

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE: 9TH MARCH, 2006

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL
AND ECONOMIC REGENERATION

4. APPEALS

(a) Planning Appeals Received

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00938/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 06/1197722
Appellant: Mr. P. Cronin,
Location: **Land to the rear of 9, Bradenham Place, Penarth**
Proposal: Demolish existing garage and outbuilding and construct
single dwelling.
Start Date: 25th January, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00937/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 06/1197723
Appellant: Mr. P. Cronin,
Location: **Land to the rear of 9, Bradenham Place, Penarth**
Proposal: Demolish existing garage and outbuilding and construct 2
no. town houses.
Start Date: 25th January, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00656/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 06/1197791
Appellant: Mr. R. Jones,
Location: **Barn at Gwern y Gaer Isaf, Peterston-Super-Ely**
Proposal: Conversion of barn to dwelling
Start Date: 2nd February, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01707/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 06/1197794
Appellant: Mr. & Mrs. I. Evans,
Location: **Great House Farm Barn, Llandough**
Proposal: Revised rear garden room extension
Start Date: 2nd February, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00789/OUT
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 06/1197795
Appellant: Mr. P. Denton,
Location: **Orchard Rise, 6, Penlan Road, Llandough**
Proposal: Demolition of existing dormer bungalow and construction of two new dwellings
Start Date: 2nd February, 2006

(b) Enforcement Appeals Received

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/05/0377/E
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1197012
Appellant: Mr. R. Thomas
Location: **Ashley House Stables, Sutton Road, Llandow**
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, the excavation and removal of top soil and the deposit of hardcore and builders waste to construct a hard standing
Start Date: 25th January, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/03/0598/M
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1197799
Appellant: Mr. David Williams
Location: **O.S. Field Parcel 4619 adjacent Arnold House, Barry Road, Dinas Powys**
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, erect additional buildings and structures, enlarge and extend previous buildings, site metal box containers and other similar structural items and lay a crushed and rolled stone hardstanding
Start Date: Awaiting start date (received 30/1/06)

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/00/0529/E
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1197755
Appellant: Mr. D. Jones & Mrs. G. Jones
Location: **1, The Courtyard, Michaelston Le Pit**
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, making a material change of the use of the land from use as agriculture to use as a residential garden extension to the approved curtilage of No. 1, The Courtyard, Michaelston Le Pit
Start Date: 8th February, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/01/0417/E
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1197753
Appellant: Merryn Leigh Ham
Location: **2, The Courtyard, Michaelston Le Pit**
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, making a material change of the use of the land from use as agriculture to use as a residential garden extension to the approved curtilage of No. 2, The Courtyard, Michaelston Le Pit
Start Date: 8th February, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/01/0416/E
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1197754
Appellant: Mr. Anthony John Rosser
Location: **3, The Courtyard, Michaelston Le Pit**
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, making a material change of the use of the land from use as agriculture to use as a residential garden extension to the approved curtilage of No. 3, The Courtyard, Michaelston Le Pit
Start Date: 8th February, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/01/0418/E
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1197752
Appellant: Mr. Carl Norman
Location: **4, The Courtyard, Michaelston Le Pit**
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, making a material change of the use of the land from use as agriculture to use as a residential garden extension to the approved curtilage of No. 4, The Courtyard, Michaelston Le Pit
Start Date: 8th February, 2006

L. P. A. Reference No: ENF/01/0419/E
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: APP/Z6950/C/06/1197751
Appellant: Mr. Michael J. Donnelly
Location: **Home Farm, Michaelston Le Pit**
Breach: Without the benefit of planning permission, making a material change of the use of the land from use as agriculture to use as a residential garden extension to the approved curtilage of Home Farm, Michaelston Le Pit
Start Date: 8th February, 2006

(c) Planning Appeal Decisions

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00388/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 05/1190587
Appellant: Mr. & Mrs. Jones,
Location: **Longlands Barn, Corntown Road, Corntown**
Proposal: Rear conservatory
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 25th January, 2006
Inspector: Ms. Penelope Davies
Council Determination: Officer Delegated

Summary

The Inspector stated that, although the proposed conservatory would not be unusually large or prominent and be constructed with matching materials, its outward protrusion and return gable end would unbalance the horizontal emphasis of this converted farm building and detract from its simple traditional appearance. This would result in an urbanising effect harmful to the rural qualities of the existing building and the countryside character of its surroundings contrary to the objectives of Policies ENV7 and ENV25 of the Vale of Glamorgan Unitary Development Plan and supplementary guidance relating to the conversion of rural buildings.

