers the advertisement would be displayed in a prominent location on the wide pavement and would be conspicuous in public views from a number of angles, introducing a discordant element in a prominent corner location and adding further visual clutter to a carefully designed public area and consequently finds that the proposal would harm the amenity of the area.

In looking at public safety the Inspector notes that the advertisement would be located on a wide pavement and not in a position likely to obstruct visibility and pedestrian flow to the nearby crossing and does not find that the siting of the advertisement would pose a danger to public safety.

The Inspector also notes that there would be conflict in terms of amenity with Policy DE1 of the CLP and Policy CC1 of the CCAAP which seek to ensure high quality design, including attractive and uncluttered public spaces.

Site Address:	Land adjacent to The Brindles Pickford Green Lane
Reference Number:	OUT/2018/3099
Description:	Outline application for the erection of up to three dwellings (all matters except access reserved)
Decision Level:	Planning Committee
Officer recommendation:	Refusal
Decision:	Refusal on 21/01/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 15/10/2019</i>

Summary of Decision

The main issues are: whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; the effect on the openness of the Green Belt; the effect of the proposal on biodiversity in the Ancient Arden; and if the proposal is inappropriate development, if this is outweighed by any very special circumstances to justify the development.

The appeal site is a field providing a gap between ribbon development on Pickford Green Lane and a detached dwelling (The Brindles) and is elevated from the road. Para. 145 of the NPPF states that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt other than in the case of certain exceptions, one of which is for limited infilling in villages. Policy GB1 allows for self-build and starter homes as part of limited infill within existing ribbon development in the Green Belt where they will not adversely impact upon openness. The Inspectors attention is drawn to a previous appeal where in that case the intrinsically rural and open nature of the site and wider agricultural setting of Pickford Green Lane was noted. He also notes these characteristics and concurs with the previous Inspector that the development pattern does not exhibit the visual characteristics of a limited infill site and concludes that the development constitutes inappropriate development.

Looking at openness, the Inspector notes that from Pickford Grange Lane the site forms part of the generally open rural context and even accounting for the proximity of existing dwellings, the proposal would increase the presence of built form and the footprint, height and volume of any dwelling would affect openness when compared with the current undeveloped nature of the site. On this he concludes that the development would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to Policy GB1 of the CLP.

In looking at biodiversity, the Inspector notes that the rural character of the site and mature landscaping to the boundaries indicate that there is habitat potential and that development would result in significant parts of the site being overlaid with buildings, hardstanding and vehicular access points which would require removal of planting. He considers that on this basis and in the absence of any evidence to demonstrate otherwise, it is reasonable to conclude there would be likely to be a net loss of biodiversity. On this matter he concludes that in the absence of an appropriate assessment, there is uncertainty as to whether the proposal would protect, enhance and/or restore habitat biodiversity and is therefore contrary to Policy GE3 of the CLP.

The Inspector notes the allocation of the SUE on the opposite side of Pickford Green Lane but that this does not include the fields immediately opposite the appeal site and even if they were to be included he considers the intervening road provides a distinct buffer to this and that the appeal site remains within the Green Belt. He finds the proposal would result in piecemeal and incremental erosion of the Green Belt which is not the same as the proposed SUE which is a comprehensive development that has been examined through the development plan process. The Inspector also notes comments in relation to housing need in the area and the good transport links available. However, he concludes that the development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that it would be harmful to openness and in conflict with development plan policies. The substantial weight to be given to Green Belt harm is not clearly outweighed by other considerations and the very special circumstances needed to justify the development do not exist.

Site Address:	The Stables Park Hill Lane
Reference Number:	TP/2019/0153
Description:	Trees T1-T14 – Fell
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 28/03/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 18/10/2019</i>

Summary of Decision

The main issues are the impact of the proposed felling of trees T1-T4 (oaks) on the character and appearance of the area and whether sufficient justification has been demonstrated for the proposed work.

