

11 February 2021		ITEM: 6
Planning Committee		
Planning Appeals		
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Not Applicable	
Report of: Jonathan Keen, Interim Strategic Lead - Development Services		
Accountable Assistant Director: Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director – Planning, Transportation and Public Protection.		
Accountable Director: Andy Millard, Director – 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: 20/00749/CLOPUD

Location: The Willows, Kirkham Road, Horndon On The Hill

Proposal: Single storey outbuilding (garage) with pitched roof

3.2 Application No: 20/00444/HHA

Location: Oak Cottage, Oxford Road, Horndon On The Hill

Proposal: Two storey rear extension

3.3 Application No: 20/00604/FUL

Location: 5 Malpas Road, Chadwell St Mary

Proposal: New dwelling to side plot adjacent to 5 Malpas Road

3.3 Application No: 20/01344/HHA

Location: 1 Fanns Rise, Purfleet-on-Thames

Proposal: Single-storey rear extension (retrospective)

4.0 Appeals Decisions:

The following appeal decisions have been received:

4.1 Application No: 20/00504/FUL

Location: Jermaine, 3 Branksome Avenue, Stanford Le Hope

Proposal: Demolition of existing single dwelling and construction of two semi-detached new build properties each with separate summerhouse outbuildings, integral garages and parking provision

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

4.1.2 The Inspector considered that the main issues to consider were the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and, the effect of the proposed development on highway and pedestrian safety.

4.1.3 The proposal would replace the existing modest detached dwelling with a substantial semi-detached building. The width of the proposed building would be considerable, and it would maintain only small gaps to the side boundaries. The combined width, height and depth would create a building of substantial scale, which would be accentuated further by the provision of dormer windows at second floor level. The proposal would appear bulky and its size would be out of scale with neighbouring properties in the area. By virtue of the substantial scale of the proposed building and the lack of undeveloped space around it, the proposal would appear cramped on the plot and have a dominant presence in the street scene. The Inspector also considered the lack of any meaningful soft landscaping would be detrimental to the appearance of the proposal. The Inspector concluded that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 of the Core Strategy (2015) and Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

4.1.4 Turning to highway safety, the Inspector noted that the proposed block plan shows that the front parking spaces would be cramped, and there are no details to show how the parking spaces would be accessed. The parking layout is such that vehicles would be blocked-in by other vehicles on the parking area. The Inspector noted that, it is apparent that there would need to be significant manoeuvring of vehicles across the pavement and the highway in order to enter and leave the proposed parking spaces. The Inspector concluded that this would cause danger to users of the highway and pedestrians, particularly given the location of the appeal site close to a road junction and dismissed the appeal.

4.1.5 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.2 Application No: 19/01606/FUL

Location: Winfield Heights, Old Hill Avenue, Langdon Hills

Proposal: Demolition of Existing Scout Hut, and Outbuildings and
Erection of Bungalow with Associated Grasscrete
Driveway

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

4.2.1 The main issues considered by the Inspector were: whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies and whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

4.2.2 The appeal site includes a dilapidated scout hut, toilet block and storage building which would be demolished as part of the proposal. The toilet block and storage building are small, utilitarian structures which are largely hidden within an area of trees and vegetation. Nevertheless, the scout hut building is more noticeable in the surroundings due to its size and position. The scout hut building has not blended into the landscape and so the Inspector found that the land subject of the appeal is within the definition of 'previously developed land'. Therefore, the question was whether or not the proposal would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.

4.2.3 The Inspector noted that the NPPF indicates openness and permanence are the essential characteristics of the Green Belt. Openness is the absence of development and it has both spatial and visual aspects.

- 4.2.4 The Inspector considered that even if the floorspace and volume decreased, an assessment of the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt goes beyond mathematical calculations. The matter also needed to be considered qualitatively with reference to the scale, siting and general visual perception of the proposal.
- 4.2.5 The proposed dwelling would be in a more open position, noted the Inspector who felt the proposal would result in a significant increase in height and mass and would accordingly appear more visually intrusive and have a greater impact on openness than the existing development. The proposal would reduce the openness of the Green Belt and lead to the encroachment of development into the countryside, contrary to one of the five purposes of Green Belt policy, as set out in paragraph 134 of the NPPF thereby constituting inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- 4.2.6 It was not considered that the provision of an additional dwelling unit, the use of PDL, the modest economic benefit and improved site security would overcome the harm to the Green Belt. Accordingly the Very Special Circumstances did not clearly outweigh the harm and the appeal was dismissed.
- 4.2.7 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.3 Application No: 18/01723/FUL

Location: Winfield Heights, Old Hill Avenue, Langdon Hills

Proposal: Erection of new dwelling including the demolition of existing scout hut, outbuildings and associated resurfacing of vehicle access leading to dwelling.