Comments

This is one of a number of recent decisions concerning extensions to converted barns which the Council has successfully resisted, even where such extensions are not visible from outside of the site in question.

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00369/OUT
Appeal Method: Hearing
Appeal Reference No: 05/1191107
Appellant: C. Wall,
Location: **Hazelcourt Ponds, Llysworney**
Proposal: Erection of Fishery Managers dwelling.
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 26th January, 2006
Inspector: Mr. D. N. Wilks
Council Determination: Planning Committee

Summary

The main issue concerned whether there was special justification for the dwelling which is sufficient to warrant its isolated location in the open countryside.

In considering the case seeking to justify the dwelling in the context of the fishery, which is a well established rural enterprise, the Inspector considered it necessary to apply similar functional and financial tests to those used with agricultural dwellings, as set out in TAN6. This involves assessing whether there is a clearly established need for a full-time worker to be available most of the time to support existing activities related to the proper functioning of the enterprise.

He stated that it is also necessary to check whether the enterprise is profitable and likely to remain economically viable; that no other dwellings are available locally which would be suitable; and if the siting and access are acceptable.

In considering the evidence, the inspector did not agree that there is an essential functional need for a full-time worker to be readily available on the site, for several reasons, these being: - First, for 5 months of the year the fishery is only open at weekends which must reduce the total amount of time required to be spent on the site, and activities which do continue on a regular basis, such as feeding and maintenance, do not require a lengthy or continuous presence. Second, until now the enterprise has not required a dwelling and it is difficult to see how the type of functions at the site have so changed in actual character as to justify a full-time presence. Activities such as feeding, maintenance, water testing, visitor reception, ticket issue, and dealing with the sheep are all of a relatively short term duration or are shared among several employees. Sudden emergencies in respect of the fish stock in the ponds which might be serious are unlikely as they live in a natural environment.

With regard to the financial test, the Inspector found the "so-called profit and loss accounts" submitted to be quite inadequate, and concluded that the available evidence did not show the existing enterprise to be economically viable.

Turning to other matters, the site of the proposed dwelling was seen to fall just outside the area granted planning permission for the fishery and was too conspicuous, straddling a ridge in one of the fields and having no existing screening apart from a hedgerow on its western boundary. From the B4268 road to the south and east the dwelling and its associated domestic curtilage would be seen as an intrusion into the open landscape which would adversely affect the character and appearance of the countryside. This was considered to be a substantial objection to the proposal.

The Inspector's overall conclusions were that it had not been shown that it was essential for a full-time worker to be readily available on the site or that the enterprise is economically viable; and that the dwelling would have a detrimental impact on the open character and appearance of the countryside. For those reasons the proposal could not be justified in terms of the national and local policies strictly controlling new dwellings in the open countryside.

Comments

Not only is this a satisfying decision insofar as it has upheld all elements of the Council's objections, it is also relevant in that the Inspector has made it clear that proposals for new dwellings relating to rural enterprises, even when relating to non-agricultural dwellings, should still nevertheless be considered against the tests within TAN6 relating to their essential need.

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00955/OUT
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 05/1191139
Appellant: Mr. Anthony Richards,
Location: Land to the rear of Tudor Lodge, Bonvilston
Proposal: Erection of Stables
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 26th January, 2006
Inspector: Mr. P. G. Horridge
Council Determination: Officer Delegated

Summary

The Inspector considered the main issues in this case to concern the effect of the stable building and access track on the character and appearance of the locality, having particular regard to the location of the site within the Bonvilston Conservation Area.

The Inspector noted that the Bonvilston Conservation Area includes the countryside immediately surrounding the built-up area, whose rural setting and environs are therefore important to the area's character. The proposal, however, would introduce a large new building into these environs which would be clearly visible from the main A48 road through the village, as it would be larger and more prominent than an existing green container situated further back within the field, which is already visible from this direction.

In principle, the erection of buildings for equestrian purposes is an acceptable form of development in the countryside and is specifically endorsed by Policy ENV8 of the Unitary Development Plan. However, criterion (ii) requires such development not to unacceptably affect the character and appearance of the locality, and in this case the need to meet this criterion is reinforced by the location within a conservation area.

