

Report to	Planning applications committee 12 July 2018	Item
Report of	Head of planning service	5
Subject	Performance of the development management service; progress on appeals against planning decisions and planning enforcement action for quarters 3-4 2017-18 and quarter 1 2018-19 (October 2017-June 2018).	

Purpose

This report updates members on the performance of development management service; progress on appeals against planning decisions and planning enforcement action for the quarter covering the period 01 October 2017 to 30 June 2018.

Recommendation

To note the report.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priorities a safe clean and low carbon city, a prosperous and vibrant city, a fair city and a health city with good housing.

Financial implications

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

Ward/s: All wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Stonard

Contact officers

Graham Nelson, Head of planning services 01603 212530

Mark Brown, Development Manager (Outer) 01603 212542

David Parkin, Development Manager (Inner) 01603 212505

Background documents

None

Report

Background

1. On 31 July 2008 the planning applications committee considered a report regarding the improved working of the committee which included a number of suggested changes to the way it operates. In particular it suggested performance of the development management service be reported to the committee and that feedback from members of the committee be obtained.
2. The committee has also asked to be informed on the outcome of appeals against planning decisions and enforcement action.
3. The last performance reports was presented to committee on 11 January 2018.

Performance of the development management service

4. The cabinet considers quarterly reports which measure the council's key performance targets against the council's corporate plan priorities. The scrutiny committee considers the council's performance data regularly throughout the year and will identify any areas of concern for review.
5. This report will only highlight trends or issues that should be brought to the attention of the planning applications committee for information.
6. For the 2017-18 financial year, of all the decisions that are accounted for by the governments NI157 indicator, some 766 applications out of 838 were dealt with by officers (a delegation rate of 91.4 per cent) and 72 applications were dealt with by committee.
7. For the first quarter of 2018-19, 162 applications out of 178 were dealt with by officers (a delegation rate of 91 per cent) and 16 applications were dealt with by committee.
8. The above compares to a delegation rate of 86.4% in 2016-17 and 90.6% in 2015-16.

Appeals

9. There are currently 16 pending planning appeals as listed within the appendix to this report. Pending appeals are currently far higher than is typically experienced, this may in part be due to delays with the planning inspectorate, however there has been an increase in planning appeals in the last 12 months.
- 10.2 appeals have been allowed, reference details for which are appended to this report. A brief summary of each is provided below:

a) 158 Wellesley Avenue South – Extension to dwelling – Delegated refusal

The application was refused on design grounds due to the proposals form and massing being over-dominant and incongruous in the street scene, having a negative impact on the surrounding Conservation Area. A particular concern was the proximity to the boundary and the effect of closing the gap between dwellings.

The inspector considered there whilst most properties were detached and set back from the road, there was a variance in the size and design of dwellings in the area. He also considered that a number of properties in the area were

constructed close to the boundaries. The inspector considered the design would harmonise with the original dwelling and not be incongruous and would preserve the character of the conservation area. The appeal was therefore allowed.

b) 12A Old Palace Road – 2 Storey extension to facilitate change of use to large HMO – Delegated refusal

The scheme was refused for reasons of overdevelopment of the site given the scale of the proposed extension. The inspector considered two main issues at the appeal being the effect of the development on (a) the character and appearance of the area and (b) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to outlook.

The inspector considered on the first point that the dwelling in question was distinctly different from its neighbours in the surrounding area and given its immediate context the proposal would not represent overdevelopment and whilst it would be visible the location did not have such a strong character that the proposed development would be either overly dominant or incongruous.

In relation to the second main issue the neighbouring property in question was a Sikh temple and the inspector agreed that whilst there would be some effect on the rear of the temple, this would not be harmful due to the community rather than residential use of the property.

The appellant also made an application for costs against the Council which was refused.

11.8 appeals have been dismissed, reference details for which are appended to this report. A brief summary of each is provided below:

a) 55 Cunningham Road – Change of use to large HMO – Committee decision to take enforcement action

The appeal case relates to a semi-detached property on Cunningham Road which has been extended and converted to an 8 bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). The appeal was against an enforcement notice which required that the property was returned to a C3 dwellinghouse or a small C4 HMO (up to six residents). The enforcement appeal was considered on the ground that planning permission ought to be granted for the development in question.