The trees form part of a woodland TPO which allows for protection of trees that merit protection as a collective unit where the individual category would not be appropriate. The trees lie within the northern part of the woodland closest to 'The Stables' that is being converted to residential use. The Inspector notes that other than from the entrance to the site the trees are not readily visible from public vantage points but that the upper canopies are clearly visible. On the matter of amenity the Inspector concludes that although they are not individually prominent, the removal of the trees would result in some limited harm to the character and appearance of the area but that the remaining trees would provide some visual continuity which with the replanting with trees of the same species would mitigate any harm.

Regarding the issues of justification, the tree survey report submitted with the application states that 2 of the trees are in an advanced state of terminal decline with little evidence of any live growth in the upper canopies and removal of this dead wood would detract from any amenity value they possess. The other 2 trees have an eccentric form with evidence of deadwood in the upper crowns, the management of which would reduce their amenity value. The appellant also raises concerns regarding potential damage to the building and safety to children playing in the area which the Inspector considers is a matter that gives considerable weight in favour of removal given the proximity of the trees to the dwelling.

The Inspector concludes that having regard to the health and poor form of the trees, safety concerns arising from their proximity to the approved dwelling, and their limited amenity value, he favours a pragmatic approach and considers that on balance there is sufficient justification to allow the trees to be felled.

The appeal is allowed with conditions requiring 4 replacement English Oak trees to be planted on site.

Site Address:	519 Tile Hill Lane
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/2914
Description:	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

Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 13/12/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 25/10/2019</i>

Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the effect of the proposed 3 dwellings on the character and appearance of the area with regard to design and separation distance from existing dwellings; the living conditions of existing and future occupiers; and whether the proposal makes adequate provision for education and NHS health facilities. There are some discrepancies with regard to drawing numbers with the Inspector clarifying which plans are considered under the appeal.

The appeal site is a vacant former police station at the corner of Tile Hill Lane and Tremelay Drive. There are new 3-storey dwellings opposite and residential properties and gardens to the rear. There are a mix of house types and designs with most having reasonable size gardens.

The Inspector notes the Councils SPG for new residential development and that the separation distance from the first floor windows of the proposed dwellings falls short of the minimum requirements. Two alternative design solutions have been put forward to address this and in the Inspector's view both designs would address issues of overlooking and privacy but he considers that size of gardens is also a factor in the overall density and pattern of development as it contributes to character and appearance. He notes that although the proposed gardens are wide enough to reflect the width of dwellings and their parking spaces, the resulting uncharacteristic short plots together with contrived house designs to overcome overlooking and privacy issues would result in development out of keeping with the prevailing character of the area, contrary to Policy DE1 of the CLP.

In looking at living conditions the Inspector notes that the rear gardens for the houses fall below the minimum 10m recommended in the SPG and considers that the short rear gardens would provide inadequate depth resulting in reduced amenity and a poor residential environment and living conditions for future occupiers.

The Inspector notes that the proposed parking falls 2 spaces short of the Council's parking standards. He further notes that there is already some on-street parking in the vicinity and with an approved development for a 40-unit residential block opposite the site along with the implementation of a residents parking scheme, considers that there is already pressure on parking provision in the area. He finds the shortfall of parking would be likely to result in on-street parking pressures that would be to the detriment of the immediate area and to existing and future residents. The Inspector concludes that the combination of short gardens and insufficient on-site parking would result in an overall poor residential environment that would harm the living conditions of existing and future residents, contrary to Policies DE1 and H3 of the CLP.

The Inspector also concludes that the proposal would be contrary to Policy IM1 as the UU put forward by the appellant to deal with NHS contributions is not sufficiently precise.

