# Report

# **Appeal Decisions**

Part 1

Date: 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2020

Item No: Insert item number here

**Subject** Appeal Decisions

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

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

Wards Caerleon, Graig, Langstone, St Julians and Victoria

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	Drobobility	What is the Council doing or	Who is responsible
RISK	Impact of Risk if it	Probability of risk	What is the Council doing or what has it done to avoid the	Who is responsible for dealing with the
	OCCURS*		risk or reduce its effect	risk?
		occurring	risk of reduce its effect	TISK!
Danining	(H/M/L)	(H/M/L)	Francisco de la referencia con	Lland of DILL with
Decisions	M	<b>L</b>	Ensure reasons for refusal can	Head of RIH with
challenged at appeal and			be defended at appeal;	Chair/Deputy of Planning
costs awarded				Committee
against the				Committee
Council.			Ensure planning conditions	Head of RIH with
Couricii.			imposed meet the tests set out	Chair/Deputy of
			in Circular 016/2014.	Planning
			111 Oliculai 010/2014.	Committee
				Committee
			Provide guidance to Head of	Development
			RIH/Chair/Deputy of Planning	Services Manager
			Committee regarding relevant	and Senior Legal
			material planning	Officer
			considerations, conditions and	
			reasons for refusal.	
			Ensure appeal timetables are	Planning Officers
			adhered to.	
Appeal lodged	M	L	Avoid delaying the	Development
against non-			determination of applications	Services Manager
determination,			unreasonably.	
with costs				
awarded				
against the				
Council	<u> </u>			

<sup>\*</sup> 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: 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2020

Planning Application Appeal		
Reference	20/0374	
Address	New Cottage, Old Roman Road, Langstone, Newport, NP18 1JQ	
Development	Proposed detached garage and associated works	
Appellant	Mr & Mrs Sanges	
Officer Decision	Refuse	
Committee Decision	N/A	
Appeal Decision	Allowed	

Planning Application Appeal		
Reference	20/0204	
Address	The Old Dairy, Rudry Street, Newport, NP19 7AN	
Development	Proposed change of use from UPVC manufacturing unit to car dealership	
Appellant	Mr B. Patrick	
Officer Decision	Refuse	
Committee Decision	N/A	
Appeal Decision	Dismissed	

Planning Application Appeal		
Reference	20/0461	
Address	Arnside, Magor Road, Newport, NP18 2EB	
Development	Proposed construction of dormer to the side of property and refurbishment	
Appellant	Mr H. Bowes	
Officer Decision	Refuse	
Committee Decision	N/A	
Appeal Decision	Dismissed	

Planning Application Appeal		
Reference	20/0167	
Address	24 Tan House Drive, Caerleon, Newport, NP18 1BS	
Development	Proposed raising of land (re-submission of 19/0583)	
Appellant	Mr S. Ireland	
Officer Decision	Refuse	
Committee Decision	N/A	
Appeal Decision	Dismissed	

Non-Determination Appeal		
Reference	20/0317	
Address	56 Fairoak Avenue, Newport, N19 8FW	
Development	Proposed change of use of property to house in multiple occupation for up to six residents and a rear single storey extension	
Appellant	Mr M. Layton	
Officer Decision	N/A	
Committee Decision	N/A	
Appeal Decision	Allowed	

Non-Determination Appeal		
Reference	20/0120	
Address	Land Adjacent to The Old Post Office, NP10 8GU	
Development	Alterations to wall and creation of pedestrian	
	access	
Appellant	Mr Ben England	
Officer Decision	Refuse	
Committee Decision	N/A	
Appeal Decision	Allowed	