

---

**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 November 2019 to 31 December 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 NOVEMBER TO 31 DECEMBER 2019

<b>No. APPEALS PENDING</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>No. APPEALS RECEIVED</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>No. APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED</b>	<b>31</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>3</b>
<b>No. MEMBER DECISIONS ALLOWED</b>	<b>-</b>

Site Address:	OS The Richard Crossman building Jordan Well
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2010 (Appeal E)
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 11/09/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 07/11/2019</i>

Site Address:	OS Cosy Club Cathedral Lanes Shopping Centre
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2011 (Appeal A)
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-

	illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 28/08/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 07/11/2019</i>

Site Address:	Lady Godiva News Broadgate
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2012 (Appeal D)
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 11/09/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 07/11/2019</i>

Site Address:	Adjacent to Primark Broadgate
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2013 (Appeal B)
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 11/09/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 07/11/2019</i>

Site Address:	2-10 Trinity Street
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2014 (Appeal C)
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 07/11/2019</i>

### Summary of Decisions

The appeal decision relates to all 5 appeals above, as the Inspector considers they raise similar issues and are all located in walking distance of each other. The main issue in respect of the appeals is whether the proposed advertisements would be acceptable with respect to amenity and public safety.

### Appeal A

The site is located in Broadgate, outside the Cosy Club restaurant and the Inspector notes there is limited advertising around the appeal site. He considers that advertisement would be displayed in a prominent position towards the outer edge of the footway where it would be conspicuous and the modern design of the proposal would be incongruous in this location in close proximity to the High Street Conservation Area and Grade II listed buildings. The Inspector concludes that the advertisement would harm the amenity of the area through its adverse effect on the character and appearance of the adjoining conservation Area and on the setting of

the nearby Listed Buildings although he does not consider that the proposal would result in harm to public safety.

#### Appeal B

The advertisement would be located between the Grade I listed Holy Trinity Church and Primark, standing end on to the grassed area between them and in a prominent location. The Inspector notes there is limited visual clutter in the area with no advertisements nearby and concludes that the advertisement would harm the amenity of the area, by adversely affecting the settings of Holy Trinity Church and the neighbouring Hill Top Conservation Area, although he does not consider the proposal would cause an obstruction or result in harm to public safety.

#### Appeal C

The site is located close to the locally listed Flying Standard PH, listed Holy Trinity Church and within the Hill Top Conservation Area, where there is no visual clutter or illuminated advertisements. The Inspector considers the advert would be prominently sited on a broad area of pavement and would introduce a conspicuous and discordant feature that would intrude on views of the public house and would harm the amenity of the area affect the settings of the Hill Top Conservation Area and locally listed PH. He also concludes that the given the location of the advertisement in an area with a conglomeration of pedestrian routes and busy road and its proposed siting close to a pedestrian crossing, that it could lead to issues with visibility and pedestrian flow causing harm to public safety.

#### Appeal D

The advertisement would be located in Broadgate where the Inspector notes there is a pattern of street furniture with benches and trees and he considers that the location of the advertisement to the side of one of the benches would appear as a discordance feature in comparison to the linear pattern of the benches. He also notes the location in close proximity to the listed Broadgate House and concludes that the advertisement would harm the amenity of the area, including the setting of Broadgate House, although he does not consider it would cause any harm to public safety.

#### Appeal E

The advertisement would be located on Jordan Well where there is a row of trees, cycle rack and an existing advertisement display just beyond the appeal site. The Inspector considers that as there is an existing advertisement, a further display would add to visual clutter and would harm the amenity of the immediate area. He also notes the proposed location adjacent to the end of a zigzag section of the pedestrian crossing where pedestrians may step out from behind the screen into the carriageway and therefore finds it would cause harm to public safety.