In this respect, the building was considered to be excessive in size for its intended function, a similar conclusion having been reached by the Inspector who dealt with an earlier proposal for stables on this site, with the current proposal of similar footprint but even greater height, while having a location and orientation which would make it more prominent, particularly in views from the public highway. He thus concluded that, in view of its size, the building would be an unnecessary and dominant feature that would harm the appearance of the conservation area and the rural setting of the village, which is one of the conservation area's characteristics.

In considering the matter of access, the route of the access track was seen to be already demarcated by a line of newly-planted trees to each side. However, the Inspector stated that the construction of a new hard surface, even of grasscrete, would accentuate the suburbanisation of the field across which it runs, to the further detriment of the appearance of the conservation area.

Comments

Following on from a very recent decision on a similar proposal, and enforcement action against the new access track part-created at the site, it is now to be hoped that this will end the recent planning involvement at this property, subject to successfully ensuring compliance with the terms of the enforcement notice which has now come into effect.

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00940/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 05/1191805
Appellant: Tirion Imogen Wordley,
Location: Land at rear of 5, Roseberry Place, Penarth
Proposal: Demolition of existing one and a half storey detached garage building. Construction of detached coach house dwelling with integral garage, driveway and walled garden.
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 31st January, 2006
Inspector: Ms. Penelope Davies
Council Determination: Planning Committee

Summary

The Inspector considered the area to have a pleasant spacious character derived from the generally uniform arrangement of substantial Victorian period properties in large landscaped plots. Whilst there would be space remaining either side of the proposed dwelling, she considered its siting with a frontage adjacent to the footway and forward of the building line along this part of the street would be at odds with the prevailing arrangement of housing in the area. Even if designed to reflect the style of nearby housing, the proposed dwelling would demonstrably interrupt the open aspect of this part of the street scene and in its small plot it would appear as a cramped and incongruous form of development. She thus concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Penarth Conservation Area.

The proposal would also result in a large flank wall on the boundary with the neighbouring property's rear garden, as well as an elevation across the full width of the garden on the proposed boundary with the existing house. Given the existing high standards of spaciousness, she considered that the proximity and massing of the development would also be overly dominant and oppressive for the occupants of Nos. 4 and 5 Roseberry Place with consequent adverse effects on their living conditions.

Comments

This decision substantiates the Council's objection to the development of large gardens within the Penarth Conservation Area which, both individually and cumulatively, can cause substantial harm to the open character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

L. P. A. Reference No: 04/01966/FUL
Appeal Method: Hearing
Appeal Reference No: 05/1190190
Appellant: Mr. and Mrs. D. Harris,
Location: Old Froglands, Llanmaes
Proposal: Extension to existing barn conversion to provide leisure facilities and accommodation ancillary to the main residential property
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 8th February, 2006
Inspector: Mr. S. B. Wild
Council Determination: Officer Delegated

Summary

The main issues in this case were the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area, the suitability of the design of the elevations and the possible use of the extension as a separate dwelling unit.

In this case the building had already been converted from a barn to a range of facilities ancillary to the main dwelling. The Inspector considered such work to generally appear to accord with the objectives of the current policy. The present proposal, however, would result in a significant increase in the size of the building. Whilst there would be some visual benefit from the removal of the dilapidated structures on the end of the building, the sheer scale of this extension would be out of keeping with that of the original building, and be unacceptably harmful to the rural character and appearance of the area.

Turning to the second issue, he noted that the treatment of the south and east elevations would contain windows and panels which are not typical of traditional rural buildings in the area. These elevations could, however, be altered to an agreed design such that this is an issue which could be overcome by the imposition of suitable conditions.

On the third issue, the Inspector shared the Council's concerns that the range of facilities proposed for inclusion in the extension contained all the normal facilities for a separate dwelling. Although accepting that it is the appellant's intention to use the extension for purposes ancillary to the main dwelling, nevertheless he considered it would be extremely difficult for the Council to enforce such limitations on any subsequent occupiers. Separate kitchen facilities were, in his view, an element which would enable the extension and parts of the existing barn to function as an entirely separate unit. He considered, however, that the kitchen facilities could be omitted and covered by conditions.

Comments

Not only is this another good example of the Inspectorate's support for the council's opposition to extensions to barn conversions, but this has also demonstrated that there is substance in the council raising concern about the manner in which extensions, particularly in the countryside, can be utilised as entirely self-contained accommodation due to presence of kitchens and other facilities.

