

Cherwell District Council

Planning Committee

18 April 2019

Appeals Progress Report

Report of Assistant Director of Planning and Economy

This report is public

Purpose of Report

This report aims to keep members informed upon applications which have been determined by the Council, where new appeals have been lodged. Public Inquiries/hearings scheduled or appeal results achieved.

1.0 Recommendations

The meeting is recommended:

- 1.1 To accept the position statement.

2.0 Report Details

2.1 New Appeals

18/01644/F – Sycamore House, Shepherds Close, Weston On The Green, OX25 3RF – Erection of building to form 1-bed dwelling, on the siting of the previously demolished barn, with courtyard garden and dedicated parking space

18/00034/F - Former Little Chef, Part Of A34 By Weston On The Green, Weston On The Green, Oxford, OX25 3QQ - Erection of a new building to provide a drive thru bakery (Use Class A1) and a sandwich shop (Use Class A1) plus a compound building, retention of the existing car parking, landscaping and all other associated works. Construction of a drive thru access lane in association with the use of the former Little Chef building as a drive thru coffee shop (Use Class A1)

18/00848/F – Streamways, 8 Rectory Close, Wendlebury, OX25 2PG - Erection of new detached dwelling with integral garage

18/01193/OUT – Highlands, 48 Bucknell Road, Bicester, OX26 2DG - OUTLINE: The demolition of an existing bungalow and proposed development of 4no. apartments with external works and parking

18/01734/F – 13 Longford Park Road, Banbury, OX15 4FU – RETROSPECTIVE – Brick wall with pier caps

18/01926/F – Greene House, Brill Road, Horton Cum Studley, OX33 1BZ - Erection of timber garage and workshop (alternative scheme to development approved under application ref. 17/01894/f, comprising higher ridge line, increased length of building and eaves height to approved and insertion of 4no rooflights to east-facing roof elevation) (existing unauthorised)

2.2 Appeals in progress

17/01962/F OS Parcel 9635 North East Of HM Bullingdon Prison, Widnell Lane, Piddington - Appeal by Mr H.L Foster against the refusal of Planning Permission for the Material change of use of land to use as a residential caravan site for 6 gypsy families, each with two caravans, including improvement of access and laying of hardstanding.

Method of determination: Public Inquiry

Key Dates

Start Date: 04.09.2018 **Inquiry Date:** 26.03.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

17/02384/OUT - OS Parcel 9100 Adjoining And East Of Last House, Adjoining And North Of Berry Hill Road, Adderbury – Appeal by Hollins Strategic Land LLP against the refusal of Planning Permission for Outline planning permission for up to 55 dwellings with associated landscaping, open space and vehicular access off Berry Hill Road.

Method of determination: Public Inquiry

Key Dates

Start Date: 11.12.2018 **Inquiry Date:** 03.09.2019(tbc) **Decision:** Awaited

18/00278/F Land Adj To West Cottages, Bicester Road, Stratton Audley. Appeal by Stonebridge Investments against the refusal of Planning Permission for erection of detached dwelling house including demolition of existing single garage.

Method of determination: Written Reps.

Key Dates:

Start Date: 26.10.2018 **Statement Due:** 30.11.2018 **Decision:** Awaited

18/00350/F – The Dower House, Church Road, Weston On The Green, OX25 3QP – appeal by Mr & Mrs A and P Doyle against the refusal of Planning Permission for Alterations, extensions to and conversion of existing timber frame garage and store to form one dwelling (revised scheme of 17/01865/F)

Method of determination: Written Reps.

Key Dates:

Start Date: 22.01.2019 **Statement Due:** 26.02.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

18/00920/F - Corble Farm, Piddington, Aylesbury, HP18 9XB – Appeal by Mr and Mrs S Amies against the refusal of Planning Permission for Provision of a glazed link between the existing farmhouse and the existing barn - Re-submission of 17/00285/F

Method of determination: Written Reps.

Key Dates:

Start Date: 04.03.2019 **Statement Due:** 08.04.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

18/00921/LB - Corble Farm, Piddington, Aylesbury, HP18 9XB – Appeal by Mr and Mrs S Amies against the refusal of Listed Building Consent for

Provision of a glazed link between the existing farmhouse and the existing barn

Method of determination: Written Reps.