#### Conclusion

The Inspector finds that the proposals would be detrimental to the amenity of the area and in appeals A, B, C and D would harm the significance of designated heritage assets. He identifies conflict with Policy DE1 of the CLP and Policy CC1 of the CCCAAP. In appeals A, B, C and D he also notes conflict with Policy HE2 of the CLP and in appeals C and E conflict with Policies AC2 and AC4 of the CLP and Policy CC1 of the CCCAAP. The Inspector concludes that the harm to

designated assets in appeals A, B, C and D would be less than substantial but that consent should only be granted if public benefits would outweigh harm. He considers that there would be limited economic benefits and that these would not outweigh the harm identified.

Site Address:	Outside the Richard Crossman Building Jordan Well
Reference Number:	TELO/2018/1993 (Appeal E)
Description:	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 28/08/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 07/11/2019</i>

Site Address:	Outside Cosy Club Cathedral Lanes Shopping Centre
Reference Number:	TELO/2018/1994 (Appeal A)
Description:	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 28/08/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 07/11/2019</i>

Site Address:	Os Lady Godiva News Broadgate
Reference Number:	TELO/2018/1995 (Appeal D)
Description:	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 28/08/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 07/11/2019</i>

Site Address:	Adj Primark Broadgate
Reference Number:	TELO/2018/1996 (Appeal B)
Description:	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refused on 28/08/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 07/11/2019</i>

Site Address:	Adj The Flying Standard Trinity Street
Reference Number:	TELO/2018/1997 (Appeal C)
Description:	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated

Decision:	Refused on 28/08/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 07/11/2019</i>

### Summary of Decisions

The appeal decision relates to all 5 appeals above, as they raise similar issues. The GPDO has been amended by removing permission for the installation, alteration or replacement of a public call box but the appeal has been determined under transitional and savings provisions which apply, as they were made prior to the changes taking effect. The Inspector notes Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO refers to development 'by or on behalf of an electronic communications code operation for the purposes of the operators electronic network'. The High Court ruling in the Westminster Judgement found that the whole development for which prior approval is sought must fall within the class relied on.

The main issue in each of the appeal having regard to the Westminster Judgement is whether the proposals are solely for the purpose of the operator's electronics communications network.

The Westminster Judgement stated that if a development is partly for the purpose of an operator's network and partly for some other purpose, it cannot be said that the development fall within the GPDO as part of the development falls outside it. The Inspector notes that the technical specification refers to the 'advertised side' of the apparatus designed to show commercial and community information and considers that as one side of the kiosk would be for the display of digital advertisements, it would contain features not solely for the telecommunications function. He concludes that the apparatus would fall outside Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GDPO and therefore does not need to consider the issues of siting or appearance that where set out in the Council's reason for refusal.

Site Address:	1 Seagrave Road
Reference Number:	FUL/2019/1101
Description:	Change of use of a 6 bed house in multiple occupation (HMO, use class C4) into a 7 bed HMO (sui generis), retention of a boundary fencing and provision of parking spaces
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 03/07/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 12/11/2019</i>

### Summary of Decision

The main issues are the effect of the proposal on: the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise and disturbance; and the character and appearance of no.1 Seagrave Road and the wider area.

The appeal property is an extended two-story end of terrace on a corner site on Seagrave Road, close to the junction with Acacia Avenue in a predominantly residential area characterised by rows of terraced properties. It has been used as a HMO for up to 6 people for a number of years. The Inspector notes that an



increase in the number of occupants would result in a limited increase in activity and where there is no operational development this may not be perceptible. However in this case, the concern is from the additional off-street parking spaces which cover a large expanse of the rear garden and provide parking for 2 vehicles. The Inspector considers that the siting of the parking area adjacent to neighbours rear gardens where they could reasonably expect a degree of peace and quiet away from the road frontage, would result in significantly more disturbance to neighbouring occupiers and consequently would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, in conflict with Policy H11 of the CLP.

In looking at character and appearance, the Inspector notes that the hardstanding covers a wide expanse of the original garden and does not include any areas of soft landscaping. She concludes that the hardstanding is readily apparent in the street scene and appears at odds with the wider locality as the extent of the parking area, its elevated position in relation to the dwelling and the manner in which it is fenced off are not characteristic features of back gardens in the locality. Consequently the proposal harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area in conflict with Policies DE1, H5 and H11 of the CDP.

