

**List of Current Planning and Enforcement Appeals  
June 2020**

Public Inquiries

Reference	Address	Proposal and Decision Type	Officer	Key Deadlines	Date of Inquiry	Current Position

Informal Hearings

Reference	Address	Proposal and Decision Type	Officer	Key Deadlines	Date of Hearing	Current Position

Written Representations

Reference	Address	Proposal and Decision Type	Officer	Key Deadlines	Current Position
W/18/0986	Ivy Cottage, Barracks Lane, Beausale	One and two Storey Extensions <b>Committee Decision in accordance with Officer Recommendation</b>	Rebecca Compton	Questionnaire: 23/10/18 Statement: 14/11/18	Ongoing
W/19/0091	21 Northumberland Road, Leamington	Erection of Railings and Gates <b>Delegated</b>	Emma Booker	Questionnaire: 17/6/19 Statement:	Ongoing

				9/7/19 Comments: -	
W/18/2177	Four Brothers Farm, Five Ways Road, Shrewley, Warwick	Notification for Prior Approval for a Proposed Change of Use of Agricultural Building to 3no. Dwelling Houses (Use Class C3) together with associated works to facilitate the conversion. <b>Delegated</b>	Rebecca Compton	Questionnaire: 03/09/19 Statement: 01/10/19	Ongoing
W/19/0350	Barn at Little Manor Farm, Manor Lane, Pinley Green.	Change of Use of Building to Dwelling <b>Delegated</b>	Dan Charles	Questionnaire: 15/11/19 Statement: 13/12/19	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>

The appeal site is located outside of the settlement boundary of Claverdon as defined by Policy H1 and therefore is located within the open countryside. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside.

Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside, save for a number of exceptions, including where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting.

The Council contended that the term "isolated" relates to both physical separation from other properties and accessibility to local services and facilities. The Council accept that the site is not physically isolated being within a reasonable distance of a number of other dwellings and buildings. However, the Council also argued that as the site is not well connected to services and facilities or accessible by means of public transport the site is isolated with regard to the wider area.

The Inspector was directed by the appellant to Court of Appeal case *Braintree DC v SSCLG, Greyread Ltd & Granville Developments Ltd* [2018] EWCA Civ 610 where the word "isolated" was considered, albeit in the context of paragraph 55 of the previous version of the Framework. The judgement concluded that the term isolated should be understood in its plain meaning i.e. physically separated or remote, and that adding a second limb to the policy relating to accessibility to services and facilities only serves to make the policy more onerous than intended. Furthermore, no such restriction is implied in its text. In other words, the term isolated should be taken to mean physically remote or separate only, in the sense of being isolated from other dwellings or settlements.

Taking this into account, the Inspector came to the judgement that the site is therefore not isolated in the context of paragraph 79 of the

Framework and Policy H1.

In terms of enhancement, the Inspector considered that the barn whilst of relatively modern construction is in a good condition with features including timber framing, deep roof overhangs and a barn door that make it an attractive rural building. He found that the loss of the traditional barn features and the modern appearance of the windows and doors would be unsympathetic to the building and would erode its attractive rural appearance. The proposal would significantly change the appearance of the barn into something more suburban that would appear discordant in the surrounding rural setting. Therefore, it would not enhance the character and appearance of the countryside.

W/19/1299	19 Camberwell Terrace, Leamington Spa.	Change of Use to HMO <b>Delegated</b>	Dan Charles	Questionnaire: 26/11/19 Statement: 24/12/19	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>
-----------	---	--	-------------	--	-------------------------

The appellant acknowledged that the proposal would lead to 14.1% of the dwellings being HMOs representing a significant over-concentration against the upper limit set by Policy H6.