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00749/FUL
Appeal Method: Hearing
Appeal Reference No: 05/1191692
Appellant: Mr. and Mrs. J. Stanley,
Location: 16, Rhodfa Felin, Cwm Barri, Barry
Proposal: Dormer loft conversion to provide bedroom/study with shower room
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 13th February, 2006
Inspector: Mr. Hywel Jones
Council Determination: Officer Delegated

Summary

The appeal property was noted to lie within a modern residential estate which, despite variations in house-types and design feature, displays a broad architectural unity. The main issue in this case thus concerned the effect of the proposed addition on the character and appearance of the area.

The envisaged dormer addition would extend over virtually the whole of the rear plane of the dwelling's main roof and, while there was no dispute that it would not be readily visible from Rhodfa Felin, it would be seen from several public vantage points in the locality. The Inspector considered that its size and shape would mean that the flat-roofed dormer would be a prominent feature, at odds with the character of the host building and that of the surrounding area. Even from relatively distant and oblique views, the Inspector considered the addition would be readily noticeable as an incongruous element within the generally consistent plane of the roofscape, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. Thus, the scheme would conflict with UDP Policies, and also be contrary to the Government's aim of achieving good design as set out in Planning Policy Wales Technical Advice Note 12: Design. Although the appellants drew attention to 3 similar dormer additions nearby, they appeared to the Inspector to represent notable exceptions to the established character of the area. In any event, he stated that the presence of other harmful development, none of which has been granted express planning permission, does not justify allowing this proposal, nor does the fact that other roof enlargements may be undertaken nearby in the future by the exercise of permitted development rights. The Inspector was also mindful that in allowing this appeal it would be difficult for the Council to resist similar schemes in the future, the cumulative effect of which would radically alter the appearance of the area.

Bearing in mind the set-back of the main facade of the proposed dormer and the present extent of overlooking from first-floor windows, the Inspector was satisfied that any effect of the scheme on neighbours, in terms of its physical presence or loss of privacy, would not have justified withholding permission had he found the scheme acceptable in relation to the main issue.

Comments

The provision of dormer windows on residential properties, modern or otherwise, is a significant issue at present within the Vale, with a substantial number of such applications submitted. In this respect, this decision is particularly important in providing support from the Inspectorate to the objectives of attaining good design, and ensuring that any such dormers, particularly by reason of their size and scale, do not cause demonstrable harm to the established character of such developments.

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/01138/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 05/1192132
Appellant: O2 (UK) Limited,
**Location: Land on electricity sub station (WPD Primary 56-105),
North Road, Cowbridge**
Proposal: Removal of existing WPD telecommunications pole and
replacement with a new 15m column, with integrated
antenna and WPD antenna together with equipment
cabinets and associated ancillary equipment
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 13th February, 2006
Inspector: Robert Gardener
Council Determination: Planning Committee

Summary

The main issue concerned whether the proposal would either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cowbridge with Llanblethian Conservation Area.

The immediate setting of the proposed pole would be that of the sub-station and the adjoining small industrial complex. In the context of these, together with a number of unsightly street furniture poles and overhead cables, the Inspector did not consider that the pole would necessarily appear out of place. However, that immediate setting was seen to be only obvious from relatively close views. Because of its height and the bulk of the shrouded antennas above any of the existing structures, the pole would be prominent and conspicuous when seen from farther afield, particularly the High Street to the south alongside the imposing Town Hall and further along North Road, all within the designated conservation area. In those views, which also take in Grade II Listed Buildings, the pole would be seen as a high, alien feature which would not be materially screened by existing but lower trees nearby.

In this respect, the Inspector considered that, rather than simply appearing as part of the existing clutter of commercial apparatus, it would increase the detrimental impact which that clutter already has. In any event, it is necessary to have regard to the character of the conservation area as a whole not simply that part on which the appellants rely.

He thus concluded that the proposal would have a harmful effect and consequently would not meet either of the statutory conservation area tests or the UDP policies identified, including the final criterion of Policy COMM 4.

Although there were other considerations to weigh in the balance, it was unlikely in this position that other effective mitigating measures could be taken, painting the monopole would not alter its impact significantly, while the appellant points out that it is also the minimum operational height possible.

The need for the installation to improve the service coverage is not disputed nor does it seem that there are existing facilities which might be used. Indeed, the appellant's analysis of alternative sites suggested the possibility of others, with the appellant doubtful that these would be effective or acceptable. That, however, was seen to be less than conclusive. In conclusion, therefore, while recognising that the Assembly Government wishes to facilitate the growth of new and existing telecommunications systems, that is not to be at the expense of the environment or in disregard to the statutory conservation area duty which would be the case here.

