

| | | |
|---|--|----------------|
| 30 June 2016 | | ITEM: 6 |
| Planning Committee | | |
| Planning Appeals | | |
| Report of: Leigh Nicholson, Development Management Team Leader | | |
| Wards and communities affected: All | Key Decision: Not Applicable | |
| Accountable Head of Service: Andy Millard, Head of Planning and Growth | | |
| Accountable Director: Steve Cox, Director of Environment and Place | | |
| This report is Public | | |
| Date of notice given of exempt or confidential report: N/A | | |
| Purpose of Report: For Information | | |

Executive Summary

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

1. Recommendations:

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: 15/01531/TPO

Location: Land Adjacent 7 8 9, Addison Gardens, Grays

Proposal: Group 1, 5 London planes. Reduce all trees by 50%.

3.2 Application No: 16/00007/HHA

Location: Bretts Farm Cottages, Marshfoot Road, Grays
Proposal: Proposed two storey extension and rear extension together with internal alterations

4.0 Appeal Decisions

The following appeal decisions have been received:

4.1 Application No: 15/00917/HHA

Location: 8 Felipe Road, Chafford Hundred
Proposal: Proposed loft conversion with rear dormer
Decision: 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 existing dwelling and wider area.
- 4.1.2 The Inspector found that the dormer would unacceptably dominate the rear roof slope, being excessively large and unacceptably close to the main ridge of the roof. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would conflict with LDF CS Policies PMD1, PMD2 and CSTP22.
- 4.1.3 The full appeal decision can be found [here](#)

4.2 Application No: 15/00515/TPO

Location: 1A Sycamore Close, Tilbury
Proposal: Removal of T10 - Beech tree from Tree Preservation Order 02/1989
Decision: Dismissed

Summary of decision:

- 4.2.1 The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposed felling on amenity and whether or not there are sufficient grounds for the works proposed.
- 4.2.2 In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector was satisfied that the sycamore trees have amenity value and that their loss would have an adverse effect on amenity. The Inspector took into account the applicant's reasons for seeking the removal of the trees but found that the reasons did not outweigh the amenity value of the trees.

4.2.3 The full appeal decision can be viewed [here](#)

5.0 Forthcoming Public Inquiry And Hearing Dates:

5.1 The following inquiry and hearing dates have been arranged:

None

6.0 Appeal Performance:

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

| | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC | JAN | FEB | MAR | |
|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Total No of Appeals | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| No Allowed | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| % Allowed | | | | | | | | | | | | | 28% |

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: **Vivien Williams**
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.

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: **Rebeka Price**
Community Development Officer

There are no direct diversity implications to this report.

9.4 **Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Section 17, Risk Assessment, Health Impact Assessment, Sustainability, IT, Environmental**

None.

Background Papers Used In Preparing This Report (include their location and identify whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

The planning files relating to any application mentioned in this report are available from Planning, Thurrock Council, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL. The planning enforcement files are not public documents and should not be disclosed to the public.

Appendices To This Report:

None

Report Author Contact Details:

Leigh Nicholson

Development Management Manager