



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: The Head of Planning

Date: 14 March 2023

Subject: RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS
SUBMISSIONS & DECISIONS

Author of Report: Abby Hartley

Summary:

List of all newly submitted planning appeals and decisions received, together with a brief summary of the Inspector's reason for the decision

Reasons for Recommendations

Recommendations:

To Note

Background Papers:

Category of Report: OPEN

1.0 RECORD OF PLANNING APPEALS SUBMISSIONS AND
DECISIONS

This report provides a schedule of all newly submitted planning appeals and decisions received, together with a brief summary of the Secretary of State's reasons for the decisions.

2.0 NEW APPEALS RECEIVED

| |
|---|
| <p>(i) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of front porch extension and single-storey rear extension including rear raised terrace and balustrade (resubmission of 22/01651/FUL) at Rivelin Filter Cottage, Manchester Road, Crosspool, Sheffield, S6 5SP (Case No: 22/03963/FUL).</p> |
| <p>(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse advertisement consent for 51 no. internally illuminated free standing pylon sign 6.5m high and 1 no. internally illuminated free standing monument sign 2.38m high at Burger King, Sevenairs Road, Sheffield, S20 1NZ (Case No: 22/03861/ADV).</p> |
| <p>(iii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of 15m streetpole and associated equipment cabinets (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) at land at Shirland Lane, Sheffield, S9 3SQ (Case No: 22/03434/TEL).</p> |
| <p>(iv) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the alterations to dwellinghouse to form 2x No. 1 bed flats (Resubmission of planning application 22/02019/FUL) at 53 White Thorns Drive, Sheffield, S8 8ET (Case No: 22/03316/FUL).</p> |
| <p>(v) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the installation of single wall mounted portrait internally illuminated 16-sheet LED advertising display panel (2.8m x 1.92m) at Devonshire Chippy, 280 Ecclesall Road, Sheffield, S11 8PE (Case No: 22/03070/FUL).</p> |
| <p>(vi) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of an open-sided extension with roof to existing unit for use as</p> |

storage area and additional open-sided storage unit with roof on existing hardstanding (Resubmission of 21/03947/FUL) at Redcar Brook Company Ltd Warehouse and Office 80m west of Fern Glen, Hathersage Road, Sheffield, S17 3AB (Case No: 22/02815/FUL).

(vii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse advertisement consent for 1x illuminated fascia name sign at 2 Joseph Hayward House, 2 Fox Valley Way, Sheffield, S36 2AB (Case No: 22/02767/ADV).

(viii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the alterations to roof to form additional habitable accommodation including erection of front and rear dormers and erection of single-storey side extension to dwellinghouse at 180 Rock Street, Sheffield, S3 9JF (Case No: 22/02293/FUL).

(ix) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of single-storey front extension and front porch, insertion of first floor window to side elevation and installation of air source heat pump to dwellinghouse at 455 Whitley Lane, Sheffield, S35 8RP (Case No: 22/02001/FUL).

(x) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the demolition of dwellinghouse, erection of five dwellinghouses with associated parking including two detached garages, landscaping, and improvements to site access at 45a Brooklands Avenue, Sheffield, S10 4GB (Case No: 22/01539/FUL).

(xi) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the removal of existing 4no billboards and erection of 3no 48 sheet internally illuminated LED digital freestanding billboards at Four Board Advertising Right at TTS Car Sales, Archer Road, Sheffield, S8 0LA (Case No: 22/01485/FUL).

(xii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the Committee decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the amendments to delivery hours to between 0800 hours and 1800 hours Mondays to Fridays and between 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturdays, no deliveries on Sundays and between 1000 hours and 1600 hours on Public Holidays (with no deliveries on Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Years Day) (Application under Section 73 to vary condition no. 3 (delivery hours) as imposed by planning permission 02/03682/FUL- Erection of unit for Class B1 (Business) use with ancillary offices and provision of car parking accommodation (Amended as per plans received on 12 February 2003)) at Abbey Glen, 10 Carley Drive, Sheffield, S20 8NQ (Case No: 22/01032/FUL).

(xiii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the

delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of two-storey building with front and rear dormer windows comprising 6 x one-bed apartments (Use Class C3) with associated landscaping and amenity space at land at rear of 14-24 Jedburgh Street, Woodgrove Road, Sheffield, S9 1NX (Case No: 21/05367/FUL).

