Report



Planning Committee

Part 1

Date: 6 June 2018

Item No: 7

Subject Appeal Decisions

Purpose To inform Members of the outcome of recent appeals

Author Head of Regeneration, Investment and Housing

Wards Ringland, Pillgwenlly and Langstone

Summary The following planning appeal decisions are reported to help inform future decisions of

Planning Committee

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

Planning Committee.

Action by Planning Committee

Timetable Not applicable

This report was prepared without consultation because it is to inform Planning Committee

of appeal decisions already taken.

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 the Planning Committee refuses an application against Officer advice, Members 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 the type of major development being presented to the Planning Committee, which often requires 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.

D: 1		D 1 1 1111	M/I (' (O ') I '	14/1 ' '11
Risk	Impact of	Probability	What is the Council doing or	Who is responsible
	Risk if it	of risk	what has it done to avoid the	for dealing with the
	occurs*	occurring	risk or reduce its effect	risk?
	(H/M/L)	(H/M/L)		
Decisions	M	L	Ensure reasons for refusal can	Planning
challenged at			be defended at appeal;	Committee
appeal and			,	
costs awarded			Ensure planning conditions	Planning
against the			imposed meet the tests set out	Committee
Council.			in Circular 016/2014.	Committee
Courion.			III Oli Calai 010/2014.	
			Provide guidence to Plenning	Dovolonment
			Provide guidance to Planning	Development
			Committee regarding relevant	Services Manager
			material planning	and Senior Legal
			considerations, conditions and	Officer
			reasons for refusal.	
			Ensure appeal timetables are	Planning Officers
			adhered to.	
Appeal lodged	М	L	Avoid delaying the	Development
against non-		-	determination of applications	Services Manager
determination,			unreasonably.	Corvided Manager
with costs			anicasonably.	
awarded				
against the				
Council				

^{*} Taking account of proposed mitigation measures

Links to Council Policies and Priorities

Not applicable. This report is to inform Planning Committee 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 of the Planning Committee.

Preferred Option and Why

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

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 or enforcement action.

There is always a risk of a planning decision being challenged at appeal. This is especially the case where the Committee makes a decision contrary to the advice of Planning Officers or where in making its decision, the Committee takes into account matters which are not relevant planning considerations. These costs can be very considerable, especially where the planning application concerned is large or complex or the appeal process is likely to be protracted.

Members of the Planning Committee should be mindful that the costs of defending appeals and any award of costs against the Council following a successful appeal must be met by the taxpayers of Newport.

There is no provision in the Council's budget for such costs and as such, compensating savings in services would be required to offset any such costs that were incurred as a result of a successful appeal.

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 to inform Planning Committee 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 to inform Planning Committee of decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate and/or Welsh Ministers.

Consultation

Not applicable. This report is to inform Planning Committee of decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate and/or Welsh Ministers.

Background Papers

Not applicable

Dated: 6th June 2018

Planning Application Appeal			
Reference	17/1164		
Address	4 Springfield Drive, Newport, NP19 9EW		
Development	Proposed first floor extension over existing ground floor		
Appellant	Mr R. Kovacs		
Delegated Decision	Refuse		
Committee Decision	N/A		
Appeal Decision	Dismissed		

Enforcement Appeal		
Reference	E15/0523	
Address	Land at the rear of 154 Commercial Road, Newport NP20 2PJ	
Development	Unauthorised rear extension and creation of flats	
Appellant	Mr Asjad Ali Nekkhavi	
Delegated Decision	Notice issued as a result of planning refusal	
Committee Decision	N/A	
Appeal Decision	Dismissed - Enforcement Notice upheld.	

Planning Application Appeal			
Reference	17/1025		
Address	Derry Lodge, Rectory Road, Llanvaches, Newport, NP26 3AY		
Development	Demolition of single storey side extension and removal of chimney stack and proposed two storey side extension		
Appellant	Mr M. Freeman		
Delegated Decision	Refuse		
Committee Decision	N/A		
Appeal Decision	Dismissed		