The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area, there are mixed-uses present and that Camberwell Terrace is but a short walk from Radford Road which is a main thoroughfare. Because of this the appellant considers the latter exception should be applied in this appeal. The Inspector does not share that view because Camberwell Terrace is a cul-de-sac, albeit with pedestrian links beyond, not a main thoroughfare. Additionally, all of the properties on Camberwell Terrace appear to be in residential use and while the Victoria Business Centre lies nearby, and partially lies within the 100m radius of the appeal site, it is clearly separate and distinct.

The Inspector concluded that the appeal proposal exacerbates the levels of disturbance prevalent in the area through an over-concentration of HMO properties. Accordingly, the proposals are contrary to Policy BE3 of the LP which seeks to resist development that has an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. The HMO is also contrary to Policy H6 e) since waste arising from the occupants of No 19 is not being adequately dealt with.

W/19/0111	2 Mill End, Kenilworth	New Dwelling <b>Delegated</b>	Helena Obremski	Questionnaire: 18/11/19 Statement: 16/12/19	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>
-----------	------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------	--	-------------------------

The Inspector observed that the appeal site forms part of a well-proportioned and defined traditional terraced housing which includes a generally consistent arrangement of fenestration and entrance features and positively contributes to the established urban character of the area and also the setting and significance, of the Conservation Area.

The Inspector noted that the proposal would infill a gap and is of a similar overall form to the host property, when viewed from the highway. However, he considered that the proposed contemporary detailing, along with the atypical fenestration arrangement to the front of the proposed dwelling, which includes 3 roof lights, 3 windows at first floor level, and the absence of a ground floor window, along with a double door front entrance, would severely disrupt the rhythm of the existing terrace and appear particularly incongruous. He therefore concluded that the proposal fails to respond positively to, or respect the existing character of the street scene, by virtue of the use of incongruous design features which are a harmful to the established traditional street scene.

He also noted that there would be a significant reduction in the amenity space for No 2 measuring about 10 sqm. In relation to the proposed dwelling, its amenity space would be about 23 sqm. Therefore, the amenity space for the existing and proposed dwelling would fall significantly short of the Council's requirement of 40sqm as set out in the SPD. Although open space facilities are available nearby, the Inspector did not believe that this would be a reasonable atonement for the failure to provide adequate private amenity space directly associated with the dwelling itself, in accordance with the Council's requirements.

The Inspector noted that a letter from the EA as appended to the appellant's final comments, identifies the flood risk for the location of the appeal site as medium, and the likelihood of flooding from surface water as low, but considered that he must make a decision based upon the current flood risk classification – Flood Zone 3. Consequently, he concluded that the proposal does not overcome the need to firstly pass the sequential test to establish whether the appeal proposal is acceptable in principle on flood risk grounds. Taking all matters into consideration, including the lack of objection from the Local Lead Flood Authority in respect of drainage and surface water management, the proposal would not be acceptable in respect of the risk of flooding.

W/19/1265	21 Elizabeth Road, Queensway, Leamington.	Change of use to HMO <b>Delegated</b>	Dan Charles	Questionnaire: 25/12/19 Statement: 22/1/20	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>
-----------	--	--	-------------	---	-------------------------

The appellant does not contest the Council's figure of 14%, they do however disagree over interpretation of the numbers, focusing instead on the number of HMOs along Elizabeth Road. The appellant has produced a list of licensable and non-licensable HMOs, of which there are three listed along Elizabeth Road. There

are 43 properties along Elizabeth Road, therefore the current concentration is 7%, which would increase to around 9% with the proposal.

However, the Inspector considered that the wording of Criteria a) of Policy H6, is clear with regards to the test to be applied and the proposal would not meet this policy requirement.

W/18/1034	Ewe Green, Hockley Road, Hatton	Certificate of Lawfulness for Conversion of Outbuilding into Granny Annexe <b>Delegated</b>	Helena Obremski	Questionnaire: 7/1/20 Statement: 4/2/20	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>
-----------	---------------------------------	--	-----------------	--	-------------------------

The appellant seeks an LDC on the basis that no material change of use would arise if the building was used for a purpose that would be incidental to the existing dwellinghouse. Their argument is based on the fact that the use of the outbuilding as an annexe for an elderly relative, with some reliance on the main dwellinghouse, would not amount to development as defined by the Act.

