

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE: 4<sup>TH</sup> MAY, 2006

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
AND ECONOMIC REGENERATION

4. APPEALS

(a) Planning Appeals Received

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01642/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198111  
Appellant: Mr. H. Adams,  
**Location: Cross Farm, Pentre Meyrick, Vale of Glamorgan**  
Proposal: Retention of partially built garage/gamesroom  
Start Date: 22<sup>nd</sup> March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01012/OUT  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198338  
Appellant: John Andrew Lamb & Owen Jones,  
**Location: Land adjacent to 32, Robert Street, Barry**  
Proposal: New House  
Start Date: 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01561/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198407  
Appellant: Mr. and Mrs. Bennet,  
**Location: No. 9, Merthyr Dyfan Road, Barry**  
Proposal: Loft conversion  
Start Date: 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01230/FUL  
Appeal Method: Public Local Inquiry  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198462  
Appellant: A. N. & M. J. Quick,  
**Location: The Greendown Inn, St. Georges Super Ely**  
Proposal: Conversion and alteration of existing buildings to create  
five dwellings  
Start Date: 5<sup>th</sup> April, 2006

---

(b) Enforcement Appeals Received

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/02/0373  
Appeal Method: Public Inquiry  
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1198244  
Appellant: Elaine Robinson  
**Location:** **The Garlands (Talbot Liveries), Walterston, Llancarfan**  
Breach: Unauthorised change of use of the land and buildings from a single approved use as a stables, riding school and livery yard to a mixed use which now includes an element of residential by way of the siting of a caravan for residential purposes  
Start Date: 16<sup>th</sup> March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/05/0742/M  
Appeal Method: Public Inquiry  
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/  
Appellant: Mr. J. Raymond  
**Location:** **Gwern Y Gedrych, Peterston Super Ely**  
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, constructing a two storey side extension, two storey rear extension, single storey front extension and a second storey on an existing single storey annexe on the land  
Start Date: 16<sup>th</sup> March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/04/0422/M  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1198154  
Appellant: Michael Charles Pritchard & Madetop Ltd  
**Location:** **r/o Tudor Cottage, Llanbethery**  
Breach: Siting, without the benefit of planning permission, a steel box container, outside of the residential curtilage of Tudor Cottage and within the open countryside  
Start Date: 22<sup>nd</sup> March, 2006

---

(c) Planning Appeal Decisions

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01246/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 05/1195596  
Appellant: G. Peros,  
**Location:** **No. 1, Dingle Close, Barry**  
Proposal: Retaining wall and new footpath and steps to side and rear of existing pool  
Decision: **DISMISSED**  
Date: 21<sup>st</sup> March, 2006  
Inspector: Ms. Penelope Davies  
Council Determination: Officer Delegated

## Summary

The Inspector noted that works have been undertaken at the site, including alterations to the ground levels, and that the proposal sought the retention of some of the development. She stated that the lawfulness of the proposed development or any other development, and the question of whether an Enforcement Notice has been complied with, were not matters that fell to be considered in this appeal. She also noted the earlier dismissed appeal for development including a patio and balcony at a higher level than the current proposal.

Looking at the proposals, the Inspector saw that the proposal would result in a footpath and steps raised significantly higher than the level of the adjoining garden at No. 2 Dingle Close and within close proximity to the boundary with it. Owing to this, there would be clear and uninterrupted views over much of the neighbouring garden. Although acknowledging that there is an existing degree of intervisibility between the properties concerned, nevertheless she considered views would be elevated, direct and, as a consequence, extremely intrusive. Moreover, persons using the footpath and steps would be visible to the adjoining residents thereby accentuating the perception of being overlooked.

Overall, the loss of privacy for the neighbouring occupants would be substantial resulting in unacceptable harm to their living conditions, which she was not satisfied could be sufficiently mitigated through such means as new boundary enclosure.

## Comments

This property has now been the subject of two planning appeals and an extant Enforcement Notice, the latter of which has also seen successful prosecution action taken against the owner for non-compliance. It is therefore hoped that this matter will be resolved in the near future through enforced compliance with the terms of the Enforcement Notice.