The inspector considered the following three main issues:

- 1) The effect of the alleged development on living conditions for occupants of the appeal property in terms of space standards, daylight and ventilation.
- 2) The effect of the alleged development on residential amenity for occupants of nearby dwellings in terms of noise, general disturbance, and privacy.
- 3) The effect of the alleged development on highway interests in terms of traffic generation and parking.

Whilst the inspector was satisfied that the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on future occupants of the HMO (main issue 1) the appeal was dismissed due to concerns with respect to main issues 2 and 3.

With regard to main issue 2 the inspector considered the proposal causes significant harm to residential amenity for occupants of nearby dwellings in terms of noise, and general disturbance. The inspector considered that when compared to a family dwelling a property occupied by eight otherwise unrelated occupants would result in an increased number of comings and goings – including those by private car and taxi – an increased number of separate social events, delivery of meals and other purchases, and people visiting for other reasons. The inspector considered that this increase in activity is likely to have a significant impact as a result of increased noise and disturbance.

In relation to main issue 3 the inspector concluded that the development would cause significant harm to highway interests in terms of traffic generation and parking. The inspector considered that the occupancy by 8 unrelated occupants is likely to result in a relatively high level of car ownership compared with a family dwelling as well as increased visitors and associated need for parking. The inspector considered that it was probably that this increase in demand would exacerbate any shortage of on-street spaces particularly outside working hours.

b) 168 Thorpe Road – Extensions to facilitate create 9 bed HMO (from 8 bed) – Delegated refusal

The application was refused on three grounds (a) due to overlooking of neighbours from a proposed dormer window, (b) due to the wall of the side extension causing an overbearing impact on neighbours and (c) the 9 bed HMO use proposed would be over-intense with insufficient external and internal amenity space.

In relation to the first two reasons, the inspector agreed with the Council's refusal noting that the extension (which in part involved the infilling of an L shaped terrace) would include a blank 3m high wall less than 2m from the neighbours boundary which would adversely affect their outlook. In relation to the dormer whilst there was an established level of overlooking from existing windows within the building, the inspector considered that new dormer would be at an obtuse angle directly facing a range of windows in the neighbouring property. The inspector also considered that fitting the proposed new dormer with obscure glazing would not be desirable as this would not provide suitable amenity for the bedroom it serves.

With regard to the final reason for refusal the inspector considered that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of future occupants and that suitable internal and external amenity areas would be provided and that sufficient cycle parking facilities could also be provided.

The inspector also noted that the scheme did not have any off-street parking and the scheme could add to existing local issues of on street car parking potentially affecting the conservation area. However, given the small increase in the number of bedrooms the inspector did not consider that this would lead to a significant level of harm.

c) 40 Bull Close – Extensions to create 7 flats – Delegated refusal

The case was refused on four grounds being (a) an over-intense form of development given the scale of the proposals and close proximity to neighbouring properties, (b) poor design which would have a negative impact on the

conservation area, (c) unacceptable living conditions for future residents with no external amenity space and (d) loss of amenity to neighbouring properties.

In relation to the first two reasons the inspector agreed that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the conservation area. The inspector noted that the proposals would deliver benefits but that given the scale of the development these would be limited and would not outweigh the harm.

The inspector also agreed that the proposal would impact the amenities of neighbours, noting that the proposal would increase the level of overlooking and result in an oppressive and overbearing development in relation to the neighbouring properties. The inspector also considered that it had not been demonstrated that the proposals would not affect the living conditions of neighbours by overshadowing.

On the matter of external amenity space for future residents the inspector noted that the 1 bed flats would not appeal to families and considered that not all flatted development is provided with external amenity space and occupiers rely on public open spaces for recreation and relaxation. Whilst there was a technical conflict with the aims of the development plan which seeks to secure external amenity space within residential developments, the inspector considered that the living conditions of the occupiers would not be compromised as access to public open spaces are within walking or cycling distance of the site.

d) 96A Angel Road – Redevelopment of site for 4 dwellings – Delegated refusal

The case was refused on the basis of overdevelopment of the site which would result in a poor standard of amenity for future residents due to a lack of external amenity space and proximity to a public house.