PLANNING APPEAL PROGRESS REPORT – SUMMARY TABLE

CURRENT APPEALS LODGED

Application Reference & Site Address	Case Officer	Type	Proposal	Progress & Dates
TP/2017/1283 3 Staircase Lane	<i>Robert Penlington</i>	Written Representations	Oak tree – shorten x12 low branches by 4m from dwellings 1 & 3 Staircase Lane	Lodged date: 04/01/2018 Start date: 04/01/2018 Questionnaire: 31/01/2018
ADV/2018/2010 OS The Richard Crossman Building Jordan Well	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged Date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
ADV/2018/2011 OS Cosy Club Cathedral Lanes Shopping Centre	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
ADV/2018/2012 Lady Godiva News Broadgate	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
ADV/2018/2013 Primark Stores Broadgate	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
AV/2018/2014 2-10 Trinity Street	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 09/04/2019 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
ADV/2018/2018 40-44 The Precinct	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019

ADV/2018/2019 25 Upper Precinct	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
ADV/2018/2022 14-16 Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
ADV/2018/2023 10-12 Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
ADV/2018/2024 Carphone Warehouse Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
ADV/2018/2025 30 Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single –sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
TELO 2018/1993 Outside The Richard Crossman Building Jordan Well	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 09/04/2018 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
TELO/2018/1994 Outside Cosy Club Cathedral Lanes Shopping Centre	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 09/04/2018 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
TELO/2018/1995 Os Lady Godiva News Broadgate	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 09/04/2018 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
TELO/2018/1996 Adj Primark Broadgate	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 09/04/2018 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019
TELO/2018/1997 Adj The Flying Standard Trinity Street	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 09/04/2018 Questionnaire/statement date: 01/05/2019

TELO/2018/2001 Os JD Sports 40-44 The Precinct	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
TELO/2018/2002 Os Clintons Cards 25-27 Upper Precinct	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
TELO/2018/2005 Adj Halifax 14 Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
TELO/2018/2006 IFO Poundland Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
TELO/2018/2007 Adj Carphone Warehouse Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
TELO/2018/2008 OS Max Mobility 30 Market Way	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Lodged date: 31/10/2018 Start date: 10/05/2019 Questionnaire date: 23/05/2019 Statement date: 14/06/2019
OUT/2017/1071 28 and land to rear Tallants Road	Nigel Smith	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
FUL/2018/3300 47A Mayfield Road	Emma Spandley	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 Questionnaire date: 19/07/2019 Hearing date: 17/09/2019

TP/2019/0505 155 Broad Lane	<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
TP/2019/0732 Binley Business Park, Compton Court Harry Weston Road	<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
TP/2019/0693 7 South Avenue	<i>Robert Penlington</i>	Informal Hearing	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 Start date: 26/06/2019rh
TP/2019/0628 12 Pinewood Grove	<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
OUT/2018/3101 Carpet Castle Willenhall Lane	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Demolition of existing building and erection of hotel (outline application with all matters reserved)	Lodged date: 23/07/2019 Start date: 31/07/2019 Questionnaire/statement:
FUL/2019/1101 1 Seagrave Road	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Change of use of a 6 bed house in multiple occupation (HIMO, use class C4) into a 7 bed HIMO (sui generis), retention of a boundary fencing and provision of parking spaces	Lodged date: 26/07/2019 Start date: 05/08/2019 Questionnaire/statement:
FUL/2018/3473 The Pilot Hotel Catesby Road	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Use of part of car park for car sales (sui generis)	Lodged date: 30/07/2019 Start date: 19/082019 Questionnaire/statement:

FUL/2019/0975 120 Bridgeacre Gardens	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Erection of a bungalow	Lodged date: 08/08/2019 Start date: 08/08/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 12/08/2019
OUT/2018/3128 55-77 Stoke Row	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Outline application for demolition of existing factory premises and erection of 46 residential apartments (matters of landscaping reserved for future consideration)	Lodged date: 12/08/2019 Start date: 27/08/2019 Questionnaire/statement:
HH/2019/0847 51 Thistly Field South	<i>Peter Anderson</i>	Written Representations	First Floor Rear and Single Storey Side Extensions	Lodged date: 13/08/2019 Start date: 22/08/2019 Questionnaire/statement:
FUL/2019/0232 189-191 Charter Avenue	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Change of use of two dwellinghouses (Use Class C3) to two 10 bedroomed (10 persons) House in Multiple Occupation (HIMO, sui generis)	Lodged date: 27/08/2019 Start date: 17/09/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 23/09/2019
HH/2019/1650 267 Sewall Highway	<i>Rhiannon Campbell</i>	Written Representations	Installation of footway crossing for vehicular access including a dropped kerb	Lodged date: 03/09/2019 Start date: 29/10/2019
S73/2019/1391 717 Tile Hill Lane	<i>Emma Spandley</i>	Written Representations	Variation of condition: No.2, (opening hours), imposed on planning permission R/2002/0193 for Change of use from a newsagent to a hot food takeaway granted on 19/05/2003 by appeal. (Resubmission of S73/2018/1833)	Lodged date: 03/09/2019 Start date: 30/09/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 04/10/2019
HH/2019/0262 54 Rosslyn Avenue	<i>Holika Bungre</i>	Written Representations	Proposed addition of pitched roof above two storey side element and extension of loft conversion rear dormer	Lodged date: 05/09/2019 Start date: 21/10/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 29/10/2019

