

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 12 NOVEMBER 2013

REPORT OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE (COMMUNITY DIRECTION) RE: APPEALS LODGED AND DETERMINED



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

A Borough to be proud of

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform Members of appeals lodged and determined since the last report.

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the report be noted.

3. BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT

Appeals Lodged

3.1 **Appeal by Mr Patrick Reilly and Mr Patrick Reilly and Others** against:

- i) against the refusal of planning permission for the removal of condition 1 of appeal decision APP/K2420/C/09/2105369; and
- ii) the enforcement notice for the change of use of the land from use for stabling horses to use as a residential gypsy and traveller caravan site beyond the temporary period permitted under appeal decision APP/K2420/C/09/2105369.

at Good Friday Caravan Site, Bagworth Road, Nailstone.

Format: Public Inquiry

Appeals Determined

3.2 **Appeal by Asda Stores Limited** against the refusal to grant permission to vary the condition relating to opening hours at Asda, Barwell Lane, Hinckley. The hours of opening were controlled by condition attached to an appeal decision in 2004, these were 08:30-20:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00-20:00 on Saturday and 10:00 to 16:00 on Sunday. The variation sought 07:00-22:00 Monday to Saturday with no change on Sunday.

The application was refused at committee against officer recommendation on the grounds that the extended opening hours would lead to an increased use of the site which would in turn increase the level of noise and general disturbance to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring residents.

The Inspector looked back at the history of the site in particular the 2004 appeal which was considering Sunday opening where the previous Inspector concluded that the proposal would harm the living conditions of nearby local residents due to noise and disturbance but that it would be outweighed by other considerations. These were mainly the reduction in noise enabled during the rest of the week by a proposed acoustic fence between the car park and surrounding properties and the increased choice for consumers from Sunday opening, and sustainability benefits from reduced travel.

The Inspector noted that the acoustic fence is now in place. He considered the noise impact assessment report submitted with the application which concludes that there would be a negligible long term adverse impact in the extended morning periods at all assessed locations and in the evening periods a minor long term impact at some locations. The report also found that there would be a change in noise environment from the car park activity at the extended hours when baseline noise levels are low. However, it concluded that recommended reasonable guidelines would be achieved inside habitable rooms with windows open. The Inspector considered the report to be robust, he noted that the findings were accepted by the environmental health officer, that the proposal was recommended for approval by the planning officer and that no other expert noise assessment was submitted.

He concludes that the technical advice indicates that the proposed extended hours would only have a limited impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents and despite its location within a residential area the proposal would not materially conflict with Policy BE1 of the Local Plan as such he found in favour of the appellant and allowed the appeal.

APPEAL ALLOWED

- 3.3 **Appeal by Helena Bull** against the refusal to grant consent to undertake work to a tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order at 3 Kinross Way, Hinckley. The proposal was for the felling of one ash tree, believed to be T16 of the TPO.

The application was refused under officer delegated powers on the basis that there was insufficient evidence submitted to justify the removal of the tree.

The Inspector considered the main issues to be the impact the proposal would have on the appearance and character of the locality, and whether the reasons given for felling are sufficient to justify that course of action.

Dealing with each in turn the Inspector noted the character of the area and the existing local tree cover in the area. He comments that about 15 metres north of the appeal tree is the corner of the field which forms part of the public open space. Along the western and southern boundaries of the open space there is a concentration of mature but medium sized pre-development trees including ash, oak and field maple, but the Inspector saw few other mature trees within the same visual area.

The Inspector notes that the appeal ash is isolated from any other trees and around 12m in height with a well shaped and deep canopy. He considered that locally it is prominent and can be seen in views from Roston Drive near the junction with Cromarty Drive and in views east off Cromarty Drive. It can also be clearly seen in views north east and north west off Kinross Way and off the spur road leading north to the southern access point of the public open space field. He therefore concluded that the appeal tree is an important component of the local landscape and therefore its retention is desirable and strong justification would be required for the proposed felling.

In considering the justification for the proposed felling the Inspector noted that the ash tree is reasonably close to the north east corner of No 3, overhanging

the eastern part of the rear garden and slightly dominating it. However, he comments it is not a large tree with one of the three stems having been removed a few years ago. The location of the tree will not cast shade on the house except in the early morning soon after sunrise, and would not result in severe shading to either the kitchen or the appellant's son's bedroom.