The Inspector notes that the for planning purposes, it is commonly held that the term "incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse" implies that the intended use should be subordinate to the main residential use of the property. The essential feature of an incidental use is that there should be a functional relationship with the primary use within the planning unit.

The Council's reason for refusal was based on the functional relationship with the primary use. Its reasons being that the proposal would have all of the elements necessary for day to day living, including washing and sleeping. It is the provision of these facilities which the Council believe could result in the outbuilding being capable of independent occupation. As such, this would create a separate planning unit which would require planning permission.

However, the Inspector considered that even if the accommodation provided facilities for independent day-to-day living, it would not necessarily become a separate planning unit from the main dwelling; it would be a matter of fact and degree. Accommodation may give an occupant the facilities of self-contained living, although it was intended to function as an annexe only, with the occupant sharing living activity in company with the family in the main dwelling. There is no reason, in law, why such accommodation should consequently become a separate planning unit from the main dwelling.

Applying planning principles established in case law, the Inspector considered that if an outbuilding with its living accommodation was part of the same planning unit as the dwellinghouse, and provided that the planning unit remains in single family occupation and continues to function as a single household, no material change of use would be involved.

The use of the proposed granny annexe for the elderly relative would be incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. Planning permission would not be required for the change of use of the outbuilding for that purpose, provided the evidence, presented clearly and unambiguously,

shows all occupants would function as a single-household.

The Inspector considered that the proposal before him was an outbuilding with all the necessary facilities for day-to-day private existence and a plan that shows it physically separate from the main dwellinghouse with land in residential use. With no functional relationship with the primary use of the planning unit and a lack of specific evidence about the proposed occupation and use, this raises the prospect of a separate planning unit being created, given the significant degree of physical and functional separation.

Consequently, he concluded that the outbuilding would no longer have a functional relationship with the primary use of the planning unit - the residential use of the dwellinghouse. Therefore, the proposed use would not be considered incidental to the use of the host dwelling as a dwellinghouse and would amount to a material change of use.

On reflection, while the decision was correct the Council's reason for refusal was not.

W/19/1164	24 Church Hill	Replacement of Sash Windows and Doors <b>Delegated</b>	Jonathan Gentry	Questionnaire: 20/12/20 Statement: 17/1/20	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>
-----------	----------------	---	-----------------	---	-------------------------

The existing timber and single glazed windows are all proposed to be replaced with double glazed units. The appellant argues that the proposed development will not result in the loss of any original historic fabric at No 24 because the existing timber windows are not original and were replaced in 1997.

On the available information, the Inspector could not be certain that the existing windows are not original. Moreover, he found the existing frames and the use of single glazing are broadly consistent with other nearby historic windows.

The Inspector noted that the individual changes from the existing windows to the replacement units would result in some increase in the width of the frames, along with a refractive difference resulting from the double-glazed units. These, along with the use of astragal bars, which would be applied to both the internal and external panes with a black spacer bar, add bulk and give each unit a modern appearance. Such incremental changes to each window replaced, incorporating all of the windows along the front, rear and a side elevation of the building would cumulatively and appreciably alter and modernise its overall appearance. His findings on this matter were reinforced having observed the replacement windows which have already been installed. Consequently, the replacement windows would fail to preserve or enhance the historic character and appearance of the CA.

