

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE: 5TH APRIL, 2006

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL
AND ECONOMIC REGENERATION

4. APPEALS

(a) Planning Appeals Received

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01038/FUL
Appeal Method: Hearing
Appeal Reference No: 06/1197940
Appellant: Mrs. S. Edwards,
Location: The Rise, Slaughter Lane, Llysworney
Proposal: Removal of Condition No. 4 on approval CORD 85/63s
18947
Start Date: 17th February, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00411/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 06/1197945
Appellant: Mr. Nicholas Stavrakis,
Location: 23, Elfed Avenue, Penarth
Proposal: Two storey extension
Start Date: 16th February, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01167/FUL
Appeal Method: Hearing
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198020
Appellant: Mr. Khaled Ali,
Location: 24, Broad Street Parade, Barry
Proposal: Amend Condition No. 2 of planning approval
02/00017/FUL to allow opening hours of: - Monday to
Thursday 10:00 to 24:00 Friday and Saturday - 10:00 to
2:00 Sunday - 10:00 to 23:00
Start Date: 24th February, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01185/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198055
Appellant: Ms. Norma Johnson,
Location: 8, Rhodfa'r Mor, Rhoose Point
Proposal: Erect boundary fence
Start Date: 1st March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01210/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198108
Appellant: Ms. Estelle Peck,
Location: Byeways, Marcross
Proposal: Two storey extension and new cesspit
Start Date: 7th March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01581/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198202
Appellant: Mr. Marc White et al,
Location: Land to the rear of Dryslwyn, Penwyllt, Kiva Koti, Turkey Oak House, Wits End and Heddfan, Llanmaes
Proposal: Change of use to domestic garden
Start Date: 15th March, 2006

(b) Enforcement Appeals Received

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/05/0249/M
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1198208
Appellant: Mr. & Mrs. Bradbury
Location: Land rear of Dryslwyn, Llanmaes
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, changing the use of the land from open countryside to a residential garden extension to Dryslwyn, Llanmaes
Start Date: 15th March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/05/0249/M
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1198204
Appellant: Mr. & Mrs. Turner
Location: Land rear of Heddfan, Llanmaes
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, changing the use of the land from open countryside to a residential garden extension to Heddfan, Llanmaes
Start Date: 15th March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/05/0249/M
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1198206
Appellant: Mr. & Mrs. Fairgrieve
Location: Land rear of Kiva Koti, Llanmaes
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, changing the use of the land from open countryside to a residential garden extension to Kiva Koti, Llanmaes
Start Date: 15th March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/05/0249/M
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1198205
Appellant: Mr. & Mrs. Stevens
Location: **Land rear of Merimbula, Llanmaes**
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, changing the use of the land from open countryside to a residential garden extension to Merimbula, Llanmaes
Start Date: 15th March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/05/0249/M
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1198207
Appellant: Dr. Morris
Location: **Land rear of Penwyllt, Llanmaes**
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, changing the use of the land from open countryside to a residential garden extension to Penwyllt, Llanmaes
Start Date: 15th March, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/05/0249/M

Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1198203
Appellant: Mr. Marc White
Location: **Land rear of Turkey Oak, Llanmaes**
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, changing the use of the land from open countryside to a residential garden extension to Turkey Oak, Llanmaes
Start Date: 15th March, 2006

(c) Planning Appeal Decisions

L. P. A. Reference No: 00/00024/FUL
01/00806/FUL
Appeal Method: Public Local Inquiry
Appeal Reference No: 00/1046866 and 01/1074017
Appellant: Minimix Ltd.,
Location: **Ewenny Quarry, Ewenny**
Proposal: a) Amendment to Condition No. 6 of planning permission reference 98/01109/FUL to permit an annual output not exceeding 300,000 tonnes ; and
b) Removal of Condition No. 13 (application 98/01109/FUL) - Daily limit on numbers of loaded vehicles leaving site
Decision: **WITHDRAWN**
Date: 16th February, 2006

Comments

The outstanding appeals in respect of Ewenny Quarry have finally been withdrawn by the appellants following the completion of the legal agreement in respect of the amended consent for quarrying at the site.