Site Address:	Carpet Castle Willenhall Lane
Reference Number:	OUT/2018/3101
Description:	Demolition of existing building and erection of hotel (outline application with all matters reserved)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 12/02/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 22/11/2019</i>
Cost Decision:	<i>Refused on 22/11/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the effect on the vitality and viability of existing centres; and whether the proposed development would provide a satisfactory environment for future occupants of the hotel, having regard to the presence of nearby industrial and commercial uses.

The appeal site is not located within a defined centre and therefore Policy R4 of the CLP requires a sequential assessment and impact test. The appellant states that the hotel is intended to serve guests in transit on the eastern side of the city on the M69/M6/A46/M40 road corridors and the Inspector is satisfied that the catchment area for the relevant assessments is appropriate on the basis of the customer base indicated. The Inspector does not consider that the nature of the development proposed would be particularly suited to the City Centre despite the availability of brownfield sites there. Furthermore, in looking at the major district centres identified with Policy R3 of the CDP, the Inspector considers that only the Brandon Road MDC is in proximity to the eastern transport corridor and for the purposes of the sequential test this is the only centre necessary to consider although the appellant has also considered the Brad Drive district centre.

The Inspector notes that Brandon Road MDC is a purpose built centre occupied by a supermarket, a number of large units housing national retailers, a number of smaller units, hotel, cafés and a TGI Fridays restaurant. Whilst there are a small number of vacant units within the centre these are dispersed across the centre and the Inspector is not convinced that any of these vacant units would be of a size or layout that would accommodate the proposal, even with some flexibility. The Inspector considers Brandon Road MDC to be a busy and well used centre with no evidence to suggest that its car parks are surplus or that they would be capable of accommodating the proposed development and is satisfied that it has been demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites available within the centre. The site at 350m from the Brandon Road MDC, is just over the 300m threshold for edge of centre sites set out in Policy R4, and whilst the Inspector notes this is only marginally over and the site is well connected to the centre, as it is technically out of centre this limited policy conflict centre must still be taken into account.

In looking at the impact test, having regard to the hotel's intended function and likely customer requirement with regard to accessibility in relation to the transport corridor to the east of the City, the Inspector considers the effects would be relatively localised and is satisfied that it would not have likely adverse implications for other hotels within the city centre or other MDC's and that the scope of the appellants impact test is appropriate. The Inspector is satisfied that the existing hotel within the Brandon Road MDC would not be unduly affected by the proposed development and that it would not directly compete with any other retail units within the centre as any restaurant/bar and fitness centre within the development would be ancillary to the main hotel use and would not impact on uses within the centre and concludes that the proposal would not conflict with Policies R3 or R4 of the CLP.

In looking at the issue of a satisfactory environment for future occupiers, the Inspector is satisfied that the site is large enough to accommodate a hotel and to allow some flexibility in its specific location to minimise proximity and exposure to adjacent industrial and commercial sites and that noise mitigation measures could be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

The Inspector concludes that whilst not within the city centre, the proposed hotel would contribute towards the provision of hotel accommodation. The existing offices appear to have been vacant for some time and a hotel would provide employment opportunities and would be likely to have greater economic benefits for the area. He is satisfied that the scope of the sequential and impact assessments are sufficient and concludes that the likely economic and employment benefits of the proposed development represent material considerations that outweigh the minor technical conflict with sequential test policy.

The appeal is allowed with conditions regarding: submission of reserved matters; submission of site investigation reports; submission of drainage details; submission of a construction method statement; and submission of an employee recruitment scheme.

Cost Decision

The Inspector considered that the Councils requirement with regard to the provision and scope of the sequential and impact tests were identified in its pre-application response were not unreasonable and were adequately substantiated even though they reached a different conclusion with regard to the scope of the tests. The Inspector considers that the council's concerns were clearly articulated and that the reasons for refusal were substantiated and that the council was not unreasonable in coming to the conclusion that it did as a matter of planning judgement and with reference to the NPPF. Even if further information had been requested at the application stage this would not necessarily overcome the need for an appeal. Whilst the questionnaire was submitted late, the statement was provided on time and the Inspector does not consider that this prejudiced the appellant's ability to respond or constituted unreasonable behaviour. She concludes that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not been demonstrated.