The inspector considered that the terrace would dominate the site and that garden areas would be extremely limited in size. Consequently the inspector considered that the development would appear cramped and discordant and would fail to respond positively to the prevailing pattern of development in the area.

With regard to rear garden space whilst the inspector acknowledged that there is no clear statement of what the minimum size of a garden area should be, the proposed private spaces were rather small (3.7 m x 4.1m for three of the units and 4.6m x 3.7m for the fourth unit), would be oppressively confined spaces and would be rather small in comparison to the prevailing size of gardens in the area and would be of limited practical use for the occupiers. Consequently the inspector considered that the proposal would not provide an acceptable level of outdoor garden space.

In relation to noise and disturbance from the pub, the inspector noted that it is very common for dwellings to be sited close to public houses and they appear to happily co-exist. The inspector suggested that the matter could be overcome through the imposition of a planning condition requiring soundproofing measures such as appropriate windows and doors for each unit if approved. The inspector also noted that the proposed dwellings would be no closer to the public house than 72 Angel Road, which also appears to happily co-exist with it.

e) 9 Osborne Court – Replacement windows – Delegated refusal

The appeal site is a block of 12 apartments with the proposal being to replace 12 windows within one flat with uPVC replacements. The main issue in this appeal was if the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Newmarket Road Conservation Area. The inspector found that the uPVC windows would fail to fully replicate the existing windows and as such the proposal would disrupt the coherent character of the building leading to less than substantial harm to the character of the conservation area. Whilst the appellant argued that uPVC windows were required to reduce maintenance and improve insulation, the inspector did not consider that there was any public benefit from the use of uPVC which would outweigh the harm caused.

f) 147A Magdalen Road – Change of use to dwelling with associated alterations – Delegated refusal

The case was refused on four grounds (a) amenity for future residents due to inadequate internal and external amenity space as well as the proximity to a hot food takeaway and lack of natural light to the ground floor, (b) insufficient evidence that the A2 premises could not be used for other business purposes, (c) the loss of the unit would have a harmful impact on the vitality and diversity of services in the local centre and (d) insufficient evidence that the proposed bin and cycle store at the front would not have a harmful impact on the character of the nearby conservation area.

With regard to the amenity of future occupiers, the inspector commented as follows:

- (a) Internal space would be considerably below national and local space standards and would be inadequate;
- (b) No noise assessment was submitted and no measures were proposed to mitigate against noise and odour from the adjacent hot food takeaway. In the absence of sufficient information on noise and odour the inspector could not be certain that the development would not have an adverse effect on future occupiers;
- (c) The ground floor would have a deep footprint and much would be reliant on artificial light, the outlook from the ground floor would also be poor given the cycle and refuse storage at the front;
- (d) The inspector did not consider proximity to the road to be of concern;
- (e) The property lacked usable external amenity space and despite Sewell Park being within 100m of the site the inspector considered that some external amenity space would be reasonable for the size of property and given that similar properties in the area have a level of rear amenity space.

In relation to grounds (b) and (c), the inspector considered that there was insufficient information to conclude that the site is no longer viable, feasible or practicable to retain for business use, particularly as there is little evidence of marketing the appeal site for rent at an appropriate level for the Local Centre rather than sale (the site had been marketed freehold as a development opportunity). The inspector also considered that the loss of the unit from the local centre would harm the diversity of services in the local centre (whilst noting that the vacant unit was not contributing to the character of the area).

The inspector did not consider that the potential for cycle and refuse storage at the frontage of the property would harm the nearby conservation area.

In applying the planning balance the inspector noted the lack of a five year housing land supply but concluded that the benefits of the development did not outweigh the identified harm.

An associated claim for costs by the appellant was also refused.

g) Legarda Court, Pearcefield – Conversion of roof space to provide 4 flats with associated alterations – Delegated refusal

The main issues in this appeal were (a) the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at Legarda Court and Tillett Road East, with particular regard to noise and disturbance, external amenity space, and overlooking; and (b) the adequacy of refuse storage provision.