The Inspector noted that the Local Authority had suggested some pruning such as low branch shortening, crown lifting and crown thinning and he places some weight on this and further considers that minor pruning could also include removal of any dead or defective branches which would reduce the appellants concern about the potential for larger branches to fall onto the rear garden by the house. Finally he considered the matters of birds using trees and creating mess on surfaces and the cost of periodic pruning against a one off felling cost and concluded these were not issues that would justify the felling of the tree.

He concluded that the appeal tree was healthy from a visual inspection, and whilst not large it did provide a high landscape value to its surroundings. With no justified reason for its proposed felling the Inspector dismissed the appeal.

APPEAL DISMISSED

- 3.4 **Appeal by Patrick Godden** against the refusal of permission to vary the condition relating to the hours of operation at Upper Grange Farm, Ratby Lane, Markfield. The hours of operation were controlled by condition attached to a 2009 permission and restricted training classes to taking place between 18:00 to 20:00 Mondays to Fridays excluding bank holidays and between 10:00 to 18:00 on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays. The variation sought training classes to taking place between 10:00 to 20:00 Mondays to Fridays excluding bank holidays and between 10:00 to 18:00 on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays. The reason for the original condition was to ensure the dog training does not become a source of annoyance. The application was refused as recommended at planning committee on the basis that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the proposed use would not result in an adverse noise impact upon the amenities of nearby residents.

The Inspector considered the main issue was the effect of the proposed extension in dog training hours on the living conditions of neighbouring residents having particular regard to noise and disturbance.

The Inspector noted that he fully understood the concerns of the Council and neighbours regarding the general noise and disturbance generated by dog training and that at the time of the site visit no dog training was taking place. However, he noted that the training fields subject of the appeal are a substantial distance from the nearest residential properties on Thornton Lane and Ratby Lane, and that these properties were at a much higher level than the training fields, separated by a combination of acoustic fencing, a large car park, an indoor training hall and the main dog kennel and reception building. It has also been confirmed that since the training fields began there have been no formal complaints received by the Council.

The Inspector considered the variation in hours would allow dog training to take place during the day, a far less sensitive time to hold training classes that during evenings and weekends which have already been found to be acceptable. In addition, the use of the show field for dog training during the

day has also been considered to be acceptable by the Council with planning permission granted for use of this field which is nearer to residential properties than the appeal site.

An acoustic report was submitted with the application which found that due to the existing background noise levels, the classes would have no detrimental effect on the situation during the day which correlates with the Council's confirmation that no complaints have been received since the use of the training fields began. Whilst there was a challenge regarding the acoustic report the Inspector considered the report provided sufficient evidence to substantiate the appellant's case that the siting of the training field in relation to neighbouring properties, combined with the existing acoustic barrier, adequately mitigates the likely effects of dog training during the day.

The Inspector considered other matters that had been raised such as the use of the land in open countryside, the enforceability of conditions on the 2009 planning permission and the public footpath that crosses the site and found that the first 2 issues were not a matter for consideration under this appeal and the third issue the public footpath would not be affected by the proposal.

The Inspector concluded that the variation of the hours as proposed would not adversely impact on neighbours amenity and as such allowed the appeal with a new condition regarding hours but subject to all other conditions imposed on 09/00770/COU

APPEAL ALLOWED

An application for the award of costs was made in respect of the appeal by Patrick Godden. The Inspector considered the facts before him that the Council had refused the application to vary the hours of operation for dog training but had approved planning permission for dog shows and dog training on the show field. He noted that both schemes were recommended for refusal by planning officers for the same reason. The officer recommendation for the application for the show field was overturned by Planning Committee who resolved to approve it. The Inspector further notes that the only reasons given by the Council to substantiate the conflicting decisions which were based on the same evidence is that the two schemes related to different activities on different parts of the site. The Inspector considers that dog training on one field will not be substantially different to dog training on another field and that the field the subject of the appeal is also further away from residential properties than the show field where it was found that both dog shows and dog training were considered acceptable.

By failing to determine the cases in a like manner, the Inspector considers the Council has behaved unreasonably which has led to unnecessary expense to the applicant in having to address the adequacy of information at appeal on one scheme where the same details justifying similar activities were judged to not be an overriding factor on another.