Site Address:	51 Thistley Field South
Reference Number:	HH/2019/0847
Description:	First floor Rear and Single Storey Side Extensions
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 22/05/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 25/11/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the effect of the first floor rear extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 53 Thistly Field South, with particular regard to outlook and light; and the effect of the side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling on a corner plot. The extension would be located above the cat-slide roof to the rear, adjacent to the boundary with No.53. The Inspector notes that although the extension would be set back 1m from the eaves of the cat-slide roof, its height and depth would result in significant bulk close to the boundary and first floor bedroom window on the neighbouring dwelling. It is recognised that the affected window is secondary but the Inspector still considers that this provides the neighbouring occupiers with outlook to the rear and that the significant increase in massing would exacerbate the limited outlook and result in a poor and dismal outlook for the neighbouring occupiers.

In looking at character and appearance, the Inspector notes that the proposed side extension would occupy a visually prominent open space at the road junction and would be a large addition that would project beyond the return building line along Holloway Field. She considers that this would disrupt the established pattern and layout of this part of the estate and would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy DE1 of the CLP.

Site Address:	117 Blackberry Lane
Reference Number:	PA/2019/1608
Description:	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 2.7 metres to the eaves
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 30/07/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 27/11/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issue is whether the proposed development would be permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

The proposed extension would extend 4m to the rear of the dwelling and would link to an existing side and rear extension. Subsection J of Class A of the GPDO states that where the enlarged part of the dwelling would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse, it should not have a width greater than half the width of the existing dwellinghouse. In this case the rear extension would connect to the existing side and rear extension to wrap around the dwellinghouse and the restrictions of subsection J apply and the Inspector notes that the entire width of the dwelling needs to be considered which in this case is greater than half the width of the dwelling.

Whilst the Inspector notes that prior approval may have been granted previously for a similar scheme, with regard to the appeal, he concludes that the proposal would fall outside the scope of permitted development rights.

Site Address:	267 Sewall Highway
Reference Number:	HH/2019/1650
Description:	Installation of footway crossing for vehicular access including a dropped kerb
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 16/08/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 11/12/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety. The appeal site is located on Sewall Highway which is a well trafficked road with on-street parking and a bus proximity in close proximity to the disabled parking space which is currently located on the highway to the front of the site.

The Inspector notes that the hardsurfacing proposed for the site would be of insufficient size to allow vehicles to turn around which is likely to result in vehicles exiting the site in reverse. Given that on-street parking takes place both on the highway and the verge and there is a nearby bus stop, the Inspector concludes that the proposed dropped kerb would unacceptably increase the likelihood of conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and motorists and would impeded the safe flow of traffic.

Whilst the Inspector acknowledges the difficulties experienced by the applicant, he considers that the wider public interest and safety of highway users must be determinative in this instance and concludes that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to the principles of Policy AC2 of the CLP.

Site Address:	34 Prior Deram Walk
Reference Number:	FUL/2019/1578
Description:	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
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 12/08/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 12/12/2019</i>
Costs Decision:	<i>Refused on 12/12/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: whether or not the development would result in an overconcentration of hot food takeaways; and the effect of the development on the living conditions of nearby residents.

The appeal site is not located within a defined centre. A sequential test provided demonstrates that there are no sequentially preferable sites available within defined centres. The SPD identifies that where a site falls within a Lower Super Output Area (LSOA) and the number of takeaways per 1000 population exceeds the average for England (as per the most up to date figures of the FEAT tool) then the area is considered to be over-concentrated. The Inspector notes that there are a number of other hot food takeaways within the same parade of units as the appeal site and that in this LSOA has already been demonstrated to be over-concentrated. No evidence is provided to demonstrate why a wider LSOA should be considered and it is not possible to control the type of food that is sold to restrict unhealthy choices and therefore the Inspector finds the proposal would be in an area with an over-concentration of hot food takeaways which would be in conflict with Policy R6 and the SPD.