	Mulberry Cottage,	Conversion of Redundant Barn into	Rebecca	Questionnaire:	<b>Appeal dismissed</b>
--	-------------------	-----------------------------------	---------	----------------	-------------------------

W/18/2453	Warwick Road, Leek Wooton	Holiday Accommodation – revised scheme. <b>Delegated</b>	Compton	19/12/19 Statement: 16/1/20	<b>and Costs Award Refused</b>
<p>Planning permission has been granted for the alteration, extension and conversion of the host property from a barn into holiday accommodation. From the evidence before me there are differences between the planning permission and the development that has been carried out. These mainly relate to the rebuilding and enlargement of the smaller projection and new openings in the northern and southern elevation of the building, the widening of front and rear door openings, the construction of a chimney, the insertion of rooflights and the bricking up of existing openings.</p> <p>The Inspector found that the enlarged openings in both the northern and southern elevation and the proposed doors and glazing would introduce incongruous domestic style features that would not sit comfortably with the more traditional rural appearance of the building. The appellant contends that the development includes less windows and doors than the original scheme. However, irrespective of the reduction in the amount of glazing, the use of 'conservation' type roof lights and original tiles, the Inspector found the number of rooflights in the eastern roof slope excessive and obtrusive interrupting the form of the roof space and undermining the building's traditional appearance.</p> <p><b>COSTS:</b></p> <p>The costs application relies on the appellant's view that the Council acted unreasonably by delaying the application by requesting a Heritage Statement and not undertaking a fair assessment of the development proposals. As the site is located within the Leek Wooton Conservation Area the Council requested a Heritage Statement in line with their Local Validation Checklist. The Inspector considers that whilst there may not have been a requirement for submission of one prior to the application subject of this appeal, the Council have clearly set out why this was the case. Therefore, the request for a Heritage Statement was justified and the Council have not acted unreasonably by requesting one.</p> <p>The appellant contends that due to delays in obtaining planning permission he has incurred a loss of rental income that would have been generated from the use of the property as holiday accommodation. The PPG is clear that an award of costs relates to costs associated with the appeal which includes the time spend by appellants and/or their agents in preparing for an appeal or providing advice. Claims relating to indirect losses such as those that may result from an alleged delay in obtaining planning permission are ineligible. Therefore, the loss of rental income as a result of the application and appeal process is not grounds for an award of costs.</p>					
W/19/0925	Sunnyside Old Warwick Road, Lapworth	Erection of a Dwelling <b>Delegated</b>	Andrew Tew	Questionnaire: 28/1/20 Statement: 25/2/20	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>

<p>The Inspector found that a new dwelling on the site would be likely to have a greater spatial and visual impact than the existing buildings upon it and as such would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>He also concluded that the location of the appeal site is not appropriate for the proposed new dwelling as it conflicts with LP Policy H1.</p>					
W/19/1055 and 1056/LB	The Limes, 21 Beauchamp Avenue, Leamington	Various alterations and extensions <b>Delegated</b>	Emma Booker	Questionnaire: 17/1/20 Statement: 14/2/20	<b>Appeals Dismissed</b>
<p>The Inspector noted that the proposed boundary treatment would differ from the previous boundary, as well as from the treatment to the front of the church. He also observed that boundary treatments to the houses to the right of the Limes up to the junction with Kenilworth Road consist of medium height painted/rendered walls which are also significantly different to that proposed.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the combined height and nature of the proposed boundary treatment, at nearly 1.6m would present a significantly different boundary to the Limes to the existing hedge and low wall, to the detriment of the setting of the heritage asset. He felt that the existing side wall between the Church and the Limes does not have a significant impact on the street scene, unlike the front boundary which runs along a fairly substantial section of Beauchamp Avenue. While the proposed brick wall elements may well match the house, he considered this would clash with the painted stucco façade of the building and the adjoining walls to the east.</p>					
W/19/1658	1, The Stables, Vicarage Lane, Sherbourne	Replacement windows; doors and roof. <b>Delegated</b>	George Whitehouse	Questionnaire: 21/1/20 Statement: 20/2/20	<b>Appeal Allowed</b>
<p>The Inspector noted that the Heritage Statement includes detailed information regarding the type and specification of the products that would be used to carry out the proposed development. In particular, the specifications have been chosen to mimic the existing wooden windows and doors in terms of style and dimensions including flush finishes. They would also feature a wood effect finish with rosewood colour to match the</p>					

existing. The Inspector considered that in these circumstances the proposed UPVC products, whilst a modern material, would be visually sympathetic to the location of the appeal property and would not lead to a noticeable change to the character and appearance of the appeal property as a converted farm building.

