

Report

Appeal Decisions

Part 1

Date: 2nd November 2022

Subject **Appeal Decisions**

Purpose To record the outcome of recent planning appeals

Author **Head of Regeneration, Investment and Housing**

Wards Beechwood, Bettws, Shaftesbury, Llanwern, Malpas, Pillgwenlly, Allt-yr-Yn and Marshfield and Tredegar Park

Summary In consultation with the Chair or Deputy Chair of Planning Committee, the Acting Head of Regeneration, Investment and Housing has delegated powers to determine planning applications previously determined by Planning Committee. The following planning appeal decisions are reported to help inform future decisions.

Proposal **To accept the appeal decisions as a basis for informing future decisions.**

Action by Development and Regeneration Manager

Timetable Not applicable

This report was prepared without consultation because it is a record of recent planning appeals to help inform future decisions.

Background

The reports contained in this schedule provide information on recent appeal decisions.

The purpose of the attached reports is to inform future decision-making. This will help ensure that future decisions benefit the City and its communities by allowing good quality development in the right locations and resisting inappropriate or poor quality development in the wrong locations.

The applicant has a statutory right of appeal against the refusal of permission in most cases. There is no Third Party right of appeal against a decision.

Work is carried out by existing staff and there are no staffing issues. It is sometimes necessary to employ a Barrister to act on the Council's behalf in defending decisions at planning appeals. This cost is met by existing budgets. Where an application is refused against Officer advice, during this interim arrangement, the Acting Head of Regeneration, Investment and Housing, along with the Chair/Deputy Chair of Planning Committee will be required to assist in defending their decision at appeal.

Where applicable as planning considerations, specific issues relating to sustainability and environmental issues, equalities impact and crime prevention impact of each proposed development are addressed in the relevant report in the attached schedule.

Financial Summary

The cost of defending decisions at appeal is met by existing budgets. Costs can be awarded against the Council at an appeal if the Council has acted unreasonably and/or cannot defend its decisions. Similarly, costs can be awarded in the Council's favour if an appellant has acted unreasonably and/or cannot substantiate their grounds of appeal.

Risks

The key risk relating to appeal decisions relates to awards of costs against the Council.

An appeal can be lodged by the applicant if planning permission is refused, or if planning permission is granted but conditions are imposed, or against the Council's decision to take formal enforcement action. Costs can be awarded against the Council if decisions cannot be defended as reasonable, or if it behaves unreasonably during the appeal process, for example by not submitting required documents within required timescales. Conversely, costs can be awarded in the Council's favour if the appellant cannot defend their argument or behaves unreasonably.

An appeal can also be lodged by the applicant if the application is not determined within the statutory time period. However, with major developments, which often require a Section 106 agreement, it is unlikely that the application will be determined within the statutory time period. Appeals against non-determination are rare due to the further delay in receiving an appeal decision: it is generally quicker for applicants to wait for the Planning Authority to determine the application. Costs could only be awarded against the Council if it is found to have acted unreasonably. Determination of an application would only be delayed for good reason, such as resolving an objection or negotiating improvements or Section 106 contributions, and so the risk of a costs award is low.

Mitigation measures to reduce risk are detailed in the table below. The probability of these risks occurring is considered to be low due to the mitigation measures, however the costs associated with a public inquiry can be very significant. These are infrequent, so the impact is considered to be medium.

Risk	Impact of Risk if it occurs* (H/M/L)	Probability of risk occurring (H/M/L)	What is the Council doing or what has it done to avoid the risk or reduce its effect	Who is responsible for dealing with the risk?
Decisions challenged at appeal and costs awarded against the Council.	M	L	<p>Ensure reasons for refusal can be defended at appeal;</p> <p>Ensure planning conditions imposed meet the tests set out in Circular 016/2014.</p> <p>Provide guidance to Head of RIH/Chair/Deputy of Planning Committee regarding relevant material planning considerations, conditions and reasons for refusal.</p> <p>Ensure appeal timetables are adhered to.</p>	<p>Head of RIH with Chair/Deputy of Planning Committee</p> <p>Head of RIH with Chair/Deputy of Planning Committee</p> <p>Development Services Manager and Senior Legal Officer</p> <p>Planning Officers</p>
Appeal lodged against non-determination, with costs awarded against the Council	M	L	Avoid delaying the determination of applications unreasonably.	Development Services Manager

* Taking account of proposed mitigation measures

Links to Council Policies and Priorities

Not applicable. This report is a record of decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate and/or Welsh Ministers.