With regard to the first issue the inspector considered that the new windows and balcony would give rise to greater overlooking of neighbouring properties and would cause material harm. The proposals would also see the loss of a grass amenity area which was to be replaced by an access and car parking area. The inspector considered that loss of the area would be harmful to the amenity of existing residents of Legarda Court and that the use as a parking area would harm the amenities of neighbouring residents through noise and disturbance.

On the second issue the inspector agreed that the proposal would not make adequate provision for refuse storage on site. In applying the planning balance the inspector noted benefits of the scheme and the lack of a five year housing land supply but concluded that the benefits of the development did not outweigh the identified harm.

h) Heath House, Gertrude Road – Redevelopment of bowling green to 4 dwellings – Committee refusal

The reason for refusal and main issue in the appeal related to the loss of the existing open space on the site which is protected by local plan policy DM8. The inspector addressed each of the criteria of DM8 in turn and considered that whilst proposals met two criteria it failed three others.

With regard to the open spaces amenity and biodiversity value (DM8 a. of second part) the inspector stated that the proposed development would undoubtedly change the nature of the appeal site from open space. However, given the presence of the trees and surrounding vegetation, and its position behind Heath House, he considered that the main part of the appeal site was not highly visible from public vantage points, with only limited views from the bend of Maltby Court. As such, the loss of the green open space would not cause harm in terms of visual amenity. Furthermore, given its generally mown nature when in use, the biodiversity value of the bowling green would not be particularly high. The inspector also noted that the majority of trees would be retained therefore maintaining their amenity and biodiversity value. The inspector also concluded that the terrace of houses would not be at odds with the character of the surrounding area or the locally listed public house.

The inspector agreed with both parties that the appeal site is no longer required for its original intended purpose and that its facilities would be demonstrably unsuitable for this purpose (DM8 b. of second part).

With regard to criteria c. of the second part of DM8 the inspector considered that on the basis of the evidence provided the appeal site has not been appropriately marketed for alternative open space uses. Noting the interest of local residents in seeking the ACV status, the inspector considered that all options for viably restoring or re-using this open space for alternative purposes have not yet been exhausted.

The inspector did not consider that the proposal would result in an overall qualitative or quantitative improvement to recreational facilities (DM8 criteria a) of the first part). The inspector considered that as drafted the £15,000 off-site contribution towards pitch and putt facilities at Mousehold Heath would not meet the tests for planning obligations, particularly as it related to a different form of open space. The inspector also considered that the sum would not represent a sufficient sum of money to replace the bowling green elsewhere and it would be likely to provide only very modest enhancements to another recreational facility in the city, as such the benefits to sport or recreation would not outweigh the loss of that open space (DM8 criteria b) of the first part).

In applying the planning balance the inspector noted benefits of the scheme and the lack of a five year housing land supply but concluded that the benefits of the development did not outweigh the identified harm.

Enforcement action

12. All items that have been referred to committee or where committee has required enforcement action to take place, since April 2013 are listed in appendix 2 with an updated on the current status. Items are removed once resolved and the resolution has been reported to committee.

Planning Appeals Pending

Application ref no	Planning Inspectorate ref no	Address	Proposal	Date appeal started	Type of appeal	Decision
17/00011/REF Application No. 17/00005/F	APP/G2625/W/17/3181627	Franchise House 56 Surrey Street	Conversion to residential (Class C3) to provide 4 residential units.	Withdrawn	Written reps.	Appeal Withdrawn
17/00011/REF Application No. 17/00006/L	APP/G2625/Y/17/3181629	Franchise House 56 Surrey Street	Conversion to residential (Class C3) to provide 4 residential units.	Withdrawn	Written reps.	Appeal Withdrawn
17/00013/REF Application No. 16/01925/L	APP/G2625/Y/17/3181822	Bethel Hospital Bethel Street	Repair works to gable wall, west wall, attic floor and cornice and reinstatement of former d	23.10.2017	Written reps.	Pending
17/00022/REF Application No. 15/01928/F	APP/G2625/W/17/3190739	St. Peters Methodist Church Park Lane	Demolition of modern extensions and conversion to provide 20 residential units (class C3).	20 March 2018	Hearing	Hearing on 08 August 2018
18/00001/REF Application No. 17/01292/F	APP/G2625/W/18/3193974	1A Midland Street	Retrospective application for changes to access and boundary treatments and the temporary siting of	30 May 2018	Hearing	Statement Due 4 July