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

- 4.3.1 The main issues were: whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies; the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.
- 4.3.2 The appeal site includes a dilapidated scout hut, toilet block and storage building which would be demolished as part of the proposal. The toilet block and storage building are small, utilitarian structures which are largely hidden

within an area of trees and vegetation. Nevertheless, the scout hut building is more noticeable in the surroundings due to its size and position. The scout hut building has not blended into the landscape and so the Inspector found that the land subject of the appeal is within the definition of 'previously developed land'. Therefore, the question was whether or not the proposal would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.

4.3.3 The Inspector noted that the NPPF indicates openness and permanence are the essential characteristics of the Green Belt. Openness is the absence of development and it has both spatial and visual aspects.

4.3.4 The Inspector considered that even if the floorspace and volume decreased, an assessment of the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt goes beyond mathematical calculations. The matter also needs to be considered qualitatively with reference to the scale, siting and general visual perception of the proposal.

4.3.5 The proposed dwelling would be in a more open position, noted the Inspector who felt the proposal would result in a significant increase in height and mass and would accordingly appear more visually intrusive and have a greater impact on openness than the existing development. The proposal would reduce the openness of the Green Belt and lead to the encroachment of development into the countryside, contrary to one of the five purposes of Green Belt policy, as set out in paragraph 134 of the NPPF thereby constituting inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

4.3.6 It was opined that the proposal would be conspicuous in the surroundings; the design would have a stark appearance and contrast with other structures nearby and the use of large areas of glazing would increase the sense of scale and domestic character of the building. There was also concern over the potential for surfacing to access the site, as a result the proposal would be out of character with the rural character of the area.

4.3.7 It was not considered that the provision of an additional dwelling unit, the use of PDL, the modest economic benefit and improved site security would overcome the harm to the Green Belt. Accordingly the Very Special Circumstances did not clearly outweigh the harm and the appeal was dismissed.

4.3.8 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.4 Application No: 18/00551/FUL

Location: Land Adjacent Curling Lane Helleborine And Meesons Lane, Grays

Proposal: Revised proposals seeking the development of 8 no. new two bedroom semi-detached low carbon dwellings with associated access, car parking and amenity areas.

Appeal Decision: Appeal Allowed

- 4.4.1 The Inspector considered the main issue in this case were the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and the living conditions of the future occupiers with regard to garden areas.
- 4.4.2 The three storey dwellings would be set into the slope with a pitched roof, with parking at ground level and pedestrian access via steps or a lift to first floor entrances. The principal, front elevations would face across the access road towards Helleborine and the rear gardens would back onto Meesons Lane. The dwellings would have a uniform, contemporary appearance with external cladding materials (the appellant proposed cement-based cladding and a cement-based roof finish in the application but during the appeal has suggested various cladding options), aluminium clad timber doors and windows and metal detailing on the pedestrian access platform. The principal front elevation would be seen from Helleborine through the existing tall trees and the second floor and roof on the rear elevation would be seen through trees from Meesons Lane.
- 4.4.3 The Council and local residents considered that the scheme would not reflect the character of Badgers Dene. The estate was built in the 1980s and has a suburban character of modest, two storey dwellings set on cul-de-sac off a central spine road. Although well maintained, the Inspector commented that the existing dwellings were unexceptional in their character and appearance and saw no need to replicate or reflect their design. Furthermore, the Inspector noted, the sloping topography of the site, its setting behind tall trees and its significant degree of separation from nearby dwellings by the intervening open space distinguishes it from the estate and requires a different approach. Whilst the scale, mass, contemporary style, materials and detailing would differ from those of the two storey, brick and tile houses on the estate, given its individual context, the Inspector found that the proposed development was of a high quality design that would sit comfortably within the site and enhance its surroundings. The proposed cladding, roof finish and doors/windows were considered acceptable in principle but as full details had not been provided, the Inspector noted a condition for external materials requiring the approval of details would ensure an attractive appearance.

