

# Report

## Appeal Decisions

---



### Part 1

Date: 11<sup>th</sup> January 2023

Item No: Insert item number here

**Subject** **Appeal Decisions**

**Purpose** To record the outcome of recent planning appeals

**Author** **Head of Regeneration and Economic Development**

**Wards** Allt-yr-Yn, Stow Hill, Tredegar Park, Malpas, Beechwood and Marshfield

**Summary** In consultation with the Chair or Deputy Chair of Planning Committee, the Head of Regeneration and Economic Development 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** Planning and Development 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 Head of Regeneration and Economic Development, 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 RED with Chair/Deputy of Planning Committee</p> <p>Head of RED with Chair/Deputy of Planning Committee</p> <p>Planning and Development 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.	Planning and Development 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, Policy and Transformation**

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: 11<sup>th</sup> January 2023

---

**Planning Appeal**

Reference	18/1022
Address	Sutton Cottage, NP10 8SH
Development	Retention of vehicle access and relocation of unauthorised gates and boundary treatment
Appellant	Mrs Lynne Jones
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal dismissed

---

**Planning Appeal**

Reference	21/0245
Address	119 Commercial Street
Development	Change of use of first floor to 2no. self contained flats
Appellant	Mr Mohammed Iqbal
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal dismissed

---

**Planning Appeal**

Reference	21/0053
Address	Locke Street Community Centre
Development	Change of use from storage to domestic dwelling
Appellant	Mr Keifer Shea-Godden
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal allowed

---

**Planning Appeal**

Reference	21/0846
Address	8 Pillmawr Circle
Development	Extension of residential curtilage to provide vehicular access from highway into new parking bay including construction of new dropped kerb
Appellant	Mr Heal
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A
Appeal Decision	Appeal dismissed

---

**Planning Appeal**

Reference	21/1179
Address	23 Arundel road
Development	Change of use from a dwelling (C3 use) to a 5 bedroom house in multiple occupation (C4 use)
Appellant	Mr Hull
Officer Decision	Refused
Committee Decision	N/A

---

Appeal Decision

Appeal allowed