



Date: 28 May 2019

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 13/05/19]

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 13/05/19]

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 13/05/19]

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

TECHNOLOGY IMPLICATIONS [Officer Initials PW Date 13/05/19]

12. There are no technology implications arising from the report

HEALTH IMPLICATIONS [Officer Initials RS Date 13/05/19]

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

EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS [Officer Initials IH Date 13/05/19]

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	Decision Type	Overtured
18/01185/FUL	Erection of detached two storey dwelling with detached garage (being resubmission of application 17/02696/FUL refused on 02/01/2018). at Land Rear Of, 10 - 11 St Edwins Close, Dunscroft, Doncaster	Appeal Dismissed 09/05/2019	Hatfield	Delegated	No

REPORT AUTHOR & CONTRIBUTORS

Mr I Harris
01302 734926

TSI Officer
ian.harris@doncaster.gov.uk

PETER DALE
Director of Regeneration and Environment