Key Dates:

Start Date: 04.03.2019 **Statement Due:** 08.04.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

18/01074/F Stonelea, School Lane, Great Bourton, Banbury

OX17 1QY. Appeal by Mr and Mrs Martin against the refusal of Planning Permission for Two dwellings with new shared access from School Lane.

Method of determination: Written Reps.

Key Dates:

Start Date: 07.12.2018 **Statement Due:** 11.01.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

18/01113/F - Motor Fuel Ltd, Bloxham Service Station, South Newington Road, Bloxham, Banbury, OX15 4QF – Appeal by Motor Fuel Group - New recessed forecourt canopy lights – Retrospective

Method of determination: Written Reps.

Key Dates:

Start Date: 26.02.2019 **Statement Due:** 05.03.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

18/01203/F – The Oxfordshire Inn, Meadow Walk, Heathfield, Kidlington, OX5 3FG – Appeal by Investfront Ltd against the refusal of Planning Permission for Demolition of existing function hall and redevelopment of the site to provide 2no detached dwellings

Method of determination: Written Reps.

Key Dates:

Start Date: 21.01.2019 **Statement Due:** 25.02.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

18/01248/F – Heathfield Cattery, Heathfield, Kidlington, OX5 3DX – appeal by Mr Paul Jarvis against the refusal of Planning Permission for Alteration and conversion of cattery building to form a single detached dwelling house.

Method of determination: Written Reps.

Key Dates:

Start Date: 23.01.2019 **Statement Due:** 27.02.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

18/01332/F - Land West Of M40 Adj To A4095, Kirtlington Road, Chesterton – Appeal by Mr C Smith and Mr R Butcher - Change of use of land to use as a residential caravan site for 3 gypsy families, each with two caravans and an amenity building; improvement of existing access, construction of driveway, laying of hardstanding, installation of package sewage treatment plant and acoustic bund

Method of determination: Public Inquiry

Key Dates:

Start Date: 29.01.2019 **Inquiry date:** TBC **Decision:** Awaited

18/01432/Q56 - Agricultural Barn, Oak Tree Farm, Tadmarton Road, Bloxham – Appeal by Mr P Davenport against the refusal of Prior Approval for Change of use of barn to 1no dwelling house and associated operational development.

Method of determination: Written Reps.

Key Dates:

Start Date: 20.02.2019 **Statement Due:** 27.03.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

18/01436/F – Land Adjacent and West of Roba, Camp Road, Upper Heyford – appeal by Sharon Haddy & Mandy Borton against the refusal of Planning Permission for Erection of three residential dwellings.

Method of determination: Written Reps.

Key Dates:

Start Date: 18.01.2019 **Statement Due:** 22.02.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

18/01490/F - Manor Farm Cottage, Church Lane, Charlton On Otmoor, Kidlington, OX5 2UA. Appeal by David and James Aubrey Calcutt against the refusal of Planning Permission for Erection of building to replace existing outbuilding, the erection of a new glazed link, alterations to another existing building, and their conversion to form one single bedroom dwelling with private amenity area.

Method of determination: Written Reps.

Key Dates:

Start Date: 07.12.2018 **Statement Due:** 11.01.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

18/01891/F – 2 Grimsbury Drive, Banbury, OX16 3HL. Appeal by Mrs H Beckett against the refusal of Planning Permission for first floor side extension.

Method of determination: Householder (Fast Track)

Key Dates:

Start Date: 12.02.2019 **Decision:** Awaited

2.3 Forthcoming Public Inquires and Hearings between 18 April and the 23 May.

None

2.4 Results

Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State have:

- 1. Dismissed the appeal by Mr N Carter for Erection of 2no detached 3 bedroom dwellings and associated car parking (4 spaces) (revised scheme of 17/01255/F). 41 Easington Road, Banbury, OX16 9HJ – 18/00875/F (Delegated)**

This appeal related to refusal of planning permission to erect 2 No. detached 3 bedroom dwellings and associated car parking in the rear garden of 41 Easington Road, Banbury.

The Inspector considered that the main issues were the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of future and neighbouring occupiers.

The appeal site is located on Easington Road in Banbury, a residential area of the town which predominantly hosts semi-detached and terraced two-storey houses, fronting onto broadly straight, formally laid out streets.