(xiv) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a 4-storey apartment block to form 6.no apartments (Use Class C3) with associated parking, access and landscaping (re-submission) at land to the rear of 377 Fulwood Road and Riverdale Road, Sheffield, S10 3GA (Case No: 21/05069/FUL).

(xv) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of 2no. dwellinghouses with parking provision and alterations to existing parking provision and amenity space serving No's 2 and 4 at land adjacent No.2 Osmaston Road, Sheffield, S8 0GT (Case No: 21/03397/FUL).

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS – DISMISSED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the retrospective application for alterations to boundary wall (raising height), raising of garden wall separating drive and front garden, renewal of front gate (2.2m high), renewal of painted render to boundary wall and dwellinghouse and renewal of decorative brick piers to either side of front gate) at 264 Darnall Road, Sheffield, S9 5AN (Case No: 22/02956/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted that the main issues were the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the effect of the development on highway and pedestrian safety.

Existing boundary treatments were noted as being typically low brick walls, with the appeal property being at the end of a row of houses. The side wall onto the adjacent green space was noted as being raised slightly and the Inspector concluded that this element of the scheme had little impact.

The new gate, of solid appearance and 2.2m high was noted as presenting a bland and defensive appearance to the street and this, combined with the raised side wall and the internal garden wall, completely enclosed the space in front of the car port to a height of well over 2m, projecting beyond the main building line to the back edge of footway, and causing harm to the character of the area.

The Inspector also noted that the height of the walls presented a visibility problem for vehicles emerging from the site, which would create a conflict

between vehicles and pedestrians.

It was concluded that the development was contrary to UDP Policies H14 and BE5; Core Strategy Policy CS74; and NPPF paragraph 110.

(ii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for a retrospective application for erection of 2No. front dormer windows at 264 Darnall Road, Sheffield, S9 5AN (Case No: 22/02955/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted that the main issue was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

The property is detached and is the end of a row of properties, adjacent to open space. It is at a higher level than its neighbours. There are a variety of styles of houses nearby, but front dormers are uncommon on this part of the road where the character is of simple pitched roofs.

The two front dormers are of considerable height and depth, dominating the roof plane and giving a top-heavy appearance, with windows of different sizes which do not align with those on the main front elevation. They form an overly prominent feature in the streetscene, exacerbated by the elevated position of the appeal property.

It was concluded that the development failed to comply with Guidelines 1 and 2 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance on House Extensions; UDP Policies H14 and BE5; Core Strategy Policy CS74; and paragraphs 130 and 134 of the NPPF.

(iii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a 48-sheet paper paste advertising display at 85A Chesterfield Road, Sheffield, S8 0RN (Case No: 22/02854/HOARD) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area.

They noted the location on an arterial route, the commercial nature of the area and the presence of flats immediately adjacent and large format retailing opposite the site.

Notwithstanding the appellants assertion that gable ends are suitable for large format advertising, the Inspector felt the size and proportions of the advert would dominate the domestic scale of the building and represent a visually obtrusive feature that would be incongruous in the street scene, in conflict with UDP policy BE13 and paragraphs 130 and 136 of the NPPF.

The appellant argued the advertisement would screen an unattractive gable wall, however the Inspector considered even if the gable were to be considered in need of maintenance, covering it with a hoarding was not the only way to achieve that objective. Equally the Inspector did not consider economic benefit arguments put forward by the appellant as advertisements can only be assessed in terms of impact on public safety and amenity.

The conclusion was unacceptable harm to amenity and the appeal was dismissed.

(iv) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the demolition of front porch and rear lean-to, erection of two-storey front extension, two/single-storey rear extension and re-rendering of the dwellinghouse at 20 Smalldale Road, Sheffield, S12 4YB (Case No: 22/02678/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector identified one main issue of the effect of the two-storey front extension on the character of the host dwelling and the street scene.

They agreed with officers that other aspects of the scheme were acceptable and noted the host dwelling was one of many similar two-storey semi-detached dwellings in the street that were elevated slightly above the road and therefore prominent.

The Inspector concluded the two-storey front projection (albeit only 1.5m deep) would project noticeably into the short frontage and be a bulky and discordant feature detracting from the character of the host dwelling, the pair of semis and the street scene.