In looking at living conditions, it is noted that the proposals include the installation of a flue to the rear which would be next to the first floor flat. The Inspector considers that specific details would need to be provided to demonstrate that a suitable method of odour and noise extraction could be achieved and on the basis of the information provided cannot conclude that the development would not result in harm to the living conditions of adjoining residents.

#### Cost decision

The appellants case is that the Council failed to engage with them during the application process to overcome the issues relating to the refusal and that the appeal questionnaire was submitted after the deadline. The Inspector is satisfied that the Council's approach was reasonable and justified as seeking additional

information would not have overcome the principle objection and would have put the applicant to additional expense that would have not altered the outcome. He also notes that there is no case to demonstrate how the delayed questionnaire has resulted in wasted expense in the appeal process. Consequently the Inspector concludes that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary expense during the appeal process has not been demonstrated.

Site Address:	80 Rotherham Road
Reference Number:	HH/2019/1426
Description:	Erection of single storey side extension
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 23/08/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Allowed on 13/12/2019</i>

### Summary of Decision

The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. The appeal site is an end of terrace dwelling on a corner plot at the junction with Blenheim Avenue. The proposal is for a single storey side extension that would extend up to the side boundary which would not meet the requirements of the householder SPG in terms of retaining a minimum distance of 2m from the side boundary and not projecting beyond established building lines.

The inspector notes that No.80 has a tall brick wall to the boundary and whilst the extension would be visible from the front and rear above the boundary wall he considers it would be sufficiently screened and of a modest size which would not appear dominant or incongruous within the street scene. He acknowledges that the extension would project up the side boundary but considers that the boundary wall already impedes openness and in the built-up context of the surroundings does not consider the requirement to maintain 2m to the boundary to be essential in maintaining the character of the area. It is also noted that the extension would sit forward of the established building line on Blenheim Avenue but the inspector considers this to be at a significant distance from the properties to the rear.

The Inspector concludes that as a result of the scale and positioning of the proposed development and the existing side boundary treatment, the proposed side extension would not adversely impact on the openness of the plot or be harmful to the character and appearance of the surroundings. The appeal is allowed with conditions requiring: development to commence within 3 years; and development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Site Address:	The Pilot Hotel Catesby Road
Reference Number:	FUL/2018/3473
Description:	Use of part of car park for car sales (sui generis)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 12/12/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 16/12/2019</i>

### Summary of Decision

The main issue is the effect on the setting of the listed building and surrounding area.

The appeal relates to part of the open car park that surrounds the Grade II listed public house. The PH has a prominent position with frontage to 3 roads. The Inspector considers the car park provides a symmetrical and well balanced area of land around the PH providing an uncluttered setting which adds to the significance of the building.

In the Inspectors view it is likely that signage and other features associated with a car sales operation would be likely to have a considerable presence on the setting and curtilage of the listed building and would have a harmful effect on the residential character of the area, most notably on Rollason Road. He notes that there are other commercial uses on the site and that the proposed use would provide income to the PH which is currently running at a loss but considers this insufficient to outweigh the harm identified.

The Inspector concludes that the public benefit derived from the contribution to the overall business of the listed building is insufficient to outweigh the harm, even though this it 'less than substantial' and that the proposal is contrary to Policies DE1 and HE2 of the CLP.

Site Address:	Carphone Warehouse Market Way
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2024 (Appeal A)
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 11/09/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>

Site Address:	30 Market Way
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2025 (Appeal F)
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 11/09/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>

Site Address:	40-44 The Precinct
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2018 Appeal (C)
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 11/09/2019

Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>
------------------	--------------------------------

Site Address:	25 Upper Precinct
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2019 Appeal (B)
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 11/09/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>

Site Address:	14-16 Market Way
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2022 Appeal (D)
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 11/09/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>

Site Address:	10-12 Market Way
Reference Number:	ADV/2018/2023 Appeal (E)
Description:	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 11/09/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>

### Summary of Decisions

As all six appeals above relate to the same form of advertisement on the same type of structure the Inspector has dealt with them all together. The main issues are the effect of the proposed advertisement on: the character and appearance of the area; and public safety.