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01404/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 05/1193591
Appellant: Mr. D. E. Jones,
Location: **Yr Ysgubor, St. Lythans, Wenvoe**
Proposal: Extension of existing dwelling to form granny annexe
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 20th February, 2006
Inspector: Ms. Penelope Davies
Council Determination: Officer Delegated

Summary

The main issue concerned the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Notwithstanding the alterations that have taken place, the Inspector considered the existing building to have simplistic qualities and a modest form commensurate with its rural context. By allowing views of the open countryside beyond, the gap between the existing garage and the dwelling was noted to make an important contribution to this setting.

The proposed annexe, however, would consolidate the existing built form obscuring the open view and its scale and massing would result in a development of significant bulk. All of this, she considered, would have an unacceptable urbanising effect harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building and the countryside character of its surroundings. Moreover, this harm would be readily apparent in views from the nearby public footpath. She thus concluded that the proposal would conflict with the objectives of Policy ENV7 and supplementary guidance relating to the conversion of rural buildings.

Comments

This appeal decision provides another example of the Inspectorate's support for the Council's policies which seek to prevent insensitive alteration or extension of rural buildings converted into dwellings.

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00665/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 05/1192316
Appellant: Mr. J. Williams,
Location: **23, Falcon Road, Barry**
Proposal: Proposed amendment to approval 04/00359/FUL to raise the main roof of the extension by 600mm
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 22nd February, 2006
Inspector: Mr. T. J. Morgan
Council Determination: Planning Committee

Summary

See summary for joint enforcement appeal in Section (d).

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00630/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 05/1194501
Appellant: Mr. Dennis O'Neill,
Location: **The Bowers, Coldbrook Road West, Barry**
Proposal: Alteration of conditions to remove restrictions on business activities
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 24th February, 2006
Inspector: Mr. A. H. Vaughan
Council Determination: Officer Delegated

Summary

The Inspector noted that the ancillary building in question has many of the features of an independent dwellinghouse, including separate services, a letter box, doorbell, entrance way and physical separation from the main dwelling. The appellant confirmed that a business use has taken place on the site in relation to therapy sessions, but its intensity is such that it is claimed to be incidental to the principal use of the site for residential purposes. The Inspector noted that the conditions now under appeal are confined to the ancillary building.

The Inspector considered, in light of the representations made by interested persons, that the business use at the appeal site has generated a level of activity in this neighbourhood that has not gone unnoticed, principally related to increased traffic and indiscriminate highway car parking. He also considered this activity has been such that it has harmed the living conditions of neighbours in breach of Policy EMP3 of the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan.

Although accepting that the appealed conditions do not prevent the incidental business use continuing in the main dwelling, the Inspector took the view that the conditions are effective in restricting this use to the main building and preventing a spread of the business use to the ancillary building. For these reasons he considered the conditions to be reasonable, appropriate and necessary, serving to protect the amenity of neighbours in a residential area from potentially increased commercial activity within the planning unit.

Comments

This decision offers support for the Council's; specific imposition of a condition restricting business use of an approved annexe, but demonstrates the need to ensure that all conditions imposed on consents meet the tests of reasonableness laid down by case law.

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00381/OUT
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 05/1193940
Appellant: Mr. & Mrs. C. Wason,
Location: **Rear of 77, South Road, Sully**
Proposal: Outline application for new dwelling
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 27th February, 2006
Inspector: Ms. Penelope Davies
Council Determination: Officer Delegated

Summary

Relative to the built development that surrounds much of the appeal site, the Inspector considered that the proposal would be compatible with the character and appearance of the area and it would be consistent with national objectives that seek the more efficient use of previously developed land. However, all of this, she stated, must be weighed against the impact of the proposal on residential amenity.