A larger, dominant extension on a dwelling opposite, suggested by the appellant as precedent was considered by the Inspector to be bulky and anomalous and was not therefore persuasive.

The Inspector agreed with officers that the front extension was in conflict with policies BE5 and H14, Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions and the aims of the NPPF and dismissed the appeal.

(v) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the provision of a first-floor rear roof terrace with steel/glass balustrade (retrospective application) at 3 Linnet Way, Sheffield, S6 6GE (Case No: 22/01595/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted that the main issue was the effect of the proposed roof terrace on the living conditions of occupiers of adjoining residential property to the east. The terrace has been formed on top of a flat roofed single storey

extension to the rear of the dwelling, by enclosing it with glass balustrades.

They considered that the terrace would afford significant overlooking of the garden of the adjoining dwelling, as well as two side windows which are at close quarters. During good weather when the terrace would be in use and the windows potentially open, the sense of lost privacy would be acute.

They concluded that the roof terrace would have a materially harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of adjoining property in respect of overlooking and privacy and it was therefore contrary to UDP Policy H14; the SPG on House extensions; and the NPPF.

(vi) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of 15m high Phase 9 slimline monopole and associated ancillary works (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) at land at junction with Montrose Road and Carter Knowle Road, Sheffield, S7 2EF (Case No: 22/01574/TEL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector identified the main issues as being the effect of the siting and appearance of the monopole on the character and appearance of the area, and if there is harm, whether this would be outweighed by need having regard to potential alternative sites.

The Inspector noted the mainly residential character of the area, with a public house to the rear of the site at the junction of Montrose Road, Carter Knowle Road and Springfield Avenue and the presence of street lighting and furniture in addition to two existing telecommunications poles and associated cabinets in close proximity to the site.

They considered that the pole, would be clearly visible in views from Carter Knowle Road, Montrose Road and Springfield Avenue in conjunction with other vertical components so would not be an isolated structure. From a distance the visibility of the monopole was not considered harmful. However, at 15m high it would be considerably higher and wider than other structures including the adjacent public house and would have more apparent and intrusive in the street scene.

The proximity to two other installations and associated cabinets would result in a cumulative visual impact and clutter that would be moderately harmful to the street scene in conflict with UDP policies H14 and BE14, Core Strategy policy CS74 and paragraphs 115 and 130 of the NPPF.

The Inspector noted the appellants assessment of alternative sites and the reasons for discounting them but was not satisfied this evidence was sufficiently robust or comprehensive or that alternative sites had been properly explored.

They therefore concluded the harm to visual amenity was not outweighed by need having regard to availability of alternative sites. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

(vii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the demolition of outbuilding, erection of two flats with associated parking at land adjacent 214 Barnsley Road, Sheffield, S4 7AF (Case No: 22/01402/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted that the main issues were the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the adjoining dwelling in terms of outlook and light.

The appeal site is a detached dwelling in a large plot, characteristic of those in the immediate vicinity, with gaps inbetween dwellings adding to the sense of space and adding to their presence in the street scene.

The proposal would replace the existing single storey outbuilding between 214 and 212 with a building containing 2 flats. Whilst the architectural style is compatible with the surroundings, it would largely fill the gap between the properties, eroding the spaciousness, appearing crowded and disrupting the rhythm of the group.

In addition, the proposal would be within 2 metres of side facing windows to number 212 and this lack of separation would lead to an overbearing impact, poor outlook and loss of light to these windows, significantly harming the living conditions of this property.

Despite the lack of a 5 year housing supply, the Inspector concluded that the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole. They dismissed the appeal as being contrary to UDP Policies H5, H14 and BE5; Core Strategy Policy CS74; and paragraphs 126 and 130 of the NPPF.

(viii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a 2 storey side extension and single-storey front extension and alteration of garden to form off-street parking to dwellinghouse at 41 Cherry Walk, Sheffield, S35 1QR (Case No: 22/00618/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted that the main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene.

It was noted that the semi-detached dwelling occupies a large and prominent corner plot on a post-war estate of similar dwellings, albeit with some

detached and terraced examples. Building set-backs and open frontages are characteristic of the estate, giving it a spacious feel.