The Inspector found that the construction of two dwellings in the rear garden of the property would be at odds with the prevailing linear pattern of development in the area and would not be read as part of Easington Road as it would have no active frontage with the road. Furthermore, the massing and siting of the two storey buildings would appear conspicuous and dominant

when viewed from public vantage points and that this would cause harm to the sylvan and verdant character of the area.

The Inspector recognised that the two dwellings would have limited garden space, however as there are no amenity space standards adopted locally and given the close proximity to recreation space, the garden space was considered to be adequate. The Inspector also found that there would not be significant harm to existing or future occupiers with regard to a loss of outlook or sunlight.

The Inspector considered that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and that the benefits of the proposal would be limited given the small scale of the scheme and would therefore not outweigh this harm and thus the appeal was dismissed.

2. Dismissed the appeal by Mr J Kent-Baguley for the proposed Sub-division of Existing 4 Flats into 7 Individual Self - contained Units (Part-retrospective). 107 Middleton Road, Banbury OX16 3QS - 18/00228/F (Delegated)

This appeal related to refusal of full planning permission (18/00228/F) for the proposed Sub-division of Existing 4 Flats into 7 Individual Self - contained Units (Part- retrospective). 107 Middleton Road, Banbury an existing end terrace building within the Grimsbury Conservation Area. The application was refused the grounds of the development resulting in an unacceptably poor living environment for potential occupants and the development having a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Grimsbury Conservation Area; contrary to the policies of the Cherwell Development Plan. The Inspector considered that the main issues were:

- a) whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Grimsbury Conservation Area (CA), and
- b) the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of future occupants, with particular regard to internal space.

In respect of the impact of the Conservation Area (CA), the Inspector noted the Conservation Area's (CA) significance as lying in its exemplification of a 19th century freehold estate, and that the site building, a non-designated heritage asset was prominently sited within the CA and made a positive contribution to the CA.

The Inspector agreed with the Council's position that the proposals would result in an intensification of the use of the site. The proposed parking spaces for the development would replace a grassed garden area to the rear. The Inspector considered that garden space was an important element of the CA's character, and that some of and as such the proposal would unacceptably undermine the verdant and spacious rear garden character of the area. Further that the proposed seven off-road parking spaces would result in car parking overly dominating the appearance of the side and rear of the site.

The Inspector further noted the lack of bin storage provision within the scheme, giving some weight to the Council's Planning and Waste Management Design Advice. On this matter the Inspector concluded that it

had not been conclusively demonstrated that refuse management for the proposed development would work effectively 'on the ground'. Accordingly, the proposal is likely to result in unacceptable bin clutter arising from the proposed seven households, around the appeal building.

Concluding on the issue of the impact on the CA the Inspector stated that the public benefits arising from the scheme did not outweigh the great weight given to the conservation of the CA and the harm identified to its significance with the development failing to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA; and on that basis, it would conflict with saved Policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Policy ESD15 of The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, Part 1.

With regard to future amenity of occupants, the Inspector noted that the proposals were inadequate in a number of ways including: inadequate bathroom sizes, inadequate kitchen facilities and that the proposals would not provide adequate lobby protection off the single stairwell, to achieve a safe place to live. In concluding on this matter the Inspector considered that the development would not provide acceptable living conditions contrary to the provisions of Saved Policy C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Policy ESD15 of The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, Part 1.

On the basis of the above, the appeal was dismissed. The appeal was for largely retrospective works and in the light of this, the unauthorised works are being pursued by the Council's Planning Enforcement Team.

3. Dismissed the appeal by Stonebridge Investments for Erection of detached dwelling house including demolition of existing single garage. Land Adj To West Cottages, Bicester Road, Stratton Audley – 18/00278/F (Delegated)

The application was for the erection of a single detached dwelling in the side garden of an end of terrace property. The site was in the conservation area and adjacent to a row of properties which are locally listed.

The inspector considered the proposal was within the built limits of the village contrary to the Council's view. However as the village is a category C village, Policy villages 1 only allows for infill and conversion. As the site was situated at the end of a row of terrace properties with open fields to the other side, the inspector agreed with the Council that the development did not meet the definition of infill as defined in the local plan i.e. A small gap in an otherwise continuous built up frontage. The proposal was therefore in conflict with policy ESD1 and policy villages 1 which seeks to restrict new developments in category C villages to manage growth in a sustainable manner.