In this respect, even if single storey in height, because of the close relationship with nearby properties, she considered the proposal would result in significant opportunities for intervisibility between dwellings and gardens that she regarded to be unneighbourly. Moreover, the long driveway passing close to windows and gardens of the neighbouring and host dwellings would result in unacceptable disturbance from associated traffic that by reason of its proximity, could not be satisfactorily mitigated by landscaping treatment.

Comments

This decision not only offers support against inappropriate 'backland' development, accessed to the side of dwellings to the front, but also insofar as it seeks to ensure the protection of the amenity of existing and proposed residents against insensitive overlooking and loss of privacy caused by such development

L. P. A. Reference No:	05/01272/FUL
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	05/1194971
Appellant:	Mr. and Mrs. Griffiths,
Location:	37, Ffordd Cwm Cidi, Barry
Proposal:	First floor garage extension
Decision:	DISMISSED
Date:	2 nd March, 2006
Inspector:	Ms. Penelope Davies
Council Determination:	Officer Delegated

Summary

The Inspector saw that Nos. 33, 35 and 37 are evenly staggered along this sloping drive and, notwithstanding the diversity of building styles in the area generally, form a distinct group of buildings set apart with consistent gaps at first floor level between properties. By reason of its height and proximity to the neighbouring and host dwellings, however, the Inspector considered that the proposal would harmfully interrupt this visual cohesiveness resulting in a visually cramped and incongruous form of development.

Although the proposed extension would be constructed in matching materials and would reflect the existing roof form of the garage, the hipped roof would, by reason of its increased height, stand out as an unpleasant contrast with the largely gable form of the neighbouring properties. The overall result would be a building with an uncomfortable visual relationship with the group of buildings within which it would sit, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene.

In terms of the impact on living conditions, the Inspector stated that, although the proposal would project forward of No. 35 it would not do so significantly and given the orientation of buildings, it would have a minimal impact on the provision of light to the adjacent dwelling. Although the height and proximity of the proposed side wall might increase the sense of enclosure for the neighbouring occupant, given the angle involved, she did not regard the effects to be so serious as to warrant dismissing the appeal for this reason.

Comments

This decision emphasises the importance of ensuring that any new development successfully integrates itself into the streetscene, and offers support for the protection of established character against insensitive alteration and extension.

L. P. A. Reference No:	05/01520/FUL
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	05/1195145
Appellant:	Mrs. Morgan,
Location:	Efail Roper, Treerhyngyll
Proposal:	Alterations and extensions to existing dwelling
Decision:	DISMISSED
Date:	6 th March, 2006
Inspector:	Ms. Penelope Davies
Council Determination:	Officer Delegated

Summary

The Inspector noted that the proposal would include two 2-storey extensions, a first floor addition, a large single-storey conservatory and an increase in ridge height of the existing building. The scale of the development would, she stated, be reflected in a substantial increase in volume and mass of built form that would fundamentally change the size of the existing dwelling to the extent that it would be disproportionate.

As a consequence, she concluded that the proposal would harmfully intrude into the rural character of the countryside and the surrounding landscape which is designated as having special qualities. Furthermore, in this elevated location close to the road and a public footpath, these unacceptable effects would be readily apparent. She also concluded that any improvements to the appearance of the existing dwelling would not need to rely on an unacceptable scale of development.

Comments

This provides yet further support for the objectives of Policy ENV7 which seeks to preclude 'disproportionate' extensions to dwellings in the countryside. The Inspector's conclusions in respect of the purported improvements to the appearance of the dwelling - as submitted by the appellant - are particularly noteworthy, given that such claims are often made in support of significant remodelling of dwellings in the countryside.