Application ref no	Planning Inspectorate ref no	Address	Proposal	Date appeal started	Type of appeal	Decision
			two workshop structures until 30 September 2018.			
18/00002/REF	APP/G2625/W/18/3194708	474B Earlam Road	Conversion of garage accommodation to dwelling.	01 June 2018	Written reps.	Statement Due 6 July
18/00003/ENFPLA	APP/G2625/C/18/3194781	1A Midland Street	Enforcement notice against changes to access, boundary treatments, siting of workshop structures.	30 May 2018	Hearing	Statement Due 11 July
18/00005/REF	APP/G2625/W/18/3196441	Sovereign Motor Company Mountergate	Continued use of site to provide short/medium stay public car park for a period of one year.	06 June 2018	Written reps.	Statement Due 11 July
18/00009/ENFPLA	APP/G2625/C/18/3197471	10 Ruskin Road	Enforcement notice against two storey extension	Awaiting start date	Written reps.	Awaiting start date
18/00006/REF	APP/G2625/Y/18/3197928	18 The Crescent Chapel Field Road	Roller shutter doors in garage doorway and re-forming car port roof.	Awaiting start date	Written reps.	Awaiting start date
18/00008/REF	APP/G2625/D/18/3198007	18 The Crescent Chapel Field Road	Roller shutter doors in garage doorway and re-forming car port roof.	Awaiting start date	Written reps.	Awaiting start date

Application ref no	Planning Inspectorate ref no	Address	Proposal	Date appeal started	Type of appeal	Decision
18/00010/REF	APP/G2625/W/18/3199271	39 Prince Of Wales Road	Change of use of second floor to two bedroom flat (Class C3).	06 June 2018	Written reps.	Statement Due 11 July
18/00011/REF	APP/G2625/W/18/3199892	Car Park Adjacent To Sentinel House 37 – 43 Surrey Street	Redevelopment of site to provide 285 student bedroom development with associated access and landscaping.	06 June 2018	Written reps.	Statement Due 11 July
18/00012/ENFPLA	APP/G2625/C/18/3200317	159 Drayton Road	Enforcement notice – front boundary wall, engineering works and front outbuilding	Awaiting start date	Written reps.	Awaiting start date
18/00013/REF	APP/G2625/D/18/3201012	108 Eaton Road	New domestic garage.	Invalid	Written reps.	Appeal cancelled as invalid
18/00014/REF	APP/G2625/W/18/3202230	9 Bracondale	Construction of three-storey apartment block to provide 3 apartments and associated external works.	06 June 2018	Written reps.	Statement Due 11 July
18/00015/REF	APP/G2625/W/18/3204095	Car Park Rear Of Premier Travel Inn Duke Street	Redevelopment of car park site to provide student accommodation.	Awaiting start date	Written reps.	Awaiting start date

Application ref no	Planning Inspectorate ref no	Address	Proposal	Date appeal started	Type of appeal	Decision
18/00016/COND	APP/G2625/W/18/3204745	171 Newmarket Road	Appeal against condition restricting access via the rear lobe	Awaiting start date	Written reps.	Awaiting start date
18/00017/REF	APP/G2625/D/18/3205108	1 Hanover Court	Removal of existing conservatory and erection of single storey side extension.	Awaiting start date	Written reps.	Awaiting start date

Planning appeals allowed – Quarters 3-4 2017-18 & Quarter 1 2018

Application ref no	Planning Inspectorate ref no	Address	Proposal	Decision Date	Type of appeal	Decision
17/00021/REF Application No. 17/01390/F	APP/G2625/D/17/3190638	158 Wellesley Avenue South	Two storey side extension with front porch. Single storey rear extension. Dormer window to front elevation.	29 Jan 2018	Written reps.	Allowed
17/00020/REF Application No. 16/01927/F	APP/G2625/W/17/3190273	12A Old Palace Road	Two storey rear extension and change of use to Sui Generis (large HMO).	01 June 2018	Written reps.	Allowed