The two-storey side extension would bring the dwelling much closer to California Drive and reduce the openness of the corner. A further single storey extension would run across the front elevation and part of the side extension, introducing a strong horizontal emphasis, uncharacteristic of the area. The combined effect of the two storey and single storey extensions would lead to an incongruous form of development, being obtrusive in the street scene and leading to a loss of openness.

The Inspector dismissed the appeal as being contrary to Policies H14 and BE5 of the UDP; the SPG on Designing House Extensions; and the NPPF.

(ix) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of 20m EE/H3G phase 7 streetworks pole on root foundation and associated ancillary works (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) at Crosspool District Youth Sports Trust, Coldwell Lane, Sheffield, S10 5TJ (Case No: 21/04964/TEL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted that the legislation dictates that the proposed development can only be assessed on the basis of siting and appearance, having regard to Local Plan policies which specifically relate to these matters and the NPPF.

The site is identified as an Open Space area in the UDP, part of a recreation facility, which provides an attractive, well-used green space in a suburban area.

The mast would be located in a central and open part of the site, some distance from Coldwell Lane, but visible from it and other surrounding streets. There would be minimal screening from adjacent shrubs and the mast would appear as an isolated and alien structure in a highly prominent location, as well as being clearly visible from houses backing onto the site. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and could also impede the existing use of the space as a community recreation facility.

The Inspector also noted that the information on the consideration of alternative sites was inadequate, including whether the rooftop of the existing building on the site could be utilised. They were unconvinced that there were no other less harmful options available. They therefore dismissed the appeal.

(x) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a digital LCD display screen to Street Hub unit at pavement outside 19 Market Place, City Centre, Sheffield, S1 2GH (Case No: 21/03281/HOARD) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted that advertisements can only be assessed in terms of amenity and public safety taking into account Local Plan policies which also address such matters. The main issue in this case is the visual prominence of the proposal in the context of the city centre public realm improvements.

The conclusion was that the large LED screen would appear as overly-dominant and visually intrusive in this prominent location, which contains a number of historic buildings. It would be particularly noticeable in the hours of darkness, especially as adverts are not prevalent in the area. For these reasons the appeal was dismissed as being contrary to Policy S10 of the UDP and the NPPF.

(xi) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for two digital LCD display screens to Street Hub unit at pavement outside 832 Ecclesall Road, Sheffield, S11 8TD (Case No: 21/02495/HOARD) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted the powers to control advertisements can only be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety and identified the main issue to be the effect on amenity with regards to visual prominence.

He noted the proposal would result in a large, illuminated display in a prominent location, and that the appellant had stressed this was necessary for public information. However, he felt most of the display would be commercial advertising with frequent changes which would be ill at ease given the low intensity of commercial activity in the area and would not be mitigated with limits on luminance.

The advert formed part of a street hub that was subject of a separate dismissed appeal (ref:21/02494/FULTEL). The Inspector could not disassociate the two and took into account the nature of the proposed housing acknowledging that it may be an improvement over the existing phone boxes to be removed, however he did not consider this sufficiently mitigated the harm of the advertisement, which he concluded would form an overly dominant and incongruous feature in the street scene, causing harm to the amenity of the area in conflict with policy S10(d) and the provisions of the NPPF.

4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS – ALLOWED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the retrospective application for erection of a front porch and carport to side of dwellinghouse at 264 Darnall Road,

Sheffield, S9 5AN (Case No: 22/02958/FUL) has been allowed conditionally.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. They noted that the Council had raised no objection to the porch and they agreed with that assessment.

They noted that the car port was constructed of white uPVC cladding with a black felt roof and acknowledged that the materials are not of high quality but concluded that the use of lightweight materials is not unexpected for a car port and that they match the window and door frames and, to a degree, the black felt is reflective of the dark tiles on the main roof.

In conclusion they felt that the carport was a subservient feature with limited visual impact and not overly conspicuous in the street scene and, as such it was in line with UDP Policies BE5 and H14; Core Strategy Policy CS74; and Paragraphs 130 and 134 of the NPPF.