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01460/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 05/1194893
Appellant: Mr. Phillip Walker,
Location: Building to the rear of 20, Plymouth Road, Barry Island
Proposal: Continued use as dwelling
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 9th March, 2006
Inspector: Ms. Penelope Davies
Council Determination: Officer Delegated

Summary

Irrespective of what might have previously existed as amenity space serving No. 20 Plymouth Road, the Inspector noted that a consequence of the proposal would be severely restricted outdoor space for the occupants of these flats. There would be little outlook and the available area for occupants to sit out or provide facilities for clothes drying or refuse storage would be inadequate.

Taken with the direct overlooking of the proposed amenity space for the appeal property that would occur from windows on the rear of No. 20 and the opportunity for intervisibility arising from the close relationship between these properties, she concluded that the proposal would result in cramped and unacceptable living conditions for occupants with the likelihood that the amenity space provided would not be used. That there might be no net gain in accommodation from proposals to relinquish a flat in No. 20, did not overcome the harm from this unsatisfactory arrangement.

Comments

In dismissing this appeal, the Inspector has been entirely consistent with a previous decision affecting the building. It is expected that this decision will finally bring to an end the involvement of the planning department in the use of this outbuilding as a dwelling, which has been the subject of two planning appeals and an appeal against a certificate of lawfulness. Any failure to comply with the extant Enforcement Notice will be rigorously pursued by the Enforcement Section.

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01228/FUL
Appeal Method: Public Local Inquiry
Appeal Reference No: 05/1190862
Appellant: Fitz Project Management,
Location: Longlands Quarry, Ewenny
Proposal: Variation of Condition No. 21(b) of approval 05/00472/FUL - to omit the words - for a temporary period expiring on 7th July, 2006 and at the end of that temporary period blasting shall revert to a maximum instantaneous charge of 45kg.
Decision: **ALLOWED** (* but decision of Council 'upheld')
Date: 10th March, 2006
Inspector: Mr. A. H. Vaughan
Council Determination: Planning Committee

Summary

As background information for Members, following input from the appointed Inspector, both parties accepted at the Inquiry that a longer period of monitoring would be appropriate for the Maximum Instantaneous Charge (MIC) of 85 kg. The Inspector considered that this would permit agreement to be reached on the methodology required together with agreed locations for this task. Results should subsequently determine the appropriateness, or otherwise of the use of an 85kg MIC. In line with this agreement, he therefore modified the appealed condition to extend the temporary period until 30th September, 2007.

The discussion then focused on the reversion limit of the lower rated MIC currently stated as 45kg in the relevant condition. Following extensive discussion, it was agreed that the 45kg limit was a cautious MIC weight limit. Officers also accepted that an increase to an MIC of 65kg for a modern emulsion type explosive charge would be unlikely to breach the 95 percentile limit for Peak Particle Velocities (PPV) of 6mm/sec over any six month period, with an upper PPV of 6 mm/sec for individual events which should not be exceeded (MTAN1).

Accordingly, the Inquiry's principal issue was narrowed to "whether it would be appropriate to increase the reversion value of the MIC, as set out in the appealed condition, above the agreed increase to 65kg MIC".

The appellants submitted that an 85kg MIC would be an appropriate size for use in this location with these strata, being an economic charge to mix and place, also providing the mechanical force needed for breakaway and primary crushing. However, they accepted that they do not want to use an MIC that would breach the PPV values set out in MTAN1.

In assessing a midway requirement for a reversion limit, a 75kg MIC was considered appropriate by the appellants. Whilst not having the force of the 85kg MIC, they considered it would be a more usable and economic MIC than the 65kg option, despite the acknowledged suitability of this lower charge for operational use.

The Inspector stated that his concern in the determination of this appeal was to ensure that whatever level of MIC is set in the revised condition as a reversion value, it permits the quarry to work both efficiently and effectively and that the living conditions of neighbours is not materially harmed.