FULL COSTS AWARDED TO THE APPELLANT

- 3.5 **Appeal by Henry Egerton** against the refusal of planning permission for the erection of a single wind turbine with a maximum blade tip height of 79m, along with an accompanying access track, crane hardstanding, electrical

switchgear house with associated underground cabling and temporary construction compound at Elms Farm, Atherstone Road, Appleby Parva.

The application was refused at committee against officer recommendation on grounds that the turbine by virtue of its scale and position would result in an unacceptable, significant adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the landscape.

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect the proposed wind turbine would have on the character and appearance of this countryside location. In reaching his decision the views of 3 local MPs and other interested persons were taken into account. The Inspector notes that there was a difference in the level of generation anticipated with the officer report stating 500Kwh per annum and the appellants stating 1,239,500Kwh per annum. As this may have influenced some representations much less weight can be attributed to this line of argument.

The Inspector sets out the policy position concluding that Policy BE27 is generally consistent with the NPPF. He notes that the proposal would help sustain the existing farming enterprise thereby offsetting the carbon footprint of the agricultural operations.

The Inspector finds that the appeal site lies within the Upper Mease Character Area described as "an expansive rural landscape of generally high sensitivity. The elevated landform provides dramatic wide ranging views". This conflicts with the appellants statement that the "local landscape is unremarkable in its character". Local policy requires development to complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area, and ensure developments are sensitively located in relation to existing landform and features. He finds this local policy broadly consistent with the NPPF.

The Inspector considers from the site visit that the zone of visual influence envelope would be extremely extensive including many public vantage points and that as it currently stands the rural presentation is very largely undamaged. The proposal would he considers introduce something that does not currently exist in the area, and it would occupy one of the high points overlooking the valley making it highly visible with no attempts at mitigating the visual impact. The Inspector finds that on balance whilst the introduction of any turbine within the landscape would most probably be visually evident, it is the sites designation within an area of generally high sensitivity, the turbines location within the rural landscape, the elevation of its position, the absence of any other such similar structure and the visual envelope it dominates that leaves him aligned to the Council's view.

Other matters raised such as noise, flicker, traffic and safety have been assessed and such matters do not constitute substantive grounds for objection. He considers that objections and support for wind energy have to be viewed against the overarching policy and, on this basis, the presumption in favour prevails at this time. He concludes that proposals should be looked at on their own merits and therefore precedent is not an issue.

The Inspector considers whilst there were 2 letters of support, there was a more negative response and therefore it could be argued that the proposal would not rest comfortably against the social component of sustainable development.

Finally, the Inspector carefully considered the written ministerial statement issued on 6 June 2013. He weighs the power that would be generated and other benefits against the visual harm to the character and appearance of this predominantly sensitive rural locality and reaches a clear conclusion against the proposal.

APPEAL DISMISSED

3.6 **Appeal by Ms S Johnson** against the refusal of planning permission for an agricultural dwelling at 3 Markfield Lane, Botcheston.

The application was refused at planning committee in line with officer recommendation on the grounds that the applicant had not provided adequate justification for the proposed dwelling which would result in an unwarranted intrusion of residential development in the countryside to the detriment of its intrinsic character and open and undeveloped appearance.

The Inspector considered the financial case for the development and considered that the appellant had over many years built up organic food production at the farm however he considered the farm had not yet reached its potential mainly due to the appellant's health problems and the absence of a full time worker. Whilst the appellant submitted forecast information that annual gross profits could rise to over £10,000 the Inspector considered there was not sufficient evidence to reassure him that the predicted income will be achieved. He further states that it is accepted that a minimum agricultural wage of £14,000 is used as a benchmark to indicate whether a holding is viable. On this basis the Inspector was not persuaded that viability has been demonstrated.

In considering the functional needs of the farm, the Inspector considered it is a relatively small concern with some 4 hectares of land capable of production. The land is currently used to rear approximately 50 poultry birds, the welfare of these birds requires close supervision which would be even more so should the number of birds increase to 300 which the appellant indicates is possible. Furthermore the growing of organic produce is more time consuming and labour intensive than otherwise, particularly with tender salad crops that need to be protected against slugs and other pests. The Inspector considered that this work could be done by someone living nearby. In addition, he considered there is a need to ensure security of the food production capacity of the farm particularly as there is a public footpath that runs along one side of the holding. As such the Inspector was persuaded that a full time presence on site is necessary if this farm is to be developed to its full potential. If viability could be achieved and demonstrated he concludes there would be a functional need for a dwelling on the farm.