(ii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the replacement of existing advertising billboard display with single sided, internally illuminated digital LED poster display at 198 Brook Hill, Sheffield, S3 7HE (Case No: 22/01693/HOARD) has been allowed conditionally.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted that advertisements can only be assessed in terms of amenity and public safety taking into account Local Plan policies which also address such matters. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed hoarding on amenity, as no concerns have been raised in respect of highway safety.

The appeal site is the gable end of a property on Brook Hill, facing the busy University roundabout. The Inspector noted that the digital display would of the same size and orientation as the existing paper display, although not sited centrally on the building and also sited higher than the existing display. It would not obscure any architectural features on the large blank gable, although the Inspector accepted that the position of the advert would be more prominent they did not accept that it would harmfully dominate the gable, especially as the profile would be slimmer than the existing display.

They considered that the proposal would be viewed in the context of significantly taller and contemporary colourful buildings opposite the site, helping it to relate to its surroundings, especially given the proliferation of other nearby signage. They also concluded that the light spill would not cause a nuisance to nearby residents in St George's Close.

They therefore allowed the appeal.

(iii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of 15m phase 8 monopole with associated cabinets and ancillary works (Application for determination if approval required for siting and appearance) at land adjacent to 17 Chapel Road, Chapeltown, Sheffield, S35 1SS (Case No: 22/01689/TEL) has been allowed conditionally.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector noted that the legislation dictates that the proposed development can only be assessed on the basis of siting and appearance, having regard to Local Plan policies which specifically relate to these matters and the NPPF.

The site is a grass verge in a residential area adjoining Chapel Road, close to the junction with Burncross Road. The Inspector recognised that the mast would be of a significantly different scale and appearance to the existing lamp posts and would interfere with the established pattern, resulting in an incongruous structure within the green space and an alien and discordant feature, unexpected in the context, although there would be some screening from nearby trees.

In the context of this identified harm, the Inspector noted that the applicant was therefore required to provide evidence that they had explored alternative locations for the mast and associated equipment. They concluded that adequate and persuasive evidence was provided on network coverage requirements and the site selection process and that this evidence had not been disputed. They were satisfied that the appeal site is the least harmful location and this weighs strongly in favour of the proposal. In the balance of considerations they concluded that the harm is outweighed by the locational needs and enhancement of the network. They therefore allowed the appeal on this basis.

5.0 CIL APPEALS DECISIONS

Nothing to report.

6.0 NEW ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

Nothing to report.

7.0 ENFORCEMENT APPEALS DISMISSED

(i) To report that an appeal against the Enforcement Notice issued by the Council for the unauthorised execution of operational development consisting of the erection of an outbuilding on the Land at Pease Bloom House, Sunny Bank Road, Sheffield, S36 3ST (Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/J4423/C/22/3301826) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The appellant appealed against the service of the notice on grounds (a) that planning permission should be granted; (d) that at the time the notice was issued it was too late for enforcement action to be taken.

On the ground (a) appeal, the main issues in this case were i. whether the development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the NPPF and any relevant development plan policies; ii. the effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt; iii. whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the development.

The inspector concluded that the development was inappropriate in the Green Belt and considered it harmful. He determined that the development would reduce the Green Belt's openness, because of the substantial size, length, massing, and prominent position of the building which can be seen from nearby and distant views. Other considerations by the appellant such as financial and environmental implications were not considered sufficient, to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and therefore contrary to the development plan and the framework.

The Inspector concluded that the development does not preserve, and has a harmful effect on, the openness of the Green Belt. It is contrary to Policies GE1, GE2 and GE6 of the SUDP, Section 9 of the SPG, and the Framework, 2021, which all aim to protect the openness of the Green Belt.

On ground (d) the onus of proof is on the appellant to provide evidence to show that the development was substantially completed more than 4 years before the notice was issued. Various evidence was provided by the appellant such as invoices which the inspector did not give weight either for or against allowing the appeal as this evidence did not establish that the materials were for the actual construction or completion of the development. Some of the evidence was contradicted by the Council's such as the different date given for completion of the building as set out in the earlier planning application. The Inspector on the balance of probability determined that the building was not substantially completed more than 4 years before the notice was served, and the appeal on ground (d) failed.

The appeal was dismissed, and the enforcement notice was upheld.

8.0 ENFORCEMENT APPEALS ALLOWED

Nothing to report.

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted.

Michael Johnson
Head of Planning

14 March 2023