---

L. P. A. Reference No:	05/01356/FUL
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	05/1195949
Appellant:	Anthony Dimech,
<b>Location:</b>	<b>No. 75, Laburnum Way, Penarth</b>
Proposal:	Two storey lounge/dining room, bedroom, bathroom extension
Decision:	<b>DISMISSED</b>
Date:	23 <sup>rd</sup> March, 2006
Inspector:	Ms. Penelope Davies
Council Determination:	Officer Delegated

## Summary

The Inspector considered that the significant depth of the proposed 2-storey extension combined with its height would result in a development of substantial bulk within close proximity to the boundary with No. 73. The outlook for the occupiers of that property would subsequently be onto a large solid wall and, because of the orientation of the latter property to the north of the appeal site, she considered there would be unacceptable overshadowing of part of the rear garden and loss of light to windows on the rear elevation.

All of the above were concluded to result in an oppressive and unneighbourly form of development that would be harmful to the living conditions of the adjoining residents.

She also noted that the proposal would obscure views of the open aspect to the rear, and that in public views the proposed extension would be seen as a significant intrusion of built form that would compromise the generally spacious feel of the area. Although these effects were not so serious to warrant withholding planning permission for that reason alone, it added weight to her conclusions.

## **Comments**

This successful appeal demonstrates the importance of ensuring that the depth of two-storey rear extensions are minimised to ensure that they take full account of the impact on neighbouring properties.

---

## **2006/07 Appeal Decisions**

L. P. A. Reference No:	04/01800/OUT
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	05/1196382
Appellant:	Philip Jones Properties Unltd,
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Land at junction of Heol Y Fro and Heol Pentre'r Cwrt, Llantwit Major</b>
Proposal:	Outline application for the construction of a convenience store (Class A1 shop use)
Decision:	<b>DISMISSED</b>
Date:	5 <sup>th</sup> April, 2006
Inspector:	Mr. A. H. Vaughan
Council Determination:	Planning Committee (contrary to officer recommendation)

## **Summary**

The Inspector noted that this part of the housing estate radiates from a roundabout where four geometrically similar access roads lead outwards, each eventually terminating in a cul-de-sac, and that, at the roundabout, on the inner quadrant of each housing area, there is undeveloped ground. These areas, one of which includes the appeal site, were seen to be grassed and varying in size, yet, in combination and symmetry he considered they make a significant contribution to the openness and character of what is otherwise a fairly compact and intensively laid out housing area.

In considering the visual impact of the proposals, the Inspector stated that should the appeal site be developed as proposed it would detract from this symmetry at entry to the estate, and mar the pleasant open aspect here, seriously harming the character and appearance of the present housing layout. This, he concluded, would breach Policy ENV25 of the Unitary Development Plan which requires new development to complement or enhance the local character of buildings and open spaces.

The Inspector noted the history of the development of the housing estate, the earlier planning permission, and the original intention for the incorporation of on-site retail facilities. He also acknowledged, in line with both Unitary Development Plan and national policy, how this would contribute to sustainability in providing a service that would potentially reduce the requirements for off-site travel. In addition, he stated that he had taken account of the ownership of the site and the rights of the owner to prevent public access together with the permitted erection of fencing that could change the appearance of the area. He also noted the perceived need for an on site retail facility.

In spite of the above, however, the Inspector concluded that he found nothing in these matters that overrides his consideration of the serious harm that would arise to the character and appearance of this core part of the housing estate should the site be developed as proposed.

Turning to the S106 obligation and the contribution towards a community woodland, this was seen to offer some support to the project in providing such a facility. It did not, however, set aside his consideration of the main issue determined in line with current development plan policy.

The Inspector also took account of the matters raised in the reasons for refusal concerning traffic generation, noise and disturbance. Whilst he considered there would be some increase attributable to the project, nevertheless he did not consider that these alleged impediments would have been significant, had he found the project acceptable in terms of character and appearance.