Finally, the Inspector considered whether there is suitable alternative accommodation available to meet the need. He noted a brick built building on site that may lend itself to conversion but such a scheme was not before him. He further noted the evidence submitted by the Council regarding the availability of existing properties, however given the functional requirements of the holding, the alternatives to a dwelling on the farm, either conversion or new build, are unlikely. The Inspector accepts that without accommodation on the farm it may be difficult to establish viability but suggests there could be

other options to explore to assist in the short term whilst viability is being established.

APPEAL DISMISSED

- 3.7 **Appeal by Sophie Johnson** against the refusal of planning permission for the conversion of a free standing garage and change of use to beauty salon at 1a Tithe Close, Stoke Golding.

The application was refused under delegated powers on the grounds of loss of off-street parking provision resulting in overdevelopment of the site and impact upon neighbouring residents and the residential character of the area.

The Inspector noted that No 1a Tithe Close comprises a bungalow with a small detached garage which has been converted into the salon. The salon is run by the granddaughter of the occupier of No 1a, she is newly qualified and this is a start up business. The Inspector considers the arrangement is akin to home working, as the granddaughter lives next door, which is encouraged by local policy as it contributes to local needs and helps to sustain the village providing employment opportunities. The proposal is supported by the local Parish Council and Ward Member. Whilst the concerns of the Local Planning Authority and neighbours are appreciated, since if the business ceased to be a low-key operation or if the bungalow were occupied in the future by car users activity may occur that could affect residential amenities or give rise to a parking shortage.

The Inspector refers to the NPPF which indicates that decision makers should look for solutions and should consider whether development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions. On this basis the Inspector considers a personal condition restricting the use of the salon to the period during which the appellants grandmother occupies the bungalow is appropriate.

APPEAL ALLOWED

- 3.8 **Two appeals by David Wilson Homes** against the refusal of planning permission for a re-plan and substitution of housetypes on Plots 40-45 and 47-49 of planning permission 12/00154/FUL (Appeal A) and the erection of 9 dwellings and associated infrastructure (Appeal B) at land off Britannia Road, Burbage.

The applications were refused at planning committee against officer recommendation on the grounds of a poor layout by virtue of creating a poor visual end stop to the street scene (Appeal A) and unsustainable location outside the settlement boundary and within the countryside and that the applicant failed to demonstrate there was a need within the Borough that justifies the development of this Greenfield site for which there is no residual housing requirement (Appeal B).

The Inspector noted that at the Hearing the Council stated there is an identified need within Burbage for residential development however, in relation to Appeal B, it maintained its objection to the sustainability of the appeal site and in particular the impact the proposed development of this Greenfield site on the character and appearance of the area.

The Inspector allowed both appeals and granted planning permission for the following reasons:

Appeal A

This site forms part of the larger site that received planning permission for 52 dwellings. The proposal seeks to amend the layout which would enable a road to be formed to provide access to the land subject of Appeal B. The Inspector notes the policy requirement for a high standard of design in order to secure attractive development. The Inspector cites the advice provided by the Urban Design Officer who considered the layout, if read in isolation, would result in a poor visual end stop between Plots 43 and 44 which would be unacceptable in design terms. However, taking into account the proposal on the neighbouring site (Appeal B) the layout would be an acceptable form of development. The Inspector considered that the poor visual end-stop could be addressed by the imposition of an appropriate condition on any approval however there is no evidence that this was a matter considered by the Council's planning committee prior to making its decision. The Inspector considers that the proposed cul-de-sac is not dissimilar to many other new developments and when this proposal is viewed together with the proposal on the adjacent land she considered that the proposals would provide continuity of the character of the wider development. On this basis the Inspector concluded that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and was not contrary to local policy BE1.

Appeal B

The Inspector noted that the site is located outside the settlement boundary for Burbage within the open countryside. It is a Greenfield site consisting of grassland associated with the dwelling at No 40 Britannia Road. She cites guidance within the NPPF particularly the 3 dimensions to sustainable development which should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. The Inspector considers the requirements of Policy 4 of the Core Strategy which states that land will be allocated for a minimum of 295 new residential dwellings focussed primarily to the north of Burbage. Furthermore the policy goes on to say that to ensure development contributes to Burbage's character and sense of place and that the village's infrastructure can accommodate the new development, the Council will protect and preserve the open landscape to the east, which provides an important setting for the village.

