

3H, Hawk Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

e-mail:

Matthew.Dunkley-
Roberts@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Mr Chris Knock

Reference Number: APP/W1850/W/19/3235107

Sent via email

Date: 13/11/2020

**APPEAL BY DR W GREEN – LAND ADJACENT THE LINK, CHURCH ROAD, WESTON-
UNDER-PENYARD, ROSS-ON-WYE, HEREFORDSHIRE**

Dear Mr Knock,

Thank you for your emails on the 6th, 13th, 20th July and the 6th August, regarding the above appeal. I apologise for the time taken for a response.

Careful consideration has been given to your point of concern in regard to paragraph 9 and the decision maker's statement regarding the character and appearance of the area. Upon completing my investigations, these were conclusions the decision maker was entitled to reach in this paragraph.

However, further to this, I regret to advise it has been found that when considering the decision letter as a whole, it became apparent that the appeal has been dismissed on the grounds of the unknown impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. As this was not a main issue or a reason for refusal it is considered that a matter has been introduced by the decision maker and the appeal dismissed on grounds that the appellant had no opportunity to comment. This is not in accordance with our published appeal guidance.

With the above in mind, I can advise you that an upheld complaint has been recorded. Please accept our sincere apologies for this error. My findings have been brought to the attention of both the Inspector and their professional manager. As part of our virtuous circle on the finding of an upheld complaint, the error will be considered for individual performance lessons as well as any wider strategic changes we can make to reduce the chance of future re-occurrence.

As the appeal decision letter constitutes a legal document, it is not possible for the Planning Inspectorate to revisit or review the decision. It is set out in planning legislation that the only way in which an appeal decision might be revisited and reviewed is further to successful challenge in the High Court.

Kind regards,

Matt Dunkley-Roberts

Customer Team Officer