In considering such matters, he noted that the effects of blasting at the quarry have been monitored at various locations, and that he was presented with tables for predicted PPV's, recorded PPV's and regression graphs to a logarithmic scale for PPV's. he noted that there was a demonstration of 95% confidence for predicted values, but that these were slanted towards a PPV of 8.5mm/sec, not the 6mm/sec required by MTAN1. Assessing the tables against MTAN1 values for the nearest property (Golden Mile Public House), at about 300m distance, the 65kg MIC predicted a 95 percentile PPV of 5.9mm/sec, whereas the 75kg and 85kg MIC's exceed the MTAN1 values.

Despite many of the measured values falling within MTAN1 guidelines, the Inspector stated that he had not been convinced that he should accept these results as a means of determining the reversion limit for the amended planning condition. In his opinion, there had not been sufficient agreement between the parties on the recording mechanisms and the methods used for taking recordings which has produced uncertainty and a lack of confidence in the measured values.

Conversely, the predicted values present a precautionary approach that would serve to protect the living conditions of neighbours, in the longer term, who could suffer material harm from blasting operations. For these reasons, he concluded that he would include a reversion value of 65kg for the MIC in the varied planning condition.

The Inspector noted the submissions from the appellants regarding the other control mechanism in the conditions which link with MTAN1 for PPV values and also the distance limitations that these conditions impose for specific MIC's. However, he did not accept that these provide a reason to set aside an upper MIC limit for general blasting procedures. Instead, he considered that the variation of the appealed condition would align with the Circular, and would provide a clear route for enforcement. It should also ensure that blasting operations comply with MTAN1, without imposing an unnecessary or unreasonable burden on the economics of the enterprise. Moreover, at the end of the trial period, if results determine that an 85kg MIC is an appropriate limit, it is open to the appellant to apply for planning permission to change the condition.

He thus allowed the appeal and varied the condition to extend the time limitation of the trial period to 30th September, 2007, while also increasing the value of the reversion limit for the MIC to 65kg.

Comments

The initial deliberations at the beginning of the Inquiry were lengthy, and instigated by the Inspector. Insofar as the appellants accepted the principle of an extension to the temporary period, officers chose to fight the appeal on the reversion limit, given that reversion to 65kg would be acceptable according to MTAN1 limits and maintained the requirement that any change to such limits would have to be the subject of a new application in the future. This has therefore protected the Council's position, and ensured that any future applications can both be supported by sufficient monitoring results and open to public consultation.

Although technically allowed, it should be noted that the Inspector has agreed with the Council's submission insofar as the narrowed remit of the appeal is concerned. The decision therefore upholds the authority's stance at Inquiry, and will be recorded as such in the core indicators.

L. P. A. Reference No:	05/00466/FUL
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	05/1194841
Appellant:	Ely Rangers AFC.,
Location:	Station Road East, Wenvoe
Proposal:	Installation of floodlighting to existing football pitch
Decision:	DISMISSED
Date:	13 th March, 2006
Inspector:	Ms. Penelope Davies
Council Determination:	Officer Delegated

Summary

The Inspector noted that floodlighting of sports facilities is not a category identified as being inappropriate within a green wedge. However, even if partly screened by trees, she considered the height of the proposed floodlights and their cumulative scale as a closely ordered group of structures would have a material impact on the openness of this part of the green wedge.

Unlike the existing low rise recreational facilities and street apparatus nearby, they would be taller more substantial structures too distanced from righting columns on the main road or pylons to be considered in the same context. However infrequently operated or controlled, either by technical specification or through planning conditions, because of the prevailing rural context, some illumination from the floodlights would be noticeable at night reinforcing their incongruous urban connotations. She therefore found that the proposal would not be acceptable in scale, form, impact or character to its rural location which at present maintains the openness of the green wedge.

While taking into account the need for the proposal to meet the requirements of the Football Association of Wales and national and local policies that seek to encourage sport and recreation, nevertheless she did not consider that these considerations either individually or cumulatively outweighed the harm to the green wedge.

Comments

Given its location within the green wedge, this decision is welcomed, and demonstrates the need to ensure that development, even when not 'inappropriate', nevertheless protects the open nature of such areas of countryside.

(d) Enforcement Appeal Decisions Received

L. P. A. Reference No:	ENF/05/0318/M
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	C/05/1192211
Appellant:	Mr. J. Williams,
Location:	23, Falcon Road, Barry
Breach:	Unauthorised construction of a two storey extension to the side of the property that is some 600mm higher than the original ridge line.
Decision:	DISMISSED
Date:	22 nd February, 2006
Inspector:	Mr. T. J. Morgan

Summary

S78 / Ground (a) Appeal - Planning Merits

The main issue in the appeals concerned the effect of the height of the two storey extension on the character and appearance of the locality and the street scene.

The Inspector noted that the appeal property lies at the end of a cul-de-sac and that the two storey extension is a visible feature in the street scene being readily seen from Palmerston Road at the top of the embankment and Langlands Road to the north. The extension was seen to rise above the ridge line of the existing house by some 600mm, with its roof appearing as a quite separate element to the main roof of the appeal property rather than the matching or subservient element that is to be expected in proposals for extensions. As a result, he did not consider its impact could be considered negligible and that it gives an unbalanced appearance to the resulting extended property, which is accentuated by the fact that it is one of a semi-detached pair of properties.

Notably, the Inspector stated as follows: - "I appreciate that the appeal site does not lie within a conservation area or other sensitive location, but there is still a need to ensure good design and protection of the character and appearance of residential locations such as this. ... I am convinced that it is not an example of good design and causes unacceptable visual harm to the street scene and the character and appearance of the locality"

Appeal on Ground (g) - Time Limits

The Inspector acknowledged that the extension has been completed, that the roof space accommodates a family member, and that the house will continue to be occupied while the necessary and substantial works are undertaken.

In these circumstances, and bearing in mind that weather conditions at this time could hamper works, he considered a period of 12 weeks to be too short to ensure compliance and that 20 weeks is a reasonable period. To this extent the appeal under ground (g) succeeded.

Comments

Given that this decision relates to joint planning and enforcement appeals, this is a fine decision insofar as it demonstrates that, just because development has been undertaken without permission, it does not negate the need for such new development to be of a high quality design and reflect the character of the property and locality. The Inspector's statement, quoted above, to that effect is therefore considered to be particularly welcomed.

(e) April 2005 – March 2006 Appeal Statistics

		Determined Appeals			Appeals withdrawn /Invalid
		Dismissed *	Allowed	Total	
Planning Appeals (incl. Tree appeals)	WR	40.5	6.5	47	1
	H	9	5	14	4
	PI	2	0	2	3
Planning Total		51.5 (82%)	11.5 (18%)	63	
Enforcement Appeals *	WR	2	1	3	1
	H	0	0	0	1
	PI	0	0	0	3
Enforcement Total		2	1	3	

All Appeals	WR	42.5	7.5	50	2
	H	9	5	14	5
	PI	2	0	2	6
Combined Total		43.5 ** (78%)	12.5 ** (22%)	66	13
This reporting period		9	0	9	2

* 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)

(f) List of Forthcoming Hearings and Public Inquiries

<u>DATE</u>	<u>SITE AND PROPOSAL/ BREACH</u>
16 th May, 2006	HEARING (ENFORCEMENT) Molchenydd Farm, Treoes <i>Construction, without benefit of planning permission, of a barn and polythene growing tunnels</i>
7 th June, 2006	HEARING Pizza Island, Broad Street Parade, Barry <i>Amendment to opening hours</i>
25 th July, 2006	PUBLIC INQUIRY (PLANNING & ENFORCEMENT) The Manse Llanbethery <i>Change of use of agricultural land to residential; unauthorised structure.</i>
TBA	PUBLIC INQUIRY Land allocated for employment, Rhose Point, Vale of Glamorgan <i>Outline application for residential development.</i>

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