W/19/1347	20 Hatton Terrace, Hatton	Two Storey Extensions <b>Delegated</b>	Ankit Dhakal	Questionnaire: 7/2/20 Statement: 2/3/20	<b>Appeal Allowed</b>
-----------	------------------------------	---	--------------	--	-----------------------

The Inspector noted that properties along Hatton Terrace are generally similar in terms of form, style and appearance. However, he found that there are some variations, including 1 Hatton Terrace, which incorporates single and two-storey extensions. Most notably, these properties include projecting gables which extend partly across their front elevations. On some properties the original recessed sections of the front elevations have been infilled with two-storey extensions. This provides consistency in their appearance which creates a strong rhythm to the streetscene.

While the proposed two-storey side extension would extend the footprint of the building to the side, the Inspector considered that this would follow the form of the host property and incorporate an appreciably lower ridge height than the main roof and would be set-back from its principal elevation.

He noted that the proposed front extension does not incorporate a 450mm set-back from the projecting gable, as recommended in the Council's Residential Design Guide. However, he considered that despite this, the proposed arrangement would be broadly consistent with other front extensions along Hatton Terrace, and a previously approved front extension to the appeal property, which despite being of a similar size to that proposed in the appeal scheme, did not incorporate a 450mm set-back.

Moreover, due to its overall form and by incorporating a lower ridge height than the projecting gable, the proposed front extension would further replicate the nearby infill two-storey extensions. Whilst this extension would be wider than other front extensions along Hatton Terrace it would still be narrower than the projecting gable at No 20. Furthermore, its width would be absorbed by the proposed side extension and the open area to the side of this particular property.

W/19/1224	Meadow Croft, High Cross Lane, Rowington	Agricultural Building, Fencing and Hardstanding <b>Delegated</b>	Helena Obremski	Questionnaire: 18/2/20 Statement: 17/3/20	Ongoing
-----------	---	--	--------------------	--	---------

--	--	--	--	--	--

W/19/1104	107 Mallory Road, Bishop's Tachbrook	Two storey Extensions and Porch <b>Delegated</b>	Jonathan Gentry	Questionnaire: 17/2/20 Statement: 10/3/20	<b>Appeal Partially Allowed and Partially Dismissed</b>
<p>The Inspector noted that the appeal property is located on a corner plot with the house well set off the fenced side boundary with Holt Avenue by a garden area maintaining a sense of openness. He also noted that the nearest properties on the same side of Holt Avenue are positioned in a fairly uniform and unassuming arrangement of semi-detached houses and they maintain a clear building line and are set back from their site frontages, which are defined by low forms of enclosure. As a consequence, he found that the appeal site is clearly visible for some distance along Holt Avenue and this reveals that the existing side elevation wall of the house adheres to the building line.</p> <p>He noted that there is no dispute between the main parties that the width of the proposed extension would be greater than the 2/3 guideline in the SPD. Whilst he accepted that exceeding the SPD tolerances does not equate to unacceptable harm, he considered that the proposed extension would be clearly very substantially sized compared to the existing house. Accordingly, it would not be a subservient addition. This would not be satisfactorily addressed by the set down from the main roof ridge of the house and the set-back from the front elevation, to accord with the SPD in other respects, and with the use of matching materials and detailing. These matters would not overcome the harm caused by its scale.</p> <p>He considered that such detrimental effects would extend beyond simply the host dwelling. With the proposed extension's prominent siting on a corner plot, its bulk, mass and height would be highly visible. It would extend considerably forward of the building line on Holt Avenue and appear noticeably uncomfortable in these more uniform surroundings as an incongruous feature.</p> <p>Its siting and scale would also result in a significant reduction in the openness because much of the side garden area would give way to the proposed extension. That the rest of the garden areas would remain would not adequately overcome what would be a substantial loss of openness, as would be experienced from Holt Avenue, in particular. The SPD cautions against such a loss, and this would be a consequence of the proposed extension that would further reinforce the loss of local character.</p> <p>However, he felt that proposed porch causes less of a concern. It would be a fairly diminutive structure that would not be untypical of those found in the immediate environs of the site.</p>					
W/19/1124	Northbound Services, A46 Warwick Bypass	Internally Illuminated Totem Pole <b>Delegated</b>	Rebecca Compton	Questionnaire: 14/2/20 Statement: 9/3/20	<b>Appeal Allowed</b>