The inspector also agreed with the council that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area due to its overall siting, scale and form.

Finally the proposal would result in the existing dwelling losing its off-street parking. In this respect the inspector noted other properties relied on on-street parking and the small increase in on-street parking would not unduly impact on highway safety.

4. Allowed the appeal by Mr B Bennett for Change of use to convert existing agricultural building into two dwelling houses. Barn At Wooden Hill Farm, Barford Road, Bloxham, OX15 4LP - 18/01144/Q56 (Delegated)

This appeal related to the refusal of a prior approval application (Part 3, Class Q) for the change of use and building operations to convert a modern agricultural barn into two dwellinghouses.

The Inspector considered that the main issue was whether the proposed alterations would go beyond the permissible building operations that could reasonably be considered necessary to enable the building to function as a dwellinghouse.

The structural integrity of the building was not disputed. The Inspector considered that all four of the external walls of the existing structure would be substantially retained, with insulation being undertaken as internal works to the building. In addition, the Inspector noted that steel portal framed buildings are not a suitable form of building for conversion under Class Q of the GPDO.

The Inspector noted that the proposed works involved the stopping up of the existing agricultural scale openings and the insertion of domestic doors and a number of windows, the replacement of the roof covering and internal works. However, the Inspector considered that the works complied with those specified under Class Q.1.(i)(i) and that the works proposed would be reasonable operations to provide a suitable living environment for future occupiers. As a result, the Inspector considered that the building was capable of conversion to residential use without building operations that would amount either to complete or substantial re-building of the pre-existing structure and that the development was permitted by Class Q.

5. Dismissed the appeal by Mr M Chick for Single yard managers dwelling in connection with existing Stratton Fields Livery Stables. Stratton Fields Livery Stables, Launton Road, Stratton Audley, Bicester, OX27 9AS – 18/00032/F (Delegated)

The appeal related to a refusal for planning permission for the construction of a single-storey dwelling that would be tied to the existing Stratton Fields Livery Stables, to be used by a yard manager.

The Inspector considered that the main issues were; a) whether there is an essential need for a new dwelling in this location in the context of development plan and national policies relating to development in rural areas and if an essential need is proven, whether any existing accommodation could meet that need; and b) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

In 2016 a Certificate of Lawfulness of existing use (CLEUD) was granted on the site for a self-contained flat at first floor level in the stables. In the current case the Council had made an assessment that the livery stables would not require an essential need for a dwelling on site, but in any case if there was an essential need, the existing flat within the stables would fulfil that need. The Inspector notes that the proposed flat would not be a like-for-like replacement given its larger footprint. Additionally, the inspector notes that due to the existing flat being granted by virtue of a CLEUD, extinguishing it

could not be achieved by a planning condition as this would not meet the required tests as set out in Planning Practice Guidance.

The Inspector found that an essential need had not been demonstrated, due to the uncertainty in relation to the proposed expansion and the business appearing reliant on the need to grant further and separate planning permissions for the livery expansion. Nonetheless, the Inspector determined that there is accommodation on-site that could ensure adequate welfare for the horses in livery and provide a 24-hour presence to oversee vulnerable livestock and to provide security; therefore, there is no demonstrable need for a new dwelling. The Inspector concludes that a new dwelling in the proposed location would conflict with Saved Policy H18 of the Local Plan and to the aims of the Framework which together seek to resist development in the countryside unless it is to meet a proven essential need.

With regard to the effect on the character and appearance of the area, the Inspector determines that, in the context of the topography and the existing vegetation the dwelling would be visually well related to the existing stable buildings on the site and to that extent the impact on the rural character and appearance of the area would be limited. By consequence, the Inspector concludes that there would be no material harm to the character and appearance of the area in the context of Saved Policies C8 and C28 and Policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Local Plan.

The appeal was dismissed.

6. Dismissed the appeal by Mr and Mrs David Bignell for the replacement of rotten fence – frontage No 60, replacement of broken trellis/rotten posts No 58 replaced with post and rail. 58-60 North Street, Fritwell, OX27 7QR – 18/01119/F (Delegated)

The application had been refused on the grounds that, by virtue of its height and appearance, the boundary treatment failed to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Fritwell Conservation Area. The Inspector agreed that this was the main issue to consider, as well as its impact on the setting of the adjacent listed building.