### **Comments**

Given the historical acceptance of retail facilities as part of the planned housing development, this is an excellent decision in which the Inspector has placed substantial weight on the manner in which the open site now contributes to the character and appearance of the locality. Indeed, he has referred to it as a 'core part' of the housing estate.

It is notable that the Inspector has not essentially raised objections to the generation of traffic, noise or disturbance, or any matters associated with potential for any increase in crime or related matters. He has also not concluded - as would be expected - on whether any development at all on the site would be permissible.

It is considered, however, that he has provided a strong indication that the essential prerequisite for any new development in the vicinity must be the protection of the contribution that the land provides to the housing estate as a whole. Any future proposals for the land, must therefore primarily be assessed against such criteria.

---

L. P. A. Reference No:	05/00825/FUL
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	05/1195694
Appellant:	Mr. N. Kensett
<b>Location:</b>	<b>No. 22 Redlands Road, Penarth</b>
Proposal:	Loft conversion re-submission due to non conformity of original dimensions.
Decision:	<b>DISMISSED</b>
Date:	6 <sup>th</sup> April, 2006
Inspector:	Mr. T. Morgan
Council Determination:	Officer Delegated

### **Summary**

This planning appeal was considered jointly with an appeal against the service of an Enforcement Notice (referred to below). The main issue in the appeals concerned the effect of the dormer on the character and appearance of the parent building and its setting.

The Inspector noted that planning permission for a rear dormer had been granted by the Council under ref: 03/00144/FUL, which allowed a dormer to be constructed 4m in width and with a depth of 2.7m. The height of front elevation of the dormer would have been 1.5m with a set back from the eaves of 1.35m. In considering the approval, he said that it appeared to him that the permitted dormer would have been subservient to the parent building and, as such, have an acceptable impact in terms of scale and appearance on the character and appearance of that building.

The dormer that has been built, however, was seen to be set back only 0.5m from the eaves with a front elevation 1.9m in height and a depth of 3.55m. As a result, he considered it occupies a substantial amount of the rear roof area and appears as a dominant rather than a subservient feature. He thus concluded that the scale and mass of the dormer gives the building an unbalanced appearance that unacceptably harms its character and appearance and that of the terrace in which it is contained.

He further noted that the extension could be seen from viewpoints on the public highway and stands out as an obtrusive element at odds with its setting, while 'having no doubt' that its effect on the parent building and the character and appearance of the locality mean that it is an example of poor design in conflict with both local policy and national guidance.

## Comments

Given that this decision relates jointly to an enforcement appeal also, this is an excellent decision, which will now be followed by monitoring to ensure compliance with the terms of the Notice. It is also considered to be of particular importance in providing the Council with evidence of the Inspectorate's support for large, poorly proportioned rear dormers, which are the subject of significantly increasing numbers of applications.

---

### (d) Enforcement Appeal Decisions Received

L. P. A. Reference No:	ENF/05/0627/M
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	C/05/1196210
Appellant:	Edwin Lawson
<b>Location:</b>	<b>No. 49 Plas Taliesin, Penarth Marina</b>
Breach:	The erection of a balcony on the first floor of a west facing elevation of a terraced property
Decision:	<b>DISMISSED</b>
Date:	22 <sup>nd</sup> March, 2006
Inspector:	Mr. A. Nixon

## Summary

In determining the appeal and the deemed application for planning permission, the Inspector considered the main issue to concern the implications of the balcony for the living conditions and privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

The Inspector noted that the balcony, which is at first floor level, is accessed from the internal accommodation by French doors and is large enough to accommodate a circular table and chairs, with room also for people to stand and lean on the enclosing railings.

He also saw that it overlooks adjoining enclosed private amenity areas at close quarters and affords close range views into the internal living accommodation of neighbouring properties. The presence of trellis work and planting along the flanks of the balcony only partly reduces the extent of this overlooking.

Whilst the viewing distance towards the windows and amenity areas of properties opposite is greater, he also considered that occupiers of these properties have suffered a diminution of their living standards because of increased and more apparent activity arising from the balcony's presence.