The sites are all in close proximity to each other in the main shopping area and would be new additions to the street scene. The Inspector notes that the advertisements would be set within a shopping precinct that has a distinctive and coherent style which other than cluster of benches and the odd bin are devoid of extraneous structures. He notes that that lack of low level advertising (other than that in shopfronts) was striking and that two existing digital screens appeared incongruous, which would be the same for all of the advertisements proposed. He considers that the proposed advertisements would be in stark contrast to the clean uncluttered lines of the shopping precinct and they would be to the detriment of the area's appearance.

The Inspector notes that the advertisement in appeal D would be at the foot of Coventry Point, but as this is being demolished considers that this too would hold a prominent position. On the matter of amenity, he concludes that the proposed



advertisement would appear out of place and at odds with the area's wider aesthetic.

On the issue of public safety, the Inspector notes that the concerns for the potential of collisions between pedestrians is not without foundation as the advertisements would be located near the porticos overhanging the shopfronts, which he considers is where the greatest pedestrian flows are likely to occur.

The Inspector concludes that the proposed advertisements would harm the amenity of the area concerned. Other than the proposal under Appeal D, they would also be likely to cause harm to public safety and, as such, a precautionary approach is warranted. Even if he were to have found otherwise he would still have concluded that, due to the harm to amenity, the appeal should be dismissed.

Site Address:	Os JD Sports The Precinct
Reference Number:	TELO/2018/2001 (Appeal C)
Description:	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 28/08/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>

Site Address:	Os JD Clinton Cards 25-27 Upper Precinct
Reference Number:	TELO/2018/2002 (Appeal B)
Description:	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 28/08/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>

Site Address:	Adj Halifax 14 Market Way
Reference Number:	TELO/2018/2005 (Appeal D)
Description:	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 28/08/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>

Site Address:	IFO Poundland Market Way
Reference Number:	TELO/2018/2006 (Appeal E)
Description:	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated

Decision:	Refusal on 28/08/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>

Site Address:	Adj Carphone Warehouse Market Way
Reference Number:	TELO/2018/2007 (Appeal A)
Description:	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 28/08/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>

Site Address:	OS Max Mobility 30 Market Way
Reference Number:	TELO/2018/2008 (Appeal F)
Description:	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 28/08/2018
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 23/12/2019</i>

#### Summary of Decisions

All six appeals relate to the same form of apparatus in the same area and so have been dealt with together.

Although there have been changes that amend the GPDO provisions for electronic communications code operators, the appeals are subject to transitional and saved provisions, so are considered against the provision of Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO. In the Westminster judgement the court found that ‘the whole development for which prior approval is sought must fall within the Class relied on, and no part of it can fall outside it. Otherwise, the general permission in the GPDO, and the restricted range of consideration would be applied to development which falls outside the scope of the permission’ and this has been taken into consideration in determining the appeals.

The main issue is whether the proposals were solely for the purpose of the operator’s electronic communications network. The technical specification clearly shows an advertising side with outdoor advertising panel and from this it is clear to the Inspector that the proposed apparatus would contain features distinct from the purpose of the operator’s network which are not a telecommunications function.

The Inspector concludes that the apparatus would be for the purpose of the operator’s telecommunications network and for the purpose of commercial display and accordingly the proposals fall outside the scope of Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO.

Site Address:	189 and 191 Charter Avenue
Reference Number:	FUL/2019/0232
Description:	Change of use of two dwelling houses (Use Class C3) to two 10 bedroomed (10 persons) Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO, sui generis)
Decision Level:	Delegated
Decision:	Refusal on 24/04/2019
Appeal Decision:	<i>Dismissed on 24/12/2019</i>

### Summary of Decision

The main issues are: the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and whether or not the proposal would give rise to inconvenience for road users on Charter Avenue arising from additional demand for on-street parking.