Planning appeals dismissed – Quarters 3-4 2017-18 & Quarter 1 2018

Application ref no	Planning Inspectorate ref no	Address	Proposal	Decision Date	Type of appeal	Decision
17/00005/ENFPLA Enforcement Reference: 15/00167/ENF	APP/G2625/C/17/3174414	55 Cunningham Road	Without planning permission, the change of use of 55 Cunningham Road from residential (Class C3)/HMO (Class C4) use to residential sui generis use.	30 May 2018	Written reps.	Dismissed
17/00014/REF Application No. 17/00725/F	APP/W2625/W/17/3183295	168 Thorpe Road	Single storey side and rear extensions and new attic room with dormer to create a 9 bed HMO.	22 Feb 2018	Written reps.	Dismissed
17/00015/REF Application No. 17/00869/F	APP/G2625/W/17/3187022	40 Bull Close	Extension of the ground, second and third floors to create 7 No. flats with associated works.	22 June 2018	Written reps.	Dismissed
17/00016/REF Application No. 17/00817/F	APP/G2625/W/17/3187694	96A Angel Road	Redevelopment of site and erection of 4 no. dwellings.	15 June 2018	Written reps.	Dismissed
17/00017/REF Application No. 17/01082/F	APP/G2625/W/17/3188185	9 Osborne Court	Replacement windows.	16 May 2018	Written reps.	Dismissed

Application ref no	Planning Inspectorate ref no	Address	Proposal	Decision Date	Type of appeal	Decision
17/00018/REF Application No. 17/00932/F	APP/G2625/W/17/3189585	147A Magdalen Road	Change of use from office (Class B1) to dwellinghouse (Class C3) including installation of 1 No. new window to first floor rear elevation and low level front wall to match existing adjacent wall.	06 June 2018	Written reps.	Dismissed
17/00019/REF Application No. 15/00455/F	APP/G2625/W/17/3190065	Legarda Court Pearcefield	Raising of the eaves and conversion of existing roof space of Legarda Court into 4 no. one bedroom flats. To include new vehicular access from Pearcefield and new parking area.	06 June 2018	Written reps.	Dismissed
18/00004/REF	APP/G2625/W/18/3194937	Heath House 99 Gertrude Road	Redevelopment of bowling green to 4 no. dwellings and car parking.	12 June 2018	Written reps.	Dismissed

Enforcement action

Status report on all items previously reported to planning applications committee (items are removed once resolved)

Case no.	Address	Development	Date referred to committee	Current status	Lead Officer
13/02087/VC &13/02088/VC	Football ground area	River bank, landscaping, street trees, etc	6 March 2014 08 Dec 2016	<p>Revised landscaping proposals and timeframes for provision were agreed at the committee meeting of 08 December 2016.</p> <p>The decision has not yet been issued due to difficulties in agreeing wording of the Section 106 agreement, these matters are now coming towards a resolution.</p> <p>Despite the above the first phase of landscaping works along Geoffrey Watling Way has been undertaken. The final phase of landscape work is scheduled to take place by the end of the year.</p>	Tracy Armitage
16/00167/ENF	55 Cunnigham Road	Change of use from C3/C4 to large HMO	12 Jan 2017	The enforcement notice has been issued and was subject to a planning appeal, the appeal has now been dismissed (see the planning appeals section of the main report) and compliance is required by November 2018.	Ali Pridmore/ Lara Emerson
16/00020/ENF	66 Whistlefish Court	Conversion of garage to a separate unit of residential accomodation (C3) and change	09 Feb 2017	The notice was served on 03 March 2017 and came into force on 14 April 2017 with a six month compliance period. It is understood that the notice has not been complied with and further action is currently being considered.	Ali Pridmore