Each of these matters led him to conclude that the development fails to adequately respect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and thus does not accord with Unitary Development Plan Policy ENV25 and attendant supplementary planning guidance.

The Inspector made it clear that he had considered carefully the fact that there are many other balconies within this marina housing area. While stating that he saw no objection to the visual impact of the structure itself, which he considered reflects the maritime context of the marina location, nevertheless such similar examples did not give rise to the same close range effects on privacy as identified in this case. The existence of these other balconies did not therefore amount to a convincing argument for the retention of the appeal development, given the adverse consequences of its presence for the living conditions of others.

### **Comments**

This is a fine decision which has fully vindicated the enforcement action taken against the balcony in question, while also demonstrating that, although balconies can be acceptable within a Marina environment, such development must always ensure that it does not cause unacceptable harm to the privacy and amenities of nearby properties.

---

L. P. A. Reference No:	ENF/05/0081
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	C/05/1195693
Appellant:	Mr. N. Kensett
<b>Location:</b>	<b>No. 22 Redlands Road, Penarth</b>
Breach:	Dormer not built in accordance with approved plans (03/00144/FUL).
Decision:	<b>DISMISSED</b>
Date:	6 <sup>th</sup> April, 2006
Inspector:	Mr. T. J. Morgan

### **Summary**

See summary for joint planning appeal above.

---

(e) April 2005 – March 2006 Appeal Statistics

The core indicators for the year indicate that the percentage of determined appeals that upheld the authority's decision was:

- i) **82.6 %** in respect of planning application decisions; and
- ii) **75%** in respect of Enforcement Appeals.

See the associated Appeals Annual Report within the agenda for overall Appeal statistics for 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2005 to 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2006.

(f) April 2006 – March 2007 Appeal Statistics

		Determined Appeals			Appeals withdrawn /Invalid
		Dismissed *	Allowed	Total	
Planning Appeals (incl. tree appeals)	WR	2	-	2	
	H	-	-	-	
	PI	-	-	-	
Planning Total		2	-	2	
Enforcement Appeals *	WR	1	-	1	
	H	-	-	-	
	PI	-	-	-	
Enforcement Total		1	-	1	
All Appeals	WR	3	-	3	
	H	-	-	-	
	PI	-	-	-	
Combined Total		3	-	3	

(g) List of Forthcoming Hearings and Public Inquiries

<u>Date</u>	<u>SITE AND PROPOSAL/ BREACH</u>
16 <sup>th</sup> May, 2006	<b>HEARING (ENFORCEMENT)</b> Molchenydd Farm, Treoes <i>Construction, without benefit of planning permission, of a barn and polythene growing tunnels,</i>
7 <sup>th</sup> June, 2006	<b>HEARING</b> Pizza Island, Broad Street Parade, Barry <i>Amendment to opening hours</i>
25 <sup>th</sup> July, 2006	<b>PUBLIC INQUIRY (PLANNING &amp; ENFORCEMENT)</b> The Manse Llanbethery <i>Change of use of agricultural land to residential; unauthorised structure.</i>

**PLEASE NOTE:** The Rhoose Point appeal below has been taken out of abeyance and, at present, is now scheduled to be heard on the following date(s): -

22<sup>nd</sup>/ 23<sup>rd</sup> May, 2006

**PUBLIC INQUIRY**

Land allocated for employment, Rhose Point, Vale of Glamorgan  
*Outline application for residential development.*

15<sup>th</sup> August, 2006  
(provisional date)

**PUBLIC INQUIRY (ENFORCEMENT)**

Gwern Y Gedrych, Peterston Super Ely  
*Unauthorised extensions.*

12<sup>th</sup> September, 2006  
(Provisional date)

**PUBLIC INQUIRY (ENFORCEMENT)**

The Garlands, (Talbot Liveries), Walterston, Llancarfan  
*Unauthorised change of use of the land and buildings from a single approved use as a stables, riding school and livery yard to a mixed use which now includes an element of residential by way of the siting of a caravan for residential purposes.*

Background Papers

Relevant appeal decision notices and application files (as detailed above).