Comments

Given the sensitivities associated with telecommunications apparatus within Conservation Areas, this decision is particularly welcomed given its support for the council's objections to the physical impact of such a mast. The decision is also important insofar as it demonstrates the importance in considering the physical impact of such proposals not only on the specific location and limited locality, but on the overall character of the conservation area.

L. P. A. Reference No: 05/00367/FUL
Appeal Method: Written Representations
Appeal Reference No: 05/1193041
Appellant: Mrs. K. Jacobs,
Location: **Land adjacent to Pen-y-Lan Cottage, Llysworney**
Proposal: New three bedroomed one and a half storey dwellinghouse
Decision: **DISMISSED**
Date: 13th February, 2006
Inspector: Robert Gardener
Council Determination: Planning Committee

Summary

The main issues concerned whether the proposal would (a) either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area; (b) adversely affect the residential amenity provided by existing neighbouring properties, and/or (c) be detrimental to highway safety.

The appeal site was seen to form part of the garden of Pen-y-Lan Cottage, located alongside the B4268 - the principal road through the village - with the Inspector agreeing with the Council's assessment that the site is highly prominent on the approaches to and from the village and conspicuous within the conservation area.

The group of buildings surrounding the site, as noted in the Council's appraisal, were agreed to contribute significantly to the character of the settlement and its conservation area at this point. Equally significant was the space around and between the buildings themselves, with the Inspector sharing the Council's assessment that the environs of Pen-y-Lan Farm are amongst those whose quality and characteristics determine the rural character of the village and require protection, and concluding that the proposed plot contributes importantly to the loose, open nature of the development pattern based around the cottage and its neighbours.

Within this context, he considered the dwelling would sit quite centrally in the plot between the cottage and White Gables and remove the characteristic and important openness which currently exists. As such, it would detract from the spacious setting of the cottage and its neighbours and largely block the visual connection between the village and the farm behind. The fact that the house would be a relatively low building and set down into the plot did not change that conclusion.

In his opinion, the proposal would thus neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, representing an inappropriate form of infilling which would not respect the layout or setting of existing notable buildings or consequently protect the historic and environmental qualities of the area.

In terms of the impact on amenity, the Inspector considered the potential for oblique overlooking to be not significant and while the outlook from the cottage would be considerably less open than is currently the case, he did not consider the proposal to be unacceptably overbearing. The Council's concern over the increased activity and disturbance which might follow, particularly from use of the access drive and parking/manoeuvring area proposed alongside the cottage was considered unlikely to detract significantly from the living conditions afforded by Pen-y-Lan Cottage, particularly given its proximity to the B4268.

Finally, the B4268 was seen to be a busy road carrying both cars and heavy vehicles. There was considered to be no justification for applying a standard lower than the national requirements. Visibility to the left, into the village, was extremely poor due to the adjacent stone shed and by the vertical and horizontal alignment of the carriageway, and the situation was aggravated by the junction of Tyle Mali with the B4268 close to and opposite the farm and cottage access. This situation was considered to be potentially hazardous and the access inadequate to serve the further dwelling proposed.

Comments

This is a fine decision which not only offers full support for the Council's conservation area appraisal's assessment of the essential characteristics of the area which policy should seek to protect, but also supports the objection in terms of its adverse impact on highway safety, which should preclude development of this site in the future on its own.

.

(d) Enforcement Appeal Decisions Received

None received.

(e)

April 2005 – March 2006 Appeal Statistics

		Determined Appeals			Appeals withdrawn /Invalid
		Dismissed *	Allowed	Total	
Planning Appeals (incl. tree appeals)	WR	32.5	6.5	39	1
	H	9	5	14	4
	PI	1	0	1	1
Planning Total		42.5 (79%)	11.5 (21%)	54	
Enforcement Appeals *	WR	1	1	2	1
	H	0	0	0	1
	PI	0	0	0	3
Enforcement Total		1	1	2	
All Appeals	WR	33.5	7.5	41	2
	H	9	5	14	5
	PI	1	0	1	4
Combined Total		43.5 ** (78%)	12.5 ** (22%)	56	11
This reporting period		8	0	8	0

* 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.

(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>
25 th July, 2006	PUBLIC INQUIRY (PLANNING & ENFORCEMENT) The Manse Llanbethery <i>Change of use of agricultural land to residential; unauthorised structure.</i>
In abeyance	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