Case no.	Address	Development	Date referred to committee	Current status	Lead Officer
		of use from C3/C4 to large HMO.			
16/00020/ENF	67 Whistlefish Court	Conversion of garage to a separate unit of residential accommodation (C3) and change of use from C3/C4 to large HMO.	09 Feb 2017	The notice was served on 03 March 2017 and came into force on 14 April 2017 with a six month compliance period. It is understood that the notice has not been complied with and further action is currently being considered.	Ali Pridmore
17/00026/ENF	21-23 St Benedicts Street	Mechanical extration and ventilation plant and flue	13 July 2017	The notice has been served and complied with.	Sam Walker
17/00078/ENF	10 Ruskin Road	First floor extension and creation of large HMO	13 July 2017	The notice has been served and came into effect on 08 March 2018 with a six month compliance period. An appeal against the notice has been received.	Rob Webb
17/00028/ENF	2 Field View	Change of use from C3/C4 to large HMO and change of use of garage to independent office unit	13 July 2017	The resolution was to serve an enforcement notice against the use of the garage and against the use of the main dwelling as a large HMO if required. The latest situation is that applications are expected by 09 July 2018.	Rob Webb

Case no.	Address	Development	Date referred to committee	Current status	Lead Officer
17/00112/ENF	2B Lower Goat Lane	Conversion of A1 unit to C4 HMO in breach of condition 2 of 16/00695/U	13 July 2017	Enforcement notice is being drafted and will be served shortly.	Ali Pridmore/ Rob Webb
17/00076/ENF	1A Midland Street	Erection of two fabrication units and associated works	10 August 2017	The notice has been served and comes into effect on 31 January 2018 with a six month compliance period. The notice has been appealed.	David Parkin / Sam Walker
17/00157/ENF	5 Nutfield Close	Subdivision of dwelling to create four residential units	12 October 2017 & 12 April 2018	The enforcement notice was served on 11 December 2017. At the meeting on 12 April 2018 members resolved to withdraw the above notice and issue a revised notice requiring the implementation of revised approval for two residential units on the site (permitted via reference 18/00005/F). The former notice was withdrawn and new notice service on 22 May.	Stephen Polley
17/00136/ENF	142 Dereham Road	Positioning and use of a hot food takeaway van on forecourt.	12 October 2017	The use of the van has ceased and this remains the case. A planning application for change of use of the shop to A3 was permitted in October. Whilst members authorised enforcement action to secure the removal of the van, members indicated that they did not want to be heavy handed and wished officers to monitor the situation to allow time for the change of use to be implemented and van removed. No notice has therefore been issued to date.	Lydia Tabbron

Case no.	Address	Development	Date referred to committee	Current status	Lead Officer
17/00006/ENF	17-19 Castle Meadow	Basement in residential use.	08 March 2018	The enforcement notice was served on 09 March 2018 with a compliance date of 06 July 2018.	Lara Emerson
17/00118/ENF	159 Drayton Road	Front retaining wall, engineering works and outbuilding to the front of the dwelling.	08 March 2018	The enforcement notice came into effect on 24 April 2018 with a six month compliance period. An appeal has been received against the enforcement notice.	Stephen Polley
17/00131/ENF	2 Mornington Road	Erection of wooden garage/garden room structure.	08 March 2018	Following the resolution of the committee there have been discussions with the site owners and their representatives with a view to identifying possible alternative solutions. This matter is ongoing but a notice will be served shortly if the matter is not resolved via negotiation.	Stephen Polley
17/00186/ENF	111 Earlham Road	Erection of fence and shed in front garden.	12 April 2018	The enforcement notice is drafted and will be served imminently.	Charlotte Hounsell
15/00046/CO NSRV/ENF	13 Magdalen Street	Removal of timber sash windows and installation of uPVC windows.	12 April 2018	A planning contravention notice has been served to ascertain relevant parties on whom to serve the notice. A response is required by 03 July 2018.	Samuel Walker
18/00022/ENF	2 Bracondale	Front garden being used as off street parking.	12 April 2018	The notice has been drafted and will be served imminently.	Stephen Little

Case no.	Address	Development	Date referred to committee	Current status	Lead Officer
18/00026/ENF	113 Trinity Street	Demolition of wall fronting highway to form off-street parking area.	14 June 2018	The notice has been served and comes into effect on 19 July with a 90 day compliance period.	Lara Emerson
18/00087/ENF	114 Trinity Street	Demolition of front boundary wall.	14 June 2018	The wall is currently being re-built without the need to serve an enforcement notice.	Lara Emerson