Options Available

To accept the appeal decisions as a basis for informing future decisions.

Preferred Option and Why

To accept the appeal decisions as a basis for informing future decisions.

Comments of Chief Financial Officer

In the normal course of events, there should be no specific financial implications arising from the determination of planning applications.

There is always a risk of a planning decision being challenged at appeal. The costs of defending decisions and any award of costs must be met by existing budgets.

Comments of Monitoring Officer

There are no legal implications other than those referred to in the report or detailed above.

Staffing Implications: Comments of Head of People and Business Change

Development Management work is undertaken by an in-house team and therefore there are no staffing implications arising from this report. Officer recommendations have been based on adopted planning policy which aligns with the Single Integrated Plan and the Council's Corporate Plan objectives.

Local issues

Not applicable. This report is a record of decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate and/or Welsh Ministers.

Equalities Impact Assessment and the Equalities Act 2010

The Equality Act 2010 contains a Public Sector Equality Duty which came into force on 06 April 2011. The Act identifies a number of 'protected characteristics', namely age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation; marriage and civil partnership. The new single duty aims to integrate consideration of equality and good relations into the regular business of public authorities. Compliance with the duty is a legal obligation and is intended to result in better informed decision-making and policy development and services that are more effective for users. In exercising its functions, the Council must have due regard to the need to: eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct that is prohibited by the Act; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. The Act is not overly prescriptive about the approach a public authority should take to ensure due regard, although it does set out that due regard to advancing equality involves: removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics; taking steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups where these differ from the need of other people; and encouraging people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low.

An Equality Impact Assessment for delivery of the Development Management service has been completed and can be viewed on the Council's website.

Children and Families (Wales) Measure

Not applicable. This report is a record of decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate and/or Welsh Ministers.

Consultation

Not applicable. This report is a record of decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate and/or Welsh Ministers.

Background Papers

Not applicable

Dated: 5th October 2022

Planning Appeal

Reference	21/1212
Address	102A Victoria Avenue, Beechwood
Development	Retention of rear dormer and attic conversion
Appellant	Mr Simpson
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal Dismissed

Planning Appeal

Reference	22/0213
Address	306 Monnow Way Bettws
Development	Provision of an off-road parking area to front of dwelling
Appellant	Mr Hussain
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal dismissed

Planning Appeal

Reference	20/1046
Address	1b Woodlands Drive
Development	Certificate of lawful use or development for existing use of the property as two separate flats
Appellant	Ms Griffiths
Officer Decision	Refused but appeal not contested on receipt of additional information at appeal stage
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal allowed

Planning Appeal

Reference	21/1286
Address	The Haven, Redwick
Development	Erection of single detached garage
Appellant	Mr Monk
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal allowed

Planning Appeal

Reference	22/0123
Address	164 Malpas Road
Development	1 no. wall mounted illuminated digital sign
Appellant	Route Media
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal allowed

Planning Appeal

Reference	21/1262
Address	Monmouthshire Timber Supplies Ltd , East Way Road
Development	Installation of 2 no. 48 sheet free standing digital advertising display units
Appellant	Mr G Hughes
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal dismissed

Planning Appeal

Reference	22/0091
Address	23 Marysfield Close
Development	Erection of single storey front and rear extensions
Appellant	Mr T Keay
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal dismissed in relation to the single storey front extension; Appeal allowed in relation to the single storey rear extension

Planning Appeal

Reference	21/0508
Address	10 Mons Close
Development	New front porch and conversion and extension of existing detached garage to create a new annex
Appellant	Mr and Mrs Rands
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal dismissed