The Inspector takes the Councils and local residents concerns regarding the loss of this Greenfield site into account. She notes it is not disputed that there is a need to make provision for a further 172 dwelling in Burbage to 2026 to satisfy the minimum requirement. She further notes that the officer report to planning committee states that evidence to date indicates that it will not be possible to allocate the entire residual housing requirement on previously developed land and therefore provision will need to be made on some Greenfield sites.

The Inspector considered that there is a good range of local services and facilities in the centre of the village, there are bus stops close by with a frequent and regular bus service from these stops to Market Harborough, Lutterworth and Hinckley. She further considered that the appeal site is on the urban fringe of the settlement, with existing built development to the north-west and south-west.

The Inspector notes the views of the local residents and Council about longer distance views and loss of a Greenfield site but from the site visit she considered the development would be viewed against a backdrop of the existing built development. Given this and that the proposal would represent a small extension to the existing built form the Inspector considered that it would not material harm the setting of the village or the character and appearance of the local area. Having regard to the direct and indirect employment opportunities which would be generated during the construction phase and that the proposal would go some way to meeting the identified need for additional housing in Burbage she concludes that it would be a sustainable form of development.

In addition, the Inspector considered the issue of loss of trees along the south western boundary and particularly the well established Common Ash which the Council considers makes a significant contribution to the landscape. She concludes that they are of low arboricultural quality and the loss of the trees and the Ash can be mitigated with replacement specimens and supplemental hedgerow planting.

Finally, the Inspector considered all other matters raised by the Council and interested parties including highway safety, impact on neighbours, continued development of Greenfield sites around the village, mix of old and new dwellings and the urban/rural balance within and around Burbage, the Village Design Statement, and the impact on wildlife habitats. However none of the issues changes her overall conclusions.

APPEALS ALLOWED

An application for the full award of costs was made on behalf of the Appellant, David Wilson Homes.

Appellant's Case

The appellant contends that the Council had acted unreasonably, the Officer making the recommendation to the Council's planning committee was qualified in respect of both planning and urban design. The appellants also referred to the Council's withdrawal of the policy basis for its 2 reasons in respect of appeal B, and stated that Policy BE1 referred to in the reason for refusal in respect of appeal A had been taken into account in granting permission in 2011 and eventually in 2012. They further stated that the Council has a record of resisting development against the advice of their officers. The appellants stated it is notable that none of the Members who made the decisions in respect of the planning applications attending the Hearing to defend those positions. They stated that the purpose of the costs regime is not punitive, it is intended to instil a sense of discipline, to prevent Members making decisions against Officer advice without sound planning reasons for rejecting a proposal. They state that no consideration was given by Members to impose a suitable condition to enable the development in respect of Appeal A to be permitted. They also note that the decision notices say the local authority has attempted to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner and whilst officers had worked with the applicants, Members did not give substance to these words.

Further comments submitted by the appellant stated that there was a need to pursue the matter of need and quite properly the appellant considered the housing position as the reason for refusal when beyond Burbage by referring

to the spatial vision for the Borough and the overarching intentions of the Framework.

Council's case

The Council refuted the claim for costs stating that it was not the case of Members seeking to maintain resistance to a scheme that had since been found to be acceptable but a genuine disagreement between Officers and Members relating to the weight to be attached to the impact of the end stop. Whilst the Development Control Manager did not take the view that the design argument was a strong one, it was not unreasonable of Members to come to a different conclusion. The matter of imposition of a condition to overcome the concerns was raised by the Inspector and the appellants have included this in their application for costs opportunistically.

With regards to Appeal B, the Council admitted that the simple maths involved indicates it would be difficult to substantiate and if the Council is required to pay costs in this case it ought not be required to pay the appellant's costs in respect of the huge expense associated with housing land supply. The Council also submitted that the proposed development would be located on a Greenfield site which local people and Members cherish. The Council considered that although the proposal would have small economic and social benefits the impact on the countryside would be disproportionately high. The test is could Members reasonably make this decision and it is considered that it is not unreasonable to expect some resistance.