4.4.4 The Inspector was satisfied that, subject to conditions, which would sufficiently mitigate the impact of the development, the proposal would not cause harm regarding landscape, ecology or highway matters.

4.4.5 The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the area and would accord with development plan policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 in the Council's Core Strategy and allowed the appeal subject to conditions.

4.4.6 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.5 Application No: 20/00123/HHA

Location: 225 Princess Margaret Road, East Tilbury

Proposal: (Retrospective) Erection of front and side wall with railings and gates

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

4.5.1 The Inspector considered the main issues were whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the East Tilbury Conservation Area and the effect of the proposal on pedestrian and highway safety, with regard to visibility.

4.5.2 The appeal comprised waist high brick walls with brick piers and railings, together with vehicular and pedestrian gates. Due to its siting, height and appearance the scheme was considered to be a wholly incongruous element that resulted in unacceptable harm to the appearance and character of the street scene.

4.5.3 The inspector concluded that the appeal scheme fails to preserve the character and appearance of the East Tilbury Conservation Area. It therefore fails to comply with Policies CSTP22, CSTP24, PMD2 and PMD4 of the Core Strategy.

4.5.4 Turning to highway safety, the Inspector noted the enclosed space at the front of the appeal property is used for the parking of cars. As there is a significant distance between the gateway and the road the Inspector was satisfied there is sufficient visibility in respect of cars leaving the appeal site and turning onto the road. As such the chances of harm to pedestrians due to the appeal scheme were considered to be minimal, so there was no reason for dismissal on highways safety.

4.5.5 The appeal was dismissed on design grounds.

4.5.6 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.6 Application No: 20/00595/HHA

Location: Lilly Cottage, Kirkham Shaw, Horndon On The Hill

Proposal: Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey side and rear extensions with rooflights

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

4.6.1 The Inspector considered the main issue in this case were: whether the proposal would be inappropriate development for the purposes of the NPPF and development plan policy; the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt and if the proposal is inappropriateness development whether any very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

4.6.2 The Inspector noted that cumulatively the proposal would significantly increase the footprint, floor area and bulk of the property by comparison to the original dwelling and concluded the proposal would result in disproportionate additions and would therefore be contrary to the NPPF constituting inappropriate development

4.6.3 The Inspector noted the proposal would, due to its volume and bulk, reduce, and therefore cause Harm to the openness of the Green Belt and attributed substantial weight to this harm.

4.6.4 The Inspector concluded that there were no very special circumstances that clearly outweighed the harm caused did not exist and dismissed the appeal.

4.6.5 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.7 Application No: 20/00600/HHA

Location: 15 Alfred Road, Aveley

Proposal: Single storey side extension

Appeal Decision: Appeal Allowed

4.7.1 The main issue relating to this appeal was the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

4.7.2 The Inspector noted that this end terrace corner property had been subject to an application for a dwelling development which was refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal. The appeal proposal was considered to be materially different to the previous scheme and would be narrower and

lower than the existing property. The Inspector noted the proposal would be sited away from the side boundary and the front elevation set behind the front building line of the terrace. The combination of these factors, the Inspector stated, would retain the spaciousness of the corner plot.

4.7.3 The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not be harmful to the character of the host building or immediate street scene and the appeal was allowed subject to three conditions relating to the development being built in accordance with the approved plans and materials

4.7.4 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.8 Application No: 19/01184/FUL

Location: Land South Of Allotment Site And Adj 130 Heath Road,
Chadwell St Mary

Proposal: Permanent siting of park home with associated
hardstanding and landscaping

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

4.8.1 The main issues in the consideration of the appeal were: whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the effect on the openness of the Green Belt; the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and if the proposal would be inappropriate development, whether the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify it.

Whether the Proposal would be Inappropriate Development and its Effect on the Openness of the Green Belt

4.8.2 The Inspector considered that the site meets the definition of previously developed land in the NPPF and the proposal can be considered as limited infilling. However, he indicated that the proposal was materially larger than any development on the site and for this reason, it was clear that the proposed dwelling and related fixed surface infrastructure would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than what currently exists on the site. The proposal was contrary to the Core Strategy and NPPF in that regard.