Contact Officer - Steve Ball, Tel: 01446 704690

Officers Consulted:

Head of Planning and Transportation.

ROB QUICK  
DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
AND ECONOMIC REGENERATION

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE: 4<sup>TH</sup> MAY, 2005

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
AND ECONOMIC REGENERATION

4. APPEALS

ANNUAL REPORT FOR FINANCIAL YEAR 2005/2006:  
PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to advise Members of the Council's performance in respect of all appeals dealt with in relation to planning and enforcement during the course of the last financial year.
2. In addition, for information purposes, a schedule of all appeal decisions received, is provided as an Appendix to the report.

Appeal Statistics : Appeals Received

3. Between 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2005 and 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2006, the Section received a total of **109** appeals, of which **80** related to planning appeals made primarily under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and **29** were appeals against the service of Enforcement Notices (Section 174).
4. As shown in Table 1 below, the number of appeals has increased significantly from last year (up 47% in total (planning - 35.5%; enforcement - 93%)), and is also considerably higher than the 2003/04 figures, which themselves were the highest for a number of years.

APPEALS RECEIVED	2003/2004			2004/2005			2005/2006		
	Plan	Enf	Total	Plan	Enf	Total	Plan	Enf	Total
Written Reps	54	6	<b>60</b>	39	8	<b>47</b>	61	20	<b>81</b>
Hearings	17	1	<b>18</b>	18	3	<b>21</b>	16	2	<b>18</b>
Public Inquiry	8	5	<b>13</b>	2	4	<b>6</b>	3	7	<b>10</b>
<b>No. of Appeals received</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>109</b>

Table 1: Breakdown of Appeals Received, including comparison with last two years.

5. Although the number of appeals has increased significantly, it is notable that the number of Hearings and Inquiries has remained relatively static. Instead, the majority of appeals were dealt with by way of written representations, which is perhaps indicative of a rise in applications for household extensions and minor development involving a small number of new dwellings.

## Appeal Statistics : Appeal Decisions

6. The Welsh Assembly Government has a nationally-set **Core Indicator** for Appeals (Indicator Ref. **PLA03**) which aims to "measure the quality of the Local Authority's decision making in relation to both planning applications and enforcement issues".
7. This is the first year for which such a core indicator is to be officially measured (although last year's results were calculated using the core indicators), with such guidance requiring the following figures to be produced:
  - (a) The number of appeals that were determined during the year, and
  - (b) The percentage of these determined appeals that upheld the Authority's decision in relation to:
    - (i) Planning application decisions
    - (ii) Enforcement Notices
8. In respect of the first figure, during the last financial year, **70** appeals were determined, with **66** relating to planning application decisions (including advertisements, Lawful Use, Conservation Area Consent etc.) and **4** to Enforcement Appeals.
9. In addition, there were a total of **17** appeals in which the appeal was not determined by an Inspector, either as a result of the withdrawal of the appeal by the appellant, the withdrawal of an Enforcement Notice by the Council, or as a result of the appeal being declared invalid.
10. The statistical breakdown of appeal decisions received is given below in Table 2.

		Determined Appeals		
		Dismissed	Allowed	Total
Planning Appeals	WR	43.5	6.5	50
	H	9	5	14
	PI	2	0	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>54.5** (82.6%)</b>	<b>11.5 (17.4%)</b>	<b>66</b>
Enforcement Appeals	WR	3	1	4
	H	0	0	0
	PI	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>

Table 2: Breakdown of Appeal Decisions by appeal method.

\* Includes all determined appeals where the decision of the Council was 'upheld' (e.g. where an Enforcement appeal succeeds in part, but the Notice is upheld) in accordance with guidance for National Core Indicators.

\*\* Split decision on 18 High Street, Cowbridge shown as 0.5 for clarity purposes.

