



13th November 2018

To the Chair and Members of the Planning Committee

APPEAL DECISIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The purpose of this report is to inform members of appeal decisions received from the planning inspectorate. Copies of the relevant decision letters are attached for information.

RECOMMENDATIONS

2. That the report together with the appeal decisions be noted.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR THE CITIZENS OF DONCASTER?

3. It demonstrates the ability applicants have to appeal against decisions of the Local Planning Authority and how those appeals have been assessed by the planning inspectorate.

BACKGROUND

4. Each decision has arisen from appeals made to the Planning Inspectorate.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

5. It is helpful for the Planning Committee to be made aware of decisions made on appeals lodged against its decisions.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED OPTION

6. To make the public aware of these decisions.

IMPACT ON THE COUNCIL'S KEY OUTCOMES

7.

	Outcomes	Implications
	Working with our partners we will provide strong leadership and governance.	Demonstrating good governance.

RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

8. N/A

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS [Officer Initials HL Date 01/11/18]

9. Sections 288 and 289 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, provides that a decision of the Secretary of State or his Inspector may be challenged in the High Court. Broadly, a decision can only be challenged on one or more of the following grounds:
- a) a material breach of the Inquiries Procedure Rules;
 - b) a breach of principles of natural justice;
 - c) the Secretary of State or his Inspector in coming to his decision took into account matters which were irrelevant to that decision;
 - d) the Secretary of State or his Inspector in coming to his decision failed to take into account matters relevant to that decision;
 - e) the Secretary of State or his Inspector acted perversely in that no reasonable person in their position properly directing themselves on the relevant material, could have reached the conclusion he did;
a material error of law.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS [Officer Initials BC Date 01/11/18]

10. There are no direct financial implications as a result of the recommendation of this report, however Financial Management should be consulted should financial implications arise as a result of an individual appeal.

HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS [Officer Initials CR Date 01/11/18]

11. There are no Human Resource implications arising from the report.

TECHNOLOGY IMPLICATIONS [Officer Initials PW Date 01/11/18]

12. There are no technology implications arising from the report

HEALTH IMPLICATIONS [Officer Initials RS Date 01/11/18]

13. It is considered that there are no direct health implications although health should be considered on all decisions.

EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS [Officer Initials RL Date 01/11/18]

14. There are no Equalities implications arising from the report.

CONSULTATION

15. N/A

BACKGROUND PAPERS

16. N/A

CONCLUSIONS

17. Decisions on the under-mentioned applications have been notified as follows:-

Application No.	Application Description & Location	Appeal Decision	Ward
17/02679/FUL	Proposed 2 bedroom detached bungalow with off-street parking at 42 St Georges Avenue, Dunsville, Doncaster, DN7 4DR	Appeal Dismissed 12/10/2018	Hatfield
16/02589/FUL	Proposed conversion and extension of existing dwelling to form six apartments. at 63 Woodfield Road, Balby, Doncaster, DN4 8HB	Appeal Allowed 11/10/2018	Balby South
17/03035/OUT	Outline application for 1 residential dwelling on approx. 0.09ha of land, matters of access and layout only. at Lime House, Chapel Lane, Sykehouse, Goole	Appeal Dismissed 10/10/2018	Norton And Askern
17/02822/FUL	Erection of one block of semi-detached dwellings at Land Rear Of The Shoes, Low Road, Conisbrough, Doncaster	Appeal Dismissed 25/10/2018	Conisbrough

REPORT AUTHOR & CONTRIBUTORS

Miss Rebecca Larder
01302 734603

TSI Officer
rebecca.larder@doncaster.gov.uk

PETER DALE
Director of Regeneration and Environment