

15 March 2018		ITEM: 6
Planning Committee		
Planning Appeals		
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Not Applicable	
Report of: Leigh Nicholson, Development Management Team Leader		
Accountable Head of Service: Andy Millard, Assistant Director – Planning, Transportation and Public Protection.		
Accountable Director: Steve Cox, Director of Place		

Executive Summary

This report provides Members with information with regard to planning appeal performance.

1.0 Recommendation(s)

1.1 To note the report

2.0 Introduction and Background

2.1 This report advises the Committee of the number of appeals that have been lodged and the number of decisions that have been received in respect of planning appeals, together with dates of forthcoming inquiries and hearings.

3.0 Appeals Lodged:

3.1 Application No: 17/01041/HHA
Location: 97 Kingsman Road, Stanford Le Hope
Proposal: Retention of garage with canopy.

4.0 Appeals Decisions:

The following appeal decisions have been received:

4.1 Application No: 17/00837/HHA

Location: 55 Lennox Close, Chafford Hundred

Proposal: Loft conversion with rear dormer and roof lights on the front elevation

Decision: Appeal Dismissed

4.1.1 The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

4.1.2 The Inspector found concern with the design and form of the dormer proposed, concluding it would result in a very large and bulky addition to the property which would be incongruous with the streetscene. The Inspector found the development to be in conflict with Annexe A1.1 (d) and CS Policies PMD2 and CSTP22.

4.1.3 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.2 Application No: 17/00577/HHA

Location: Dame Elyns, Stanford Road, Stanford Le Hope

Proposal: Demolition of existing lean buildings adjoining house and erection of single storey extension infill between existing house and outbuilding

Decision: Appeal Allowed

4.2.1 The Inspector considered the main issue to be whether the proposed development would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

4.2.2 The Inspector took the view that the demolition of the existing 'original' lean to buildings helped to offset the proposed extension. The Inspector took an alternative view to the Council and found the scale of the extension to be compliant with CS Policy PMD6. The Inspector allowed the appeal and in doing so imposed conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans and to ensure that materials to match the main dwelling are used.

4.2.3 The full appeal decision can be found online.

5.0 Forthcoming public inquiry and hearing dates:

5.1 Application No: 15/01354/OUT

Location: Land Part of Little Thurrock Marshes, Thurrock Park Way

Proposal: Application for outline planning permission (with details of landscaping, scale and appearance reserved) for the development of 13.36 ha of land to provide up to 280 residential units, a 250 sq.m. community facility (Use Class D1) and 1,810 sq.m. of commercial floorspace (Use Class B2/B8) with associated landscape, flood improvement and access works.

Dates: 15-18 May (Public Inquiry)

6.0 APPEAL PERFORMANCE:

6.1 The following table shows appeal performance in relation to decisions on planning applications and enforcement appeals.

	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	
Total No of Appeals	2	2	6	5	8	1	0	2	0	3	2		31
No Allowed	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		8
% Allowed													25%

7.0 Consultation (including overview and scrutiny, if applicable)

7.1 N/A

8.0 Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

8.1 This report is for information only.

9.0 Implications

9.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Sean Clark**
Director of Finance & IT

There are no direct financial implications to this report.

9.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Benita Edwards**
**Interim Deputy Head of Law (Regeneration) and
Deputy Monitoring Officer**

The Appeals lodged will either have to be dealt with by written representation procedure or (an informal) hearing or a local inquiry.

Most often, particularly following an inquiry, the parties involved will seek to recover from the other side their costs incurred in pursuing the appeal (known as 'an order as to costs' or 'award of costs').

9.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Rebecca Price**
Community Development Officer

There are no direct diversity implications to this report.

9.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

None.

10. Background papers used in preparing the report (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

- All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation can be viewed online: www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning. The planning enforcement files are not public documents and should not be disclosed to the public.

11. Appendices to the report

- None

Report Author:

Leigh Nicholson

Development Management Team Leader