Note: Longlands Quarry PLI - shown as dismissed for purposes of core indicators, since decision of authority was 'upheld' at appeal (albeit that permission was 'allowed' with a varied temporary permission)

11. The above table thus indicates that, for the Core Indicators set nationally, the percentage of determined appeals that upheld the authority's decision was:
- (a) **82.6 %** in respect of planning application decisions; and
  - (b) **75%** in respect of Enforcement Appeals.
12. In comparing the last two years, it is notable that the high level of success in both planning and enforcement appeals has been maintained, with last years results of 82.5% and 75% respectively being almost identical. Given the increase in the number of planning appeals determined during the year (up from 57 last year to 66 this year), this is considered to be a significant achievement.

Year	Received	Withdrawn	Decided	Allowed
2000-2001	679	110	628	245 (39%)
2001-2002	708	92	601	246 (41%)
2002-2003	755	57	705	267 (38%)
2003-2004	858	50	703	256 (36%)
2004 - 2005	1,013	61	900	303 (34%)

Table 3: Planning Inspectorate Statistics for Planning Appeal decisions in Wales for last five financial years.

13. As can be seen from Table 3 above, the performance of the Vale of Glamorgan Council continues to compare very favourably to the recent trend in Wales over the last five years. While the national figures have generally shown a national average trend of around 37% appeals allowed, the Vale's figures have been sustained at their current high level, to a point where only 17.4% of planning appeals are allowed, a figure considerably better than the national average.
14. Although the new indicators do not allow for comparisons in respect of all appeals, nevertheless for internal purposes it is worth noting Table 4 below, which identifies the continued improvement in performance over the course of the last five years.

	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06
Appeals determined	63	59	68	69	70
Allowed	21 (33%)	17 (29%)	17 (25%)	13 (19%)	12.5 (18%)
<b>Dismissed</b>	<b>42 (67%)</b>	<b>40 (68%)</b>	<b>48 (71%)</b>	<b>56 (81%)</b>	<b>57.5 (82%)</b>
Part Allowed: Dismissed	-	-	3 (4%)		
Written Reps	43	42	51	48	54
Hearings	17	8	11	16	14
Public Inquiry	3	9	7	5	2

Table 4: Year-on-Year Comparison, incl. breakdown of Decisions by method (all appeals).

15. For Members information, a list of all appeal decisions received, divided by appeal method, is attached as Appendix A to this report.

#### Appeal Statistics : Costs Decisions

16. During the course of the last financial year, the Council has made one application for an award of costs against appellants, which related to the following site:

**Salt Barn, St. Athan** A FULL award of costs was awarded to the Council against the appellant, who pursued his appeal to a Public Inquiry 'without reasonable prospect of success', while also failing to accord with the Procedural Rules.

Officers are presently pursuing the appellant for payment of the Council's costs through the High Court, the appellant having previously failed to agree or pay such costs.

17. No applications for costs have been made against the Council during the last financial year.

#### Comment

18. During the course of the last financial year, the number of appeals has reached new heights, with some 109 appeal received in total. The impact of such an increase in the number of appeals has been particularly marked during the last six months, during which time 71 appeals have been received (65% of total).
19. As Members will be aware, the appeals procedure rules require that targets for submission of appeal documentation are met in time, with no opportunity for flexibility. In this respect, it remains particularly notable that the section has ensured that 100% of statements, questionnaires and notifications have been submitted in accordance with procedural requirements, despite the unprecedented level of new appeals received in the last financial year.
20. During 2004/05, the Council's 82.5% success rate in planning appeals meant that we could proudly claim to be No. 1 in Wales insofar as appeal success results go (Planning Officers Society for Wales Figures). Faced with such a significant workload, it is thus commendable that the high degree of appeals success has been able to be maintained.
21. As ever, continuing efforts will be made to ensure that the excellent appeals performance is maintained.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) That the content of the above report be noted.
- (2) That the report be referred to the Economy and Environment Scrutiny Committee and Community Liaison Committee for information purposes.

Reasons for Recommendations

- (1) The report is for noting.
- (2) For information purposes.

Background Papers

Appeals Register, relevant appeal decision notices and application files.

Contact Officer - Steve Ball, Tel: 01446 704690

Officers Consulted:

All relevant Chief Officers have been consulted on the contents of this report.

ROB QUICK  
DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
AND ECONOMIC REGENERATION