18 th May 2017	ITEM: 6							
Planning Committee								
Planning Appeals								
Wards and communities affected: Key Decision:								
All	Not Applicable							
Report of: Leigh Nicholson, Development Management Team Leader								
Accountable Head of Service: Andy Millard, Head of Planning and Growth								
Accountable Director: Steve Cox, Director of Environment and 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: 16/00271/FUL

- Location: Barn To North East Of St Cleres Hall Stanford Road Stanford Le Hope SS17 0LX
- Proposal: Demolition of existing car storage building and erection of a residential terrace of 5no. three bedroom dwellings

3.2 Application No: 16/00635/FUL

Location: Oddsit Licenced Bookmakers 587 - 589 London Road West Thurrock Essex RM20 4AR

Proposal: Erection of a new mixed-use building comprising ground floor retail A1 shop unit with a separate self-contained 2bed flat on the upper floors (amended application following 15/00449/FUL) incorporating a first floor roof terrace

3.3 Application No: 16/00815/CLEUD

Location: 123 Mollands Lane South Ockendon RM15 6DJ

Proposal: Retain mobile home on property

4.0 Appeals Decisions:

The following appeal decisions have been received:

4.1 Application No: 16/01180/HHA

Location:27 Cecil Avenue Chafford Hundred Grays RM16 6QAProposal:Loft conversion with front dormer, two rear dormers and
extension of gable roof and chimney.

Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Summary of decision:

- 4.1.1 The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene.
- 4.1.2 The Inspector took the view that, due to the increase in ridge and chimney height, together with the proposed dormers, the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition to the otherwise uniform character and appearance of this group of dwellings. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene. The appeal was consequently dismissed.
- 4.1.4 The full appeal decision can be found <u>here</u>

4.2 Application No: 16/01226/HHA

Location:	68 River View Chadwell St Mary RM16 4BD
Proposal:	Drop kerb to front of property.

Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Summary of decision:

- 4.2.1 The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the safety of public highway users.
- 4.2.2 The Inspector concurred with the Council's concerns relating to the width of the access and agreed that the access would not be nearly wide enough to accommodate smooth vehicular manoeuvring onto and off of the carriageway. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would unacceptably prejudice the safety of public highway users. The appeal was consequently dismissed.
- 4.2.3 The full appeal decision can be found here

5.0 Forthcoming public inquiry and hearing dates:

- 5.1 The following inquiry and hearing dates have been arranged:
- 5.2 None.

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												
No Allowed	0												
% Allowed									0%				

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 **Head of Corporate Finance**

There are no direct financial implications to this report.

9.2 Legal

Implications verified by:

Principal Regeneration Solicitor

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

Vivien Williams

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 documentation viewed online: supporting can be 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**