The Inspector observed that when travelling north, the majority of the appeal site is screened by vegetation on the verge, with only the top of the advert totem initially visible close to the site. He considered that the visual effect of the advert closer to the site is localised and is viewed in the context of the service area as opposed to any wider rural setting. When observed travelling from the southbound, it is softened by the backdrop of vegetation. As such any visual affect is predominantly limited to the immediate setting of the advert.

He felt that although the area beyond the service station is devoid of adverts and displays, the appeal site itself supports signage appropriate to the land-use and the appeal advert fits well in that particular context. Furthermore, when viewed collectively, the appeal advert does not appear to dominate when set against the BP Totem and as such he saw no benefit to the Council's suggestion that the advert should be limited to the height of that structure.

The Inspector made reference to the appeal decisions at the service station on the southbound carriageway. He noted that the service area and advert totem appear more prominent, given its slightly elevated and open position, and does not benefit from the same degree of natural landscaping that surrounds the appeal site. As such, the taller advert totem at that site appears more prominent and starker given its form, which, unlike the appeal advert, is set against the backdrop of the sky.

W/19/1285	2 Penns Close, Cubbington	Revised design of Extension <b>Committee Decision in accordance with Officer Recommendation</b>	George Whitehouse	-	<b>Appeal Allowed</b>
-----------	------------------------------	--	----------------------	---	-----------------------

Planning permission was granted for a front dormer, front porch and two storey side extension with dormer at 2 Penns Close in April 2019. The appellants seek to vary condition No. 2 of the previous permission in order to reflect a number of changes to the detailed roof and rear dormer design to the development shown in the approved scheme that has been completed.

The Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) states that side extensions should be no more than 2/3 of the width of the original property and have a minimum set down of 225mm from the ridge of the main roof in order to appear subordinate to the main dwelling. In this case, planning permission was granted for a side extension that was over 2/3 of the width of the host property and set down about 225mm. However, as constructed, the extension is set down about 0.1m from the ridge.

The Inspector considered that given the site's location and the curvature of the road, the change in the roof design is only visible over short distances when passing the site. It is seen in the context of the existing extension and alterations to the appeal property and the varied roof and building heights of the adjacent properties as a result of the changing site levels within the immediate locality. Against this backdrop, the change in the roof design does not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties. The use of matching materials, fenestrations and the modest scale of the change ensures that the extension sits relatively unobtrusively against the existing built form of the main property and allows it to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the main house. He therefore concluded that the overall change in the roof design does not significantly detract from the architectural integrity of the