The Inspector cited the Council's conservation area appraisal which observes that the street pattern in North Street is landscape dominated with a sense of enclosure created by low limestone walls, rather than a built up frontage, which is a key element in creating North Street's distinctive character.

The Inspector agreed with the Council that the fence is incongruous in this environment and causes harm to the Conservation Area and the setting of a nearby listed building. Therefore notwithstanding arguments in respect of the privacy and security the fence provides, the Inspector dismissed the appeal.

3.0 Enforcement Appeals

3.1 New Enforcement appeals

None

3.2 Enforcement appeals in progress

None

3.3 Enforcement appeal results

- 1. Dismissed the appeal by Total Property Developments UK Ltd against an Enforcement Notice issued on 12 April 2018 for the material change of use of an incidental outbuilding to a self-contained residential unit with its own curtilage within the rear garden of 44 West Street, Banbury, OX16 3HD. (ref: 16/00242/EUNDEV)**

The Enforcement notice related to a building which had been erected within the rear garden of the above property and was in use as self-contained residential accommodation. At the start of the investigation there was found to be a person residing in the independent residential dwelling and paying rent to do so. The building did not have planning permission and the only permission that was in place was for two separate buildings to be used as bin stores for 44 and 44a West Street in the place where the current building stood.

The notice required a number of actions to remedy the breach including the cessation of the unauthorised use, and removal from the building of all fixtures and fittings associated with residential use, and the removal of all utilities from the building.

The time period given with which to comply was 3 months.

The appeal was submitted under ground (f) section 174(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. (f) "that the steps required by the notice to be taken, or the activities required by the notice to cease, exceed what is necessary to remedy any breach of planning control which may be constituted by those matters or, as the case may be, to remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by any such breach".

The appellant in their appeal statement, contested some of the requirements of the notice and also that the steps required to comply exceeded what was necessary to remedy the breach of planning control. The Council accepted some minor alterations to the wording of the requirements of the notice and the notice was varied by the Inspector with the words "for residential use" deleted and substituted with "as a self-contained residential unit" at requirement 5 (1) and 5(2). The insertion of the words "with the exception of the electricity supply" was applied at requirement 5 (3) as electricity was supplied to the building before the breach took place and could therefore not be considered to have 'facilitated' the change of use. Requirements 5(4) and 5(5) of the notice were deleted, these required fencing to be removed, however it was not clear if this fencing was erected prior to the breach taking place, to shield the bin stores from the properties and therefore went beyond what was required to remedy the breach of planning control.

The appellant also submitted an application for costs against the Council on the grounds that it had acted unreasonably by not entering into negotiations after the enforcement notice had been served. Following the issuing of the

enforcement notice, the appellant had requested that the Council withdraw the notice and issue a new notice with lesser steps. The Council disagreed with this approach and the appellant was informed that the correct route to challenge the notice would be through an appeal to PINS. The costs application was refused with the Planning Inspectorate finding that the Council had not behaved unreasonably and its behaviour had not lead the appellant to incur unnecessary or wasted expense. The Inspector agreed that the correct procedure was to make their arguments through the appeal process.

The appellant now has until the 4 June to fully comply with the requirements of the notice and an inspection will take place shortly after that date. The Council has already confirmed that the self-contained residential use has ceased.

For completeness, the requirements of the notice (as varied) are as follows:

1. Cease the use of the building as a self-contained residential unit;
2. Remove from the building all fixtures and fittings associated with residential use and remove them from the Land including, but not limited to kitchen units, kitchen sink, cooker, toilet, shower, sink, satellite dish;
3. Remove all utilities associated with the building, with the exception of the electricity supply, including, but not limited to the meter box and any pipe work associated with the building;
4. Remove from the land the post box that relates to the unauthorised dwelling house
5. Restore the land to its condition before the breach took place.

2. Dismissed the appeal by Mrs Phillipa Hawes against an Enforcement Notice issued on 4 April 2018 for the material change of use of the Land from residential garden associated with the occupation of dwellings No.5 and 6 Heathfield Cottages Kidlington OX5 3DX to (a) the siting of a caravan/mobile home used as an independent dwellinghouse (b) erection of decking and fencing and (c) sub dividing garden. (Ref: 16/00126/UNDEV)

The enforcement notice related to the unauthorised use of the land as a caravan site including the stationing of a caravan/mobile home and its use for residential purposes as an independent unit of occupation in the Green Belt and the sub-division of the garden land to of 5 and 6 Heathfield Cottages to land to facilitate this change of use.