Character and Appearance

4.8.3 The Inspector considered the appeal site to be contained to the east by the boundary with Orsett Heath and to the north by the boundary with an allotment site and the siting of the park home would not be particularly visible

from Heath Road and accordingly the proposal would not result in material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Very special circumstances

4.8.4 The provision of a strip of land to be provided as a highway verge to accommodate a new footpath, the removal of an existing fence and replacement with a hedge and the lack of a 5 year housing supply were not considered to be matters that clearly outweighed the harm to the Green Belt as a result of the proposal. No very special circumstances existed and the appeal was accordingly dismissed.

4.8.5 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.9 Application No: 20/00490/HHA

Location: 6 Nutberry Close, Grays

Proposal: Single storey rear extension with three roof lights

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

4.9.1 The main issues regarding the Inspector's consideration of this appeal were whether the proposals amounted to inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of Chapter 13 of the NPPF; the effect of the proposal upon openness; and whether, if it was inappropriate development, whether any very special circumstances existed which clearly outweighed the in principle and any other harm caused.

4.9.2 The Inspector noted that cumulatively the proposal would significantly increase the footprint, floor area and bulk of the property by comparison to the original dwelling and concluded the proposal would result in disproportionate additions and therefore contrary to paragraph 145 of the NPPF and inappropriate development.

4.9.3 The Inspector commented that the proposals would, due to the volume and bulk, cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt and attributed substantial weight to this harm.

4.9.4 The Inspector considered the matters raised by the appellant, including the need to work from home and reference to another development nearby. However, the Inspector concluded that very special circumstances that clearly outweighed the harm caused did not exist and dismissed the appeal.

4.9.5 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.10 Application No: 20/00251/FUL

Location: 32 Lancaster Road Chafford Hundred

Proposal: Demolition of existing double garage, subdivision of existing plot and the construction of a new detached dwelling, including off-street parking, private garden amenity space and associated development

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

- 4.10.1 The Inspector considered the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of future occupiers with particular regard to private amenity space.
- 4.10.2 The Inspector found that the scale and positioning of the dwelling within the proposed plot left very little space about the building and that the scale and siting of the proposal in relation to the plot size and its positioning close to its rear boundary would lead to the development having a somewhat cramped and discordant appearance.
- 4.10.3 The Inspector considered the location of the majority of the garden space to the side of the dwelling would further emphasise the limited depth of the plot and the cramped appearance of the proposed dwelling and that the siting of the dwelling in such a tight plot would appear at odds with the prevailing more open form of development within the vicinity, and thus would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, which would be clearly visible from users of the footpath and from Lancaster Road.
- 4.10.4 In addition the private amenity space was found to lack sufficient depth to provide an adequate and attractive area for future occupants to utilise as a private garden area.
- 4.10.5 The quality of the amenity space would be further reduced through the land rising towards the footpath at the rear, the presence of mature trees within the site and its use for the storage of refuse bins. This led the Inspector to conclude that the private amenity space would be a rather enclosed area that would be neither an adequate nor attractive space for future occupiers of the proposed dwelling.
- 4.10.6 Thus the Inspector found the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of future occupiers. It would be in conflict with the Core Strategy and the NPPF which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments contribute positively to the character of an area and provide a high standard of amenity for future users.
- 4.10.7 Although the proposal would boost housing supply, it would only be by one unit and the harm to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of possible occupiers was serious and outweighs the benefits of

the scheme when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole. As such the presumption in favour of sustainable development as envisaged by the NPPF does not apply in this case.

4.10.8 For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal was dismissed.

4.10.9 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.11 Application No: 19/01206/FUL

Location: Green House, Robinson Road, Horndon On The Hill

Proposal: Permission to build two detached 3 bedroom bungalows
Each will have a bathroom, lounge, kitchen/diner, utility room, ensuite and hallway. The walls will be a combination of stone and render with a slate roof.

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

4.11.1 The Inspector considered the main issues to be whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; the effect on the openness of the Green Belt and whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, and whether these matters would amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

4.11.2 The Inspector found the proposal was inappropriate development as it did not constitute infilling within a village, and the Inspector concluded the location was not within a village as required within paragraph 145. The Inspector also found that the proposal would result in a loss of openness which would be harmful. The Inspector also concluded that the proposed development would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

4.11.3 The Inspector concluded that the other considerations in the case did not clearly outweigh the harm and that the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development in the Green Belt did not exist.