The Inspector notes that Charter Avenue is predominantly residential in character, although it is apparent that HMO uses are prevalent in the area. He notes that the appeal properties have permission for use as large HMOs for 7 residents in each case and that the proposal would not result in any changes to the external appearance of the buildings and that the increase in internal activity is unlikely to be perceptible to neighbouring occupiers. However, he considers there would be a marked increase in the potential number of occupants across the properties from 14 to 20 and that this would put strain on the external areas to the site frontage. In his view, the number of vehicles parked in this area would result in a tighter parking arrangement and the cumulative demand for parking from occupants and visitors is likely to increase parking on the road and verges which would draw attention to the more intensive use of the site to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

In addition to this the Inspector notes that the increase in occupants is likely to increase bin storage requirements and that the bin storage area proposed to the rear is unlikely to be convenient, with responsibility for returning bins to this likely to be unclear, given the number of occupants and likely turnover of tenants. He considers this to be a further indicator that the intensification of use would have a deteriorating impact on the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, as the neighbouring properties have permission for HMO use, he considers an over-intensive use of the appeal site and any cumulative impact with neighbouring HMOs has the potential to increase the presence of HMOs to the detriment of the residential character of the area. On this matter the Inspector concludes that the proposal would be over-intensive and would increase the prominence of the HMOs within the street scene to the detriment of the residential character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies H10 and H11 of the CLP.

The Inspector notes that the proposal would require a maximum of 15 parking spaces on the basis of current parking standards and that the proposed 7 fall significantly short of this. Parking surveys submitted show that there is space for 25 vehicles along Charter Avenue but the highway authority argue that there is no additional capacity in view of recently approved planning applications. The Inspector notes that constraints of the parking forecourt on site would be likely to increase the potential for vehicles to be displaced onto the highway and that it appears that the parking of vehicles more often takes place on the verge. Given

the well-trafficked nature of the dual carriageway he is not convinced that the additional demand for parking could be accommodated without an increase in parking on the road which would have the potential to result in inconvenience for road users on Charter Avenue. Th Inspector concludes that the number of off-street parking spaces to be provided would be a significant shortfall and contrary to the requirements of Policy AC3 and appendix 5 of the CLP.

## 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>FUL/2018/3300</b> 47A <i>Mayfield Road</i>	<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 Hearing date: 17/09/2019
<b>TP/2019/0505</b> 155 <i>Broad Lane</i>	<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>TP/2019/0732</b> Binley Business Park, Compton Court <i>Harry Weston Road</i>	<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 Questionnaire date: 31/07/2019
<b>TP/2019/0693</b> 7 <i>South Avenue</i>	<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: 26/06/2019
<b>TP/2019/0628</b> 12 <i>Pinewood Grove</i>	<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

<b>FUL/2019/0975</b> 120 <b>Bridgeacre Gardens</b>	<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
<b>OUT/2018/3128</b> 55-77 <b>Stoke Row</b>	<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:
<b>S73/2019/1391</b> 717 <b>Tile Hill Lane</b>	<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:
<b>FUL/2019/0538</b> 148-150 <b>Clay Lane</b>	<i>Anne Lynch</i>	Written Representations	Change of use to A5	Lodged date: 11/09/2019 Start date: 01/11/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 04/12/2019
<b>FUL/2019/0125</b> 9-13 <b>Spon Street</b>	<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
<b>LB/2019/0245</b> 9-13 <b>Spon Street</b>	<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
<b>HH/2019/1677</b> 6 <b>Baginton Road</b>	<i>Peter Anderson</i>	Written Representations	Erection of two storey side and rear extension, raised patio area and retaining wall	Lodged date: 04/11/2019 Start date: 19/12/2019
<b>FUL/2018/2584</b> 14 <b>Albany Road</b>	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Change of use to 10No. bedroomed House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class Sui Generis) (Retrospective)	Lodged date: 01/11/2019 Start date: 18/11/2019 Questionnaire/statement: 19/11/2019
<b>FUL/2019/1781</b> 89 <b>Windmill Road</b>	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Erection of two storey rear extensions and loft conversion to create eight additional HMO bedrooms	Lodged date: 12/11/2019 Start date: 11/12/2019  <b>COSTS APPLIED FOR</b>