FUL/2019/1578 34 Prior Deram Walk	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Change of use from retail shop (Use Class A1) to Hot food takeaway (Use Class A5); Erection of single storey rear extension; and installation of external extraction equipment to rear roof.	Lodged date: 06/09/2019 Start date: 30/09/2019 Questionnaire: 10/10/2019 Statement: 30/10/2019
HH/2019/1426 80 Rotherham Road	<i>Peter Anderson</i>	Written Representations	Erection of single storey side extension	Lodged date: 10/09/2019 Start date: 21/10/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 24/10/2019
FUL/2019/0538 148-150 Clay Lane	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Change of use to A5	Lodged date: 11/09/2019 Start date: 01/11/2019
FUL/2019/0125 9-13 Spon Street	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Retention of two artificial palm trees	Lodged date: 13/09/2019 Start date: 17/10/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 12/11/2019
LB/2019/0245 9-13 Spon Street	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Listed Building Consent for the retention of two artificial palm trees	Lodged date: 13/09/2019 Start date: 17/10/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 12/11/2019
PA/2019/1608 117 Blackberry Lane	<i>Rhiannon Campbell</i>	Written Representations	Application under Prior Approval for rear extension. The extension will be 6.0 metres away from the original rear wall of the building with a height of 4.0 metres at the highest point and 2.7m to the eaves	Lodged date: 25/09/2019 Start date: 08/10/2019

APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED

Application Reference Site Address	Case Officer	Type	Proposal	Appeal Decision & date
FUL/2018/3452 89 Windmill Road	Liam D'Onofrio	Written Representations	Change of use of former public house to 11 Bed House in Multiple Occupation	Decision : ALLOWED 11/09/2019 Decision type: <i>Planning Committee</i> COSTS DECISION: ALLOWED
FUL/2019/0712 110 Hugh Road	Liam D'Onofrio	Written Representations	Extension and conversion of detached garage to created one bed dwelling	Decision : DISMISSED 19/09/2019 Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
HH/2019/0373 5 Rosegreen Close	Peter Anderson	Written Representations	Erection of a two storey front extension	Decision : DISMISSED 24/09/2019 Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
FUL/2019/0524 55 Yelverton Road	Ayesha Saleem	Written Representations	Erection of single storey rear extension and use of existing dwelling as 3 flats	Decision : DISMISSED 27/09/2019 Decision type: <i>Planning Committee</i>
ADV/2018/2026 36-42 Corporation Street	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Decision : DISMISSED 02/10/2019 Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
OUT/2018/3099 Land adjacent to The Brindles Pickford Green Lane	Ayesha Saleem	Written Representations	Outline application for the erection of up to three dwellings (all matters except access reserved)	Decision : DISMISSED 15/10/2019 Decision type: <i>Planning Committee</i>

TP/2019/0153 The Stables Park Hill Lane	<i>Robert Penlington</i>	Informal Hearing	Trees T1-T14 – Fell	Decision : ALLOWED 18/10/2019 Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
FUL/2018/2914 519 Tile Hill Lane	<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	Decision : DISMISSED 25/10/2019 Decision type: <i>Delegated</i>