4.11.4 The proposal was found to be contrary to the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

4.11.5 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.12 Application No: 20/00345/HHA

Location: The Willows, Kirkham Road, Horndon On The Hill

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

4.12.1 The main issues were: whether the proposal is inappropriate development for the purposes of the NPPF and development plan policy; the effect of the development upon the openness of the Green Belt; and if the development is inappropriate, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

4.12.2 The Inspector agreed with the Council that the extension would exceed the reasonably sized room allowance as outlined within Policy PMD6 and would represent a disproportionate addition to the building owing to it resulting in a substantially greater form and massing when compared to the sizes of the original dwelling and would conflict with the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

4.12.3 The Inspector noted the increase in built form would be readily apparent from Kirkham Road owing to the availability of views of the side elevations of the proposed extension and this arrangement would erode the physical character of openness arising from the increase in built form. In addition, the increase in built form, would also erode the spatial quality of openness that is an intrinsic feature of the Green Belt and the Inspector concluded that the proposed development would have an adverse effect upon openness. The development, in this regard, would conflict with the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

4.12.4 The Inspector did not find any matters put forward amounted to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development. Accordingly, the appeal was dismissed.

4.12.5 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.13 Application No: 20/00488/FUL

Location: 1 Quarry Mews, Purfleet

Proposal: Retrospective planning permission for erection front boundary fence, the erection of side and rear boundary wall with the change of use from amenity land to residential use

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

4.13.1 The Inspector considered that the main issues were the effect of the development upon highway safety; and the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

4.13.2 In relation to highway safety the Inspector highlighted that the side wall is located immediately adjacent to the edge of the pavement and that the boundary treatment would be directly adjacent to this. It was noted that the positioning of the boundary treatments meant vehicles leaving the driveway would be somewhat obscured by other motorists and pedestrians. Furthermore, drivers of vehicles leaving the driveway would have their views of vehicles and pedestrians in Fanns Rise being somewhat obscured. In consequence, such motorists would not have sufficient levels of visibility in order to prevent such manoeuvres from coming into conflict with other motorists and pedestrians. This arrangement would erode highway safety.

4.13.3 In relation to the character and appearance of the development, the Inspector highlighted that within the area there was a varied use of boundary treatment, as such whilst re positioned the erected wall would not appear to be incongruous, particularly as other boundary treatments within the vicinity are in similar proximity to the highway. It was also noted that the enclosure of the amenity land is not injurious to the character of the surrounding area, irrespective of its permitted use.

4.13.4 The full appeal decision can be found online.

4.14 Application No: 19/00918/FUL

Location: 44 High Road, North Stifford, Grays

Proposal: Change of use from open land (nil use) to residential use in association with 44 High Road with associated plastic grass, partly constructed children's playhouse and wooden bench outside the curtilage of 44 High Road, situated to the rear of 34 and 36 High Road

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

4.141. The Inspector considered the main issues to be whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; the effect on the openness of the Green Belt and whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, and whether these matters would amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

4.14.2 The Inspector found the proposal would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt and therefore harmful. The proposal would cause harm to the Green Belt by virtue of inappropriateness. There would also be harm to the openness of the Green Belt and to one of the purposes of including land within it and this harm is given substantial weight. There would additionally be some harm to the character and appearance of the area. However, the

Inspector did not consider that with the removal of the children's equipment the proposal would affect neighbouring amenity.

4.14.3 The proposal was found to be contrary to the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

4.14.4 The full appeal decision can be found online.

5.0 APPEAL PERFORMANCE:

5.1 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	5	4	5	4	7	0	4	3	0	14			46
No Allowed	1	0	2	2	0	0	3	1	0	2			11
% Allowed	20%	0%	40%	50%	0%	0%	75%	33.33%	0%	14.29%			23.91%

6.0 Consultation (including overview and scrutiny, if applicable)

6.1 N/A

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

7.1 This report is for information only.

8.0 Implications

8.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Laura Last**
Management Accountant

There are no direct financial implications to this report.

8.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Tim Hallam**
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').

8.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Natalie Warren**
Strategic Lead Community Development and Equalities

There are no direct diversity implications to this report.

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

None.

9.0. 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.

10. Appendices to the report

- None