The notice required a number of actions to remedy the breach including the cessation of the unauthorised use, removal of the caravan/mobile home and the removal of unauthorised decking and walkways. The notice also required the removal of any waste materials and making good damage to the land caused by the breach.

The time period given with which to comply was 3 months.

The appeal was submitted under ground (a) and ground (g) of section 174(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. (a) that, in respect of any breach of planning control which may be constituted by the matters stated in the notice, planning permission ought to be granted or, as the case may be, the condition or limitation concerned ought to be discharged; and (g)

that any period specified in the notice in accordance with section 173(9) falls short of what should reasonably be allowed.

Under the ground (a) appeal the Inspector considered the main issues to be:

- (i) Whether the development amounts to “inappropriate development” within the Green Belt, having regard to local and national policy;
- (ii) Whether the location of the development would facilitate sustainable modes of travel;
- (iii) If the development does amount to inappropriate development within the Green Belt, whether the harm by way of that inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other material considerations such that very special circumstances exist to justify a grant of planning permission.

The planning Inspector found that the development was inappropriate development in the Green Belt and had led to a reduction in the openness of the Green Belt. He concluded that the very special circumstances needed to justify a grant of planning permission did not exist and therefore the appeal on ground (a) failed.

Under ground (g) the appellant argued that the compliance period was too short as the caravan was tenanted for 6 months and a further 3 months should be added to the compliance period. On this ground, the Inspector stated that the appellant had not provided any convincing argument to justify the request for the extension of time and as such the appeal of ground (g) also failed.

The notice was varied by the Inspector as follows: The red line on the plan attached to the notice was amended so as not to include the properties No.5 and 6 Heathfield Cottages and the main part of their gardens. The deletion of the words “the siting of a caravan/mobile home used as an independent dwellinghouse” were replaced with “the use of the land as a caravan site including the stationing of a caravan/mobile home and its use for residential purposes as an independent unit of occupation” and the insertion of the words “of the land as a caravan site” at requirement 5(1).

The appellant now has until 6 June 2019 to fully comply with the requirements of the notice and an inspection will take place shortly after that date.

The full requirements of the notice (as varied) are as follows:

1. Cease the use of the land as a caravan site and remove the caravan/mobile home from the site, demolish the unauthorised raised decking, the walkways around the sides of the caravan/mobile home and the raised deck patio together with associated hand rails;
2. Remove all waste materials, (equipment and debris) created as a result of any demolition works carried out in order to comply with the other requirements of the notice.
3. Make good any damage resulting from carrying out the unauthorised works or from the works required to ensure compliance with this Notice and reinstate the garden to the previous condition.

4.0 Consultation

None

5.0 Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection

- 5.1 The following alternative options have been identified and rejected for the reasons as set out below.

Option 1: To accept the position statement.

Option 2: Not to accept the position statement. This is not recommended as the report is submitted for Members' information only.

6.0 Implications

Financial and Resource Implications

- 6.1 The cost of defending appeals can normally be met from within existing budgets. Where this is not possible a separate report is made to the Executive to consider the need for a supplementary estimate.

Comments checked by:

Denise Taylor, Group Accountant, 01295 221982,
Denise.Taylor@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk

Legal Implications

- 6.2 There are no additional legal implications arising for the Council from accepting this recommendation as this is a monitoring report.

Comments checked by:

David Mytton, Solicitor, For and on behalf of Nick Graham, Director of Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer, David.Mytton@Oxfordshire.gov.uk

Risk Management

- 6.3 This is a monitoring report where no additional action is proposed. As such there are no risks arising from accepting the recommendation.

Comments checked by:

David Mytton, Solicitor, For and on behalf of Nick Graham, Director of Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer, David.Mytton@Oxfordshire.gov.uk

7.0 Decision Information

Wards Affected

All

Links to Corporate Plan and Policy Framework

A district of opportunity

Lead Councillor

Councillor Colin Clarke, Lead Member for Planning

Document Information

Appendix No	Title
None	
Background Papers	
None	
Report Author	Paul Seckington, Senior Manager of Development Management
Contact Information	01327 322341 paul.seckington@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk