



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Planning & Highways Committee

Report of: The Head of Planning

Date: 9 January 2024

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 construction of vehicular access and provision of off-street parking to dwellinghouse at 528 Fulwood Road, Sheffield, S10 3QD (Case No: 23/01242/FUL).</p>
<p>(ii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the replacement of existing hoarding with a digital hoarding at Pizza Palace, 418 Pitsmoor Road, Sheffield, S3 9AY (Case No: 23/02074/HOARD).</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 an application to allow temporary extension to operational hours on Friday and Saturday nights (0900hrs - 0200hrs (the following morning)) (Application under Section 73 to vary condition 7 (Opening Hours) imposed by planning permission ref. 23/01337/CHU - Previous permission under Section 73 to vary condition 7, preceded by section 73 permission ref. 23/00668/CHU, original permission ref. 20/02805/CHU - Use of retail unit (Use Class A1) and residential flat (Use Class C3) as a drinking establishment with small food offering (Use Class A4), including internal refurbishment) at Copa Bar, 293 – 295 Ecclesall Road, Sheffield, S11 8NX (Case No: 23/02030/CHU).</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 construction of vehicular access and provision of off-street parking to dwellinghouse at 526 Fulwood Road, Sheffield, S10 3QD (Case No: 23/01003/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 erection of single-storey front and rear extensions, with balcony to rear, erection of dormer windows to front and rooflights to front and rear of dwellinghouse at 155 Long Line, Sheffield, S11 7TX (Case No:</p>

23/00375/FUL).

(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 alterations to roof of dwellinghouse including raised ridge height, hip to gable extension, dormer window to rear and rooflights to front at 14 Sherwood Glen, Sheffield, S7 2RB (Case No: 23/00836/FUL).

(vii) 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 advertisements and installation of an internally illuminated digital display hoarding at JCDecaux, Advertising Right next to 30 London Road, Sheffield, S2 4LR (Case No: 22/04496/HOARD).

(viii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision(s) of the City Council to refuse planning permission and listed building consent for the internal alterations and single-storey rear extension to dwellinghouse at The Old Rectory, Norton Church Road, Sheffield, S8 8GZ (Case No's: 22/04364/FUL & 22/04365/LBC).

(ix) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse an application for prior notification for the installation of H3G 15m street pole and additional equipment cabinets (Application to determine if approval required for siting and appearance) at Top Road, Sheffield, S35 0AQ (Case No: 22/04179/TEL).

(x) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission and listed building consent for:

Planning Permission:

Change of use to a private function hall (Use Class Sui Generis) and erection of a single-storey side extension and internal alterations to existing building including raising the floor level and reconfiguration of toilet areas (Retrospective Application)

Listed Building Consent:

Erection of a single-storey side extension and internal alterations to existing building including raising the floor level and reconfiguration of toilet areas (Retrospective Application)

At The Office, 117 Upperthorpe Road, Sheffield, S6 3EA (Case No's: 22/04105/FUL and 22/04106/LBC).

(xi) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse an application for prior notification for the installation of telecommunications base station comprising of 17.5m high slimline column, associated GPS module fixed to the top, 2no.

equipment cabinets, 1no. meter cabinet and ancillary works (Application to determine if prior approval required for siting and appearance) at Grass Verge, Abbey Lane, Sheffield, S8 0EQ (Case No: 22/04049/TEL).

(xii) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the delegated decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for the uses of land for a horse-riding arena including landscaping, parking and associated works at land to the rear of Keren The Beeches and 11 Oriol Road, Brookhouse Hill, Sheffield, S10 3TF (Case No: 22/03993/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 extension of roof over north side to form additional habitable rooms, alterations to the exterior and provision of a link road from existing driveway to south side at Manor Cottages, Common Lane, Ringinglow, Sheffield, S11 7TG (Case No: 22/02716/FUL).

(xiv) An appeal has been submitted to the Secretary of State against the committee decision of the City Council to refuse planning permission for an outline application for erection of up to 92 dwellinghouses and associated vehicular and pedestrian access (all matters reserved except Access) at land between Hollin Busk Road, Broomfield Grove and Broomfield Lane, Sheffield, S36 2AQ (Case No: 22/02303/OUT).

3.0 APPEALS DECISIONS – DISMISSED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the upgrading of an existing 48 sheet advertisement display to a digital poster at 668 Barnsley Road, Sheffield, S5 6UB (Case No: 23/00760/HOARD) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

The Inspector supported the Council's reason for refusal determining that 'Due to a combination of its location, size, and illumination the advertisement would be highly prominent in the street scene and would appear out of place and dominant in this residential area'

The Inspector also commented that 'given the prominent location of the advertisement, the illuminated changing images would stand out, during both the day and at night, further accentuating its visual prominence and thus its harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area'.

Whilst the Inspector acknowledged the environmental, social, and economic benefits outlined by the appellant regarding digital advertisements, including the overall reduction of panels nationwide, they did outweigh the harm to the visual amenity in this particular case and the appeal was dismissed.

(ii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of two-storey side extension (with single-storey front element) to dwellinghouse at 41 Cherry Walk, Sheffield, S35 1QR (Case No: 23/00576/FUL) has been dismissed.

Click [here](#) to view this decision.

(iii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse an application for a lawful development certificate for a hip to gable loft conversion and erection of rear dormer extension to dwellinghouse (Application under Section 192) at 5 Delves Avenue, Sheffield, S12 4AA (Case No: 23/00135/LD2) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue was whether the Council's decision to refuse the Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) was well founded, and whether or not the proposed development is Permitted Development. The key question in determining this is identification of what is considered to be the Principal Elevation of the house.

The Inspector noted the proposed roof extension would extend beyond the plane of the roof slope facing Delves Avenue and that the Technical Guidance, published by the Government to aid interpretation of permitted development rules, makes reference to the principal elevation in most case being that which fronts the main highway serving the house, usually containing the main architectural features and main entrance to the house.

In pre-application advice from 2017 on an alternative proposal, officers had referred to the Rainbow Place elevation being the principal elevation, and reiterated that in other commentary on subsequent proposals. However the Inspector noted this was not binding.

They noted the Rainbow Place elevation had more windows but that it faced a continuous fenced boundary and grassed area of Rainbow Place, whereas the Delves Avenue elevation features the main front door entrance to the dwelling and a path leads from that to a gated pedestrian entrance onto Delves Avenue. They were satisfied that this relationship made the Delves Avenue elevation the principal elevation.

As such the works were not Permitted Development and the Council was correct to refuse to grant the LDC.

(iv) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for an outline planning application (seeking approval for all matters except landscaping) for the erection of 1x four storey apartment block comprising 4x flats with associated car parking, and formation of Local Area of Play (LAP) at land at junction with Crookes Road and Weston View, Sheffield, S10 5BZ (Case No: 22/03309/OUT) has been

dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issues were:

- The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future and neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to the provision of open space and overlooking; and,
- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The Inspector considered that the proposal would not unacceptably affect the living conditions of neighbouring or future occupiers with regard to privacy and outlook.

Nevertheless, the proposal would result in harm in terms of reducing the provision of open space and increasing the demand for such space. The proposal would therefore conflict with UDP Policies LR4, H5 and BE5, and Policies CS47 and CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (March 2009, the CS) which collectively, and amongst other matters, require developments to meet the needs of occupiers, including families and children, and provide satisfactory living conditions for occupants and neighbours. They also require developments to protect open spaces, or provide an equivalent or better replacement, especially where there is a quantitative shortage. Paragraphs 99 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) similarly require the protection of open spaces, unless they can be suitably replaced, the promotion of well-being and high amenity standards.

The Inspector therefore concluded that they were satisfied that the adverse impacts which have been identified above would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits from the provision of four dwellings in this instance and dismissed the appeal.

(v) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse a prior notification application for erection of 20m monopole with associated cabinets and equipment (Application to determine if approval required for siting and appearance) at land opposite Staniforth Works, Main Street, Sheffield, S12 4LA (Case No: 22/02975/TEL).

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered the main issues to be:-

- a) Whether the siting and appearance of the equipment would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Hackenthorpe Conservation Area (HCA); and
- b) In the event of harm to the HCA being found whether this would be outweighed by need in the location proposed, the lack of less harmful alternative sites and the public benefits.

In terms of a) he concluded the pole and its cabinets would visually detract from views into the HCA and have a harmful effect on its significance, which would be less than substantial within the meaning of the NPPF, and therefore needed to be weighed against public benefit.

On b) he noted the economic, social and digital connectivity benefits of the upgraded equipment, and that these weighed in favour of the proposal but also the requirement for equipment to be sympathetically designed. He also concluded the search for alternative, less harmful locations was not convincing and was not therefore satisfied alternative locations are not available.

Overall, the benefits did not outweigh the considerable weight given to the harm to the heritage asset and he therefore dismissed the appeal.

(vi) To report that an appeal against the delegated decisions of the Council to refuse planning permission and listed building consent for the erection of an open-sided veranda with a clear glazed roof at Chantreyland Nursery, Grange Barn, 34 Matthews Lane, Sheffield, S8 8JS (Case No's 22/02883/FUL (Appeal A) & 22/02884/LBC (Appeal B)) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The appeal decision related to both appeals and the Inspector identified the main issue as being whether the proposal would preserve the architectural and historic interest of the 18th century 18th Grade 2 listed Norton Grange and adjoining wash house, and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Norton Conservation Area.

The proposed open sided glass verandah canopy, constructed in grey powder coated aluminium and glass was to be bolted into the mortar joints and to the ground. Although lightweight the Inspector felt its fixing to the building would cause some damage and its design would not reflect the architectural style of the vernacular building. In addition, they felt the notable length of the structure, added to the existing porch would add further clutter along the east elevation. As such they felt it would appear incongruous, out of character, and fail to harmonise with the building or preserve its special interest. They gave this harm considerable importance and weight.

As required by paras 199-202 of the NPPF they considered the harm less than substantial and balanced this against public benefits of the proposal. The appellant had identified benefits of providing a covered areas for parents and carers at drop off and collection times and an ability to share confidential information under cover. However, the Inspector was unaware of any national requirement for such a facility and felt there were other means of achieving this with less harm. Nonetheless the benefits put forward were private, not public and not sufficient to outweigh the harm.

The harm caused to the listed building was relevant in the context of

considering impact on the Conservation Area as the building is an important element of the Conservation Area and contributes positively to its character and appearance and the proposal are visible in the public realm. The Inspector therefore concluded that the works were also harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in addition to the special architectural and historic interest of the Listed Building.

The proposal therefore failed to comply with the statutory duty, the NPPF and policies BE15, BE16, BE17 and BE19 (UDP) and CS74 (Core Strategy) and the appeals were dismissed.

(vii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for an outline application (all matters reserved) for residential development at land adjacent 1 Orgreave Lane, Sheffield, S13 9NE (Case No: 22/02124/OUT) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector identified the main issues to be a) whether the development provided satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers and b) the effect of the development on highway safety.

The Inspector noted the site was within a residential area and was a long linear plot between 1 Orgreave Lane and a 3-storey block of flats with several windows overlooking the site and contained a hedgerow and mature trees. Although he understood the flat windows to be secondary windows or serving non-habitable rooms he did not feel this would prevent overlooking and loss of privacy from upper floor windows despite the presence of the vegetation on the boundary, which offered little protection when not in leaf and could not be guaranteed as a permanent screen.

It would therefore result in significant overlooking of the private garden at the rear of the site that would represent an unacceptable standard of living conditions for future occupiers. He recognised the outline nature of the application meant the design and location for the dwelling could differ from the indicative plan but was not convinced a suitable scheme could be achieved and concluded on living conditions that the poor standard of living would be contrary to policy H14 of the UDP, Supplementary Planning Guidance and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

For b) he noted the junction was complex given its location on a bend and with traffic islands and signalisation. He noted the likely location of access within the narrow frontage and the undoubted ability for the site to accommodate turning provision so that vehicles could enter and exit in forward gear but at a point where three roads meet with vehicles travelling from either direction.

He considered the absence of traffic controls on the driveway it would be difficult for drivers leaving the site to anticipate the direction of arriving vehicles increasing the risk of conflict and collisions including with vulnerable

road users such as cyclists. Similarly, vehicles approaching the site access would be unlikely to anticipate a vehicle existing given the signalisation. He accepted other access points existed close by but they were historic and some distance from the body of the junction but felt these contributed to traffic confusion and the proposal would exacerbate this.

He concluded on highway safety that the proposal would, as a result of the proposed vehicular access, unacceptably affect highway safety on and around the junction serving Orgreave Lane in conflict with UDP Policy H14 and paragraph 111 of the NPPF.

The Inspector, in applying the tilted balance owing to a lack of 5-year housing supply noted the proposal would provide one new dwelling in a location with adequate access to services. It would also lead to a small and time-limited economic benefit during the construction phase, as well as some limited social and economic benefits resulting from future occupiers. Given the small scale he afforded this modest weight but gave the substandard living conditions and impact on highway safety significant weight and felt these outweighed the benefits of one dwelling and dismissed the appeal.

(viii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decisions of the Council to refuse planning permission and advertisement consent for the:

Appeal A:

Removal of 2no. BT kiosks and installation of 1no. BT Street Hub (Case No: 22/01427/FULTEL)

Appeal B:

2no. digital 75" LCD display screens to Street Hub unit (Case No: 22/01428/HOARD)

At pavement outside Morrisons, Fulwood Road, Sheffield, S10 3BB have both been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector considered both appeals in a single decision letter and identified the main issues as being the effect of the development on the character of the area including the character appearance and significance of the Broomhill Conservation Area (BCA); and upon the visual amenity of the area.

They identified the significance of the BCA as being derived from the high proportion of historic building stock using local stone and brick in the form of terraced residential properties and standout commercial units, that is restrained and described in the BBEST Neighbourhood Plan as distinctly 'nineteenth century'.

They noted the appeal site currently contained a pair of telephone kiosks and is in an area of modern shops which contrasts sharply with its surroundings. Although the telephone kiosks do not contribute positively to the street scene and are immediately adjacent to many other items of street furniture the Inspector did not feel this was cluttered owing to the wide pavement.

The Inspector felt the street hub would be prominent in views when travelling towards the city centre along Fulwood Road and would be more prominent and intrusive than the telephone kiosks and would also be widely visible from a number of directions where its illumination and animation would draw the eye. Despite the commercial nature of the area, they concluded it would be a prominent and overtly modern and vibrant feature which would result in less than substantial harm to the character of the BCA and fail to preserve its character and appearance in conflict with policies BE10, BE16 and S10 of the UDP, CS74 of the Core Strategy, and DDHM2 of the BBEST Neighbourhood Plan, in addition to the NPPF.

The less than substantial harm was weighed against the public benefits of the scheme which were the improved communications infrastructure, supporting wi-fi calling, device charging, traffic and environment monitoring which are public safety and air quality benefits. However, the Inspector did not consider it had been demonstrated they couldn't be provided in a less intrusive way so they gave this limited weight, such that it did not outweigh the harm.

The appeals were therefore dismissed.

(ix) To report that an appeal against the committee decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the demolition of outbuildings, erection of 4 dwellinghouses with associated parking, landscaping and formation of access at Kenwood Hall Hotel, Kenwood Road, Sheffield, S7 1NQ (Case No: 20/03276/FUL) has been dismissed.

Officer Comment:-

The Inspector identified three main issues:-

- i) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Nether Edge Conservation Area (NECA);
- ii) The effect of the proposal on the Kenwood Hall Historic Garden; and
- iii) The effect of the proposal on biodiversity with particular regard to tree removal.

i) Conservation Area

They noted the NECA has a verdant character, in the form of mature planting, a defining feature of its character and appearance, and that the established tree belts in the grounds of the hotel make a significant positive contribution to this, and a notable section of planting would have to be removed to facilitate the development.

The Inspector felt the dwellings themselves would not be harmful but the

removal of a substantial section of established tree belt would cause harm. Given the public use of the rest of the site this harm would be visible. The Conservation Area Appraisal identifies that the loss of trees is the main threat to the areas established landscape comes from the loss of trees.

The Inspector therefore felt the significant loss of trees would detract from the heritage significance of the NECA which lies in its mature planting. They felt this harm would be less than substantial and noted that the NPPF therefore requires this to be balanced against public benefit.

They found conflict with policies BE16 and BE17 of the UDP (but not with GE15) and with CS74 of the Core Strategy.

ii) Historic Garden

The Historic Garden is a non-designated heritage asset, and the Inspector noted it was designed by Robert Marnock, a well-known exponent of the gardenesque movement and designer of Sheffield's Botanical Gardens. They felt the structural planting under threat from the development was a robust and consistent feature throughout the history of the garden, and its substantial removal would detract from the significance of the garden by reducing its legibility as a Marnock designed parkland and given the importance of this identified this harm as substantial.

As a result they concluded the proposal would fail to accord with policy BE21 of the UDP.

iii) Biodiversity

The Inspector noted the Ecological Appraisal had identified the site had low ecological value overall, and that this could be replaced with new planting and other specific provisions, subject to conditions.

They therefore concluded no significant adverse impact on biodiversity or conflict with GE11 (UDP).

Other Matters

The Inspector noted public benefits of replacement/reinstatement planting, the utilising of a sustainable site with good transport links and the socio economic benefits of the construction process.

The delivery of additional housing was given limited weight given the small contribution it would make to the city's housing stock and the adverse impacts of doing so.

They gave the adverse impacts significant weight and concluded they outweighed the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole.

As a result of the harm caused to the NECA and given this provided a clear reason for refusal, the presumption in favour of sustainable development

(para 11 NNPF) did not apply and the appeal was dismissed.

4.0 APPEALS DECISIONS – ALLOWED

(i) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse an application for prior notification for the installation of 20m High FLI Cypress Tree with 6no. apertures. 2no. dishes and active routers to be fixed to support poles below antennas and associated ancillary works (Application to determine if prior approval required for siting and appearance) at Goole Green, Off Fulwood Road, Sheffield, S10 3QH (Case No: 22/04048/TEL) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue was the effect of the siting and appearance of the proposed installation on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the countryside and the Fulwood Conservation Area (the FCA).

The Inspector commented that the proposal includes the erection of a 20m tall mast disguised as a cypress tree and a set of seven cabinets within a fenced off area covered in stone chippings. This would be sited in an area of undergrowth and younger vegetation adjacent to the mature trees at the boundary of the field. Although the disguise would not stand up to close or prolonged inspection, it would be sufficient to largely hide the mast from public views where it would only be seen from a distance in glimpses between buildings and trees. Given its location at the edge of the field against the mature tree line, the prominence of this proposal would be further reduced. Although the trees would provide greater screening while they are in leaf, even when these have dropped, the mast would still appear as an evergreen tree. Therefore, the proposed mast would not unacceptably affect the character of its rural surroundings and the FCA.

Therefore, the siting and appearance of the mast and its associated works would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would preserve the character of the FCA and its countryside location, as well as the setting of the Listed Building. Consequently, the proposal would meet the requirements of S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The Inspector was also mindful of, and considered that proposal would comply with, Policies GE2, GE4, BE5, BE14 and BE16 of the SUDP which are a material consideration. For those reasons the appeal was allowed.

(ii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension to dwellinghouse at 14 Oakcroft Mews, The Coach House, 379B Fulwood Road, Sheffield, S10 3GA (Case No: 22/02108/FUL) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

The main issue was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Ranmoor Conservation Area (the RCA).

The Inspector allowed the appeal determining that previously approved works have already resulted in a domestic appearance to the coach house and the proposal would not be so significant as to unacceptably increase this domestic character. Moreover, the extension would be subservient to the coach house and would maintain its relationship with the main house. Given its relative scale and appearance it would have a neutral effect on the historic interest and significance of the RCA. In light of the above, the Inspector considered that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Ranmoor Conservation Area and would therefore comply with Policies H14, BE5 and BE16 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan March 1998) and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (March 2009).

(iii) To report that an appeal against the delegated decision of the Council to impose condition 4 (formation of a garden) against a granted planning permission for the erection of detached split level dwellinghouse at land to the rear of 56 to 68 Church Street, Oughtibridge, Sheffield, S35 0FW (Case No: 21/04348/FUL) has been allowed.

Officer Comment:-

Effectively this appeal was dismissed rather than being allowed as the Inspector agreed with the reasons for imposing the condition and dismissed the appellants grounds of appeal.

The main issue was whether the condition is necessary having regard to the living conditions of the occupiers of 70 Church Street by reason of private amenity space.

The Inspector considered that the removal of the condition would result in an inadequate amount of private amenity space and thus unsatisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of No 70. Moreover, doing so would conflict with UDP2 Policy H14 which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development would not cause serious loss of existing garden space which would harm the character of the neighbourhood. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, which aims to achieve a high standard of amenity. The condition is therefore necessary. However, whilst the intentions behind the condition are clear, for accuracy it is necessary to correctly refer to the area to be additional garden as outlined on the approved plans in blue for accuracy.

For that reason the Inspector felt it necessary to allow the appeal for the sole purpose of amending the wording of the original condition 4 to state instead:-

Prior to above ground works commencing on the development site, the existing garage associated with No 70 located immediately to the rear, in the

area outlined in blue on the approved plans, shall be removed and this said area shall be laid out as garden to be maintained and retained in association with No 70 Church Street.

5.0 CIL APPEALS DECISIONS

Nothing to report.

6.0 NEW ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

Nothing to report.

7.0 ENFORCEMENT APPEALS DISMISSED

Nothing to report.

8.0 ENFORCMENT APPEALS ALLOWED

Nothing to report.

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted.

Michael Johnson
Head of Planning

9 January 2024