<b>FUL/2019/1818</b> <i>Land at Brade Drive</i>	<i>Liam D'Onofrio</i>	Written Representations	Erection of a detached single storey building to accommodate a drive-thru coffee facility, car park and associated works	Lodged date: 22/11/2019 Awaiting start date
<b>FUL/2019/2485</b> <i>48 St Georges Road</i>	<i>Emma Spandley</i>	Written Representations	Change of use to an 7no. bedroomed, 7no. person House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class Sui Generis). (Resubmission FUL/2019/0059)	Lodged date: 13/12/2019 Awaiting start date
<b>FUL/2019/2768</b> <i>88a Three Spires Avenue</i>	<i>Nigel Smith</i>	Written Representations	Change of use of existing dwelling to form three apartments and erection of rear extension	Lodged date: 13/12/2019 Awaiting start date
<b>FUL/2019/2617</b> <i>35-37 Stanley Road</i>	<i>Emma Spandley</i>	Written Representations	Erection of single storey detached structure	Lodged date: 14/12/2019 Awaiting start date

## APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED

Application Reference Site Address	Case Officer	Type	Proposal	Appeal Decision & date
ADV/2018/2010 OS The Richard Crossman building Jordan Well	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>07/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
ADV/2018/2011 OS Cosy Club Cathedral Lanes Shopping Centre	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>07/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
ADV/2018/2012 Lady Godiva News Broadgate	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>07/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
ADV/2018/2013 Adjacent to Primark Broadgate	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>07/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
ADV/2018/2014 2-10 Trinity Street	Mary-Ann Jones	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>07/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>



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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>07/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>07/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>07/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>07/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>07/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
FUL/2019/1101 1 Seagrave Road	Shamim Chowdhury	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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>12/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
OUT/2018/3101 Carpet Castle Willenhall Lane	Anne Lynch	Written Representations	Demolition of existing building and erection of hotel (outline application with all matters reserved)	Decision : <b>ALLOWED</b> <b>22/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>  <b>COSTS DECISION: REFUSED</b>
H/2019/0847 51 Thistley Field South	Peter Anderson	Written Representations	First floor Rear and Single Storey Side Extensions	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>25/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>

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 2.7 metres to the eaves	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>27/11/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
HH/2019/1650 267 Sewall Highway	<i>Rhiannon Campbell</i>	Written Representations	Installation of footway crossing for vehicular access including a dropped kerb	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>18/10/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>12/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>  <i>Costs decision refused on 12/12/2019</i>
HH/2019/1426 80 Rotherham Road	<i>Peter Anderson</i>	Written Representations	Erection of single storey side extension	Decision : <b>ALLOWED</b> <b>13/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>16/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
ADV/2018/2024 Carphone Warehouse Market Way	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
ADV/2018/2025 30 Market Way	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Installation of a freestanding single-sided internally-illuminated digital display screen in association with telephone kiosk	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>

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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
TELO/2018/2001 Os JD Sports 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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
TELO/2018/2002 Os JD Clinton 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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
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	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>

TELO/2018/2008 OS Max Mobility 30 Market Way	<i>Mary-Ann Jones</i>	Written Representations	Prior approval for the installation of ground based electronic communications apparatus comprising a freestanding digital display screen and telephone kiosk	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>23/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>
FUL/2019/0232 189 and 191 Charter Avenue	<i>Shamim Chowdhury</i>	Written Representations	Change of use of two dwelling houses (Use Class C3) to two 10 bedroomed (10 persons) Houses in Multiple Occupation (HIMO, sui generis)	Decision : <b>DISMISSED</b> <b>24/12/2019</b> decision type: <i>Delegated</i>