host property and limits any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.					
W/19/1783	Oakbank, 26 Hill Wootton Road, Leek Wooten	One and two storey extensions <b>Delegated</b>	Emma Booker	-	<b>Appeal Allowed</b>
<p>The Inspector considered that the appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. Given the site's location and mature landscaping along the front boundaries, the proposal would only be visible over short distances when passing the site. It would be seen in the context of the previous extensions and alterations to No. 26 and nearby properties, including the two storey front extension at No.22. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and siting of the proposed extension, stepped down and set back, would not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties.</p>					
W/19/1512	2A St Fremund Way, Whitnash	First Floor Side Extension <b>Delegated</b>	Thomas Fojit	Questionnaire: 25/2/20 Statement: 18/3/20	Ongoing
<b>New</b> W/19/0869	Leasowes Farm, Southam Road, Radford Semele	Timber Cabin for Holiday Rental. <b>Delegated</b>	Helena Obremski	Questionnaire: 9/3/20 Statement: 20/4/20	Ongoing
<b>New</b> W/19/1633	Land at Honiley Road, Beausale	Erection of 2 Dwellings <b>Delegated</b>	Helena Obremski	Questionnaire: 19/3/20 Statement: 30/4/20	Ongoing
<b>New</b> W/19/1858	Former Tamlea Building, Nelson Lane, Warwick.	Redevelopment for residential Purposes. <b>Committee Decision in accordance with Officer Recommendation</b>	Helena Obremski	Questionnaire: 29/5/20 Statement:	Ongoing

				26/6/20	
<b>New</b> W/19/2006	Unit 1, Moss Street, Leamington	Removal of Condition to allow for the Unrestricted Occupancy of 47 bed HMO. <b>Committee Decision in accordance with Officer Recommendation</b>	Helena Obremski	Questionnaire: 11/6/20 Statement: 9/7/20	Ongoing
<b>New</b> W/19/1253/LB	Waverley House, 70 Binswood Avenue, Leamington	Replacement Sash Windows <b>Delegated</b>	Jonathan Gentry	Questionnaire: 12/6/20 Statement: 10/7/20	Ongoing
<b>New</b> W/19/1769	Oldfield Farm, Old Warwick Road, Rowington.	One and Two Storey Extensions <b>Delegated</b>	Jonathan Gentry	Questionnaire: 12/6/20 Statement: 3/7/20	Ongoing
<b>New</b> W/19/1973	Wooton Grange Farm House, Warwick road, Kenilworth	Extensions and Alterations <b>Delegated</b>	Jonathan Gentry	Questionnaire: 23/4/20 Statement: 15/5/20	Ongoing
<b>New</b> W/19/0697 and 0698/LB	36 High Street, Kenilworth	Tree House, Pergola and Fencing <b>Delegated</b>	Rebecca Compton	Questionnaire: 11/3/20 Statement: 8/4/20	Ongoing
<b>New</b> W/19/1531	Land off Pitt Hill, Bubbenhall.	Prior notification of Change of Use of agricultural Building to 5 Dwellings.	Rebecca Compton	Questionnaire: 3/6/20	Ongoing

		<b>Delegated</b>		Statement: 1/7/20	
<b>New</b> W/19/2113/LB	3 Hatton Green, Hatton	New Roof over Conservatory <b>Delegated</b>	Zoe Herbert	Questionnaire: 12/6/20 Statement: 10/7/20	Ongoing

Enforcement Appeals

Reference	Address	Issue	Officer	Key Deadlines	Date of Hearing/Inquiry	Current Position
ACT 450/08	Meadow Cottage, Hill Wootton	Construction of Outbuilding	RR	Start date 04/06/19 Statements 22/11/19	Public inquiry 1 DAY	The inquiry has been held in abeyance

Act/063/19	19 Camberwell Terrace	Change of use to HMO- only Ground G period of compliance is being appealed (as there is a planning appeal W/19/1299 -see above)	RR	Start date 24/12/19 Statements due 04/02/19	Written representations	<b>Appeal Dismissed and Enforcement Notice Upheld.</b>
------------	-----------------------	--	----	---	----------------------------	--

The appellant made the case that the period of compliance was too short. However, the Inspector considered that the 6 month period given was more than sufficient given the existing passage of time.

Tree Appeals

Reference	Address	Proposal and Decision Type	Officer	Key Deadlines	Date of Hearing/Inquiry	Current Position