Inspectors Decision

The Inspector considers the applications for costs in light of Circular 03/2009, she cites Paragraph B15 which says that planning authorities are at risk of an award of costs against them if they prevent or delay development which should clearly be permitted, and Paragraph B29 which gives examples of circumstances which may lead to an award of costs against a planning authority. Such examples include persisting in objections to a scheme, or part of a scheme, which has already been granted planning permission and not imposing conditions on a grant of planning permission where conditions could have effectively overcome the objection. Finally, she refers to paragraph B20 that states planning authorities are not bound to accept the recommendations of their Officers, however if Officers' professional or technical advice is not followed, authorities will need to show reasonable planning grounds for taking a contrary decision and produce relevant evidence on appeal to support the decision in all respects.

With regards to Appeal A, the Inspector considers that the Council did not adequately demonstrate why the layout would be harmful and no substantial evidence to support this view in terms of a formal assessment of the design merits of the scheme was put forward. As such she considers the Council has acted unreasonably as it has failed to produce relevant evidence to support the decision in all respects. Further, she considers there is evidence that the Council has persisted in objecting to development on the larger site, in addition no consideration had been given to whether or not the imposition of an appropriate planning condition would satisfy the Council's concerns in this respect. As such she considers the Council acted unreasonably by persisting in its objection and because it would have been possible to impose a condition on any approval.

With regards to Appeal B, the Inspector notes that the Council confirmed that there is an identified need within Burbage for residential development. The Council sought to pursue part of its first reason for refusal which referred to the proposed development as being unsustainable, in particular the impact of the proposed development of this Greenfield site on the character and appearance of the area, however no substantial evidence was provided in its statement or at the hearing to support this view. Having regard to the need for new housing within Burbage and the economic benefits of the proposed development the Inspector considers the Council failed to demonstrate why it considered the impact on the countryside would be disproportionately high in this case. As such she considered the Council has acted unreasonably, as it has failed to produce relevant evidence to support the decision in all respects. The Council's second reason for refusal referred to there being no residual housing requirement for Burbage. The Inspector noted the simple calculation carried out at the Hearing to show that this was not the case. However, she contends that given the wording of the first reason for refusal it was reasonable for the appellants to consider whether or not the Council had a 5 year land supply of housing land. Had the Council's position been made clear following the submission of the appellant's grounds of appeal rather than at the hearing this work could have been aborted. She therefore considers that the award of costs should include the work undertaken by the appellants in this regard.

FULL COSTS AWARDED TO THE APPELLANT

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (KP)

- 4.1 The Council has a total net budget for the administration of appeals for 2013/2014 of £154,760.
- 4.2 Costs have been awarded and are therefore payable by the Council for the appeals noted in sections 3.4 and 3.8. Costs associated with appeal #3.4 (estimated at £4,000) will be met from the existing appeals legal fees budget. Costs associated with 3.8 are expected to be in excess of £20,000 and therefore a supplementary budget request may be required to fund these costs.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS (MR)

- 5.1 None

6. CORPORATE PLAN IMPLICATIONS

This document contributes to Strategic Aim 1 of the Corporate Plan

- Creating a vibrant place to work and live.

7. CONSULTATION

None

8. RISK IMPLICATIONS

It is the Council's policy to proactively identify and manage significant risks which may prevent delivery of business objectives.

It is not possible to eliminate or manage all risks all of the time and risks will remain which have not been identified. However, it is the officer's opinion based on the information available, that the significant risks associated with this decision / project have been identified, assessed and that controls are in place to manage them effectively.

The following significant risks associated with this report / decisions were identified from this assessment:

Management of significant (Net Red) Risks		
Risk Description	Mitigating actions	Owner
None	None	

9. KNOWING YOUR COMMUNITY – EQUALITY AND RURAL IMPLICATIONS

This report is for information purposes only to draw member's attention to recent appeals lodged with the Authority and appeal decisions issued by the Planning Inspectorate. As this report is not seeking a decision it is envisaged that there are no equality or rural implications arising as a direct result of this report.

10. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

By submitting this report, the report author has taken the following into account:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| - Community Safety implications | None relating to this report |
| - Environmental implications | None relating to this report |
| - ICT implications | None relating to this report |
| - Asset Management implications | None relating to this report |
| - Human Resources implications | None relating to this report |
| - Voluntary Sector | None relating to this report |

Contact Officer: Tracy Miller ext 5809