

Appeals Report

Appeal Decisions received between 15/02/2024 and 25/03/2024

PLANNING APPEALS

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-----|
| Total Appeal Decisions Received | 9 | |
| Dismissed | 8 | 89% |
| Allowed | 1 | 11% |
| Split | 0 | 0% |

Written Reps

Emilie Stock Road Stock Ingatestone Essex CM4 9PQ

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Reference | 23/00472/FUL |
| Proposal | Demolition of disused agricultural buildings and construction of single storey dwelling house |
| Appeal Decision | Appeal Dismissed - 15/02/2024 |
| Key Themes | Inappropriate development in the Green BeltHarmful to openness Very special circumstances do not exist |
| Agreed with CCC on | Inappropriate development in the Green BeltHarmful to openness Very special circumstances do not exist |
| Disagreed with CCC on | N/A |
| Costs Decision | None |

Land Rear Of 201 Beehive Lane Great Baddow Chelmsford

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Reference | 23/00825/FUL |
| Proposal | Proposed new bungalow with associated amenity space and parking. |
| Appeal Decision | Appeal Dismissed - 13/03/2024 |
| Key Themes | The character and appearance of the area; The living conditions of neighbouring residents in respect of privacy, outlook and disturbance; and a protected tree. |
| Agreed with CCC on | Significant harm to character and appearance of the area; Unacceptable harm to living conditions of neighbouring residents in respect of noise, disturbance and privacy. |
| Disagreed with CCC on | Would not lead to unacceptable harm to a protected tree. |
| Costs Decision | None |

Householder

Glenwood Nathans Lane Writtle Chelmsford Essex CM1 3RF

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Reference | 23/00059/FUL |
| Proposal | Proposed detached double garage |
| Appeal Decision | Appeal Dismissed - 11/03/2024 |
| Key Themes | Inappropriate in the Green Belt; openness; any very special circumstances |
| Agreed with CCC on | Inappropriate; harmful to openness; no very special circumstances |
| Disagreed with CCC on | |
| Costs Decision | None |

55 Lime Walk Chelmsford Essex CM2 9NQ

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Reference | 23/00042/FUL |
| Proposal | Loft conversion including rear dormer, raising of the ridge and roof windows to front elevation. Increase of height of existing chimney. |
| Appeal Decision | Appeal Dismissed - 05/03/2024 |
| Key Themes | impact on house and surrounding area |
| Agreed with CCC on | harmful to appearance of the street scene; poor design; disproportionate extensions |
| Disagreed with CCC on | |
| Costs Decision | None |

3 West Avenue Chelmsford Essex CM1 2DB

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Reference | 23/00611/FUL |
| Proposal | Retrospective application for a fence. |
| Appeal Decision | Appeal Dismissed - 18/03/2024 |
| Key Themes | Harmful to character of area |
| Agreed with CCC on | Harmful to character of area |
| Disagreed with CCC on | N/A |
| Costs Decision | None |

6 Butts Way Chelmsford Essex CM2 8TJ

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Reference | 23/01019/FUL |
| Proposal | Demolition of existing garage. Raise roof to create first floor with dormer window. Two storey side extension. Single storey rear extension. Front porch extension. Alterations to fenestration. |
| Appeal Decision | Appeal Dismissed - 20/02/2024 |
| Key Themes | Inappropriate development in the Green Belt Harm to openness of Green Belt No very special circumstances exist Impact to appearance and character of area |
| Agreed with CCC on | Inappropriate development in the Green Belt No very special circumstances exist |
| Disagreed with CCC on | Impact to openness of Green Belt Impact to appearance and character of area |
| Costs Decision | None |

91 Galleywood Road Great Baddow Chelmsford Essex CM2 8DW

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Reference | 23/01137/FUL |
| Proposal | Proposed double storey rear extension, new second floor and roof plus internal alterations and facade amendments (reduced scheme) |
| Appeal Decision | Appeal Allowed - 14/03/2024 |
| Key Themes | The effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and of the surrounding area. |
| Agreed with CCC on | |
| Disagreed with CCC on | Development would not harm the character or appearance of the surrounding area and the dwelling would fit in with its surroundings. |
| Costs Decision | None |

20 Meadgate Avenue Great Baddow Chelmsford Essex CM2 7LG

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Reference | 23/00773/FUL |
| Proposal | Part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension. Single storey front extension. Addition of new catslide element to rear roof slope. Addition of first floor side window. Alterations to existing fenestration |
| Appeal Decision | Appeal Dismissed - 18/03/2024 |
| Key Themes | |
| Agreed with CCC on | effect on neighbouring amenity |
| Disagreed with CCC on | |
| Costs Decision | None |

De Beauvoir Farm Church Road Ramsden Heath Billericay Essex CM11 1PW

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Reference | 23/01186/FUL |
| Proposal | Retrospective application for the erection of replacement walls and gates. |
| Appeal Decision | Appeal Dismissed - 13/03/2024 |
| Key Themes | |
| Agreed with CCC on | - wall, piers and gates fall under the definition of a "building"- the proposal falls under exception d) of Paragraph 154 of the NPPF - replacement of a building- the walls, piers, railings and gates are materially larger and constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt- more substantial and permanent physical boundary which is highly urbanising. Giving moderate weight on the visual dimension of the openness of the Green Belt- fall back position as described by the appellant does not exist as inspector agrees adjacent to a highway, so to be permitted development can be no higher than 1m above ground level- little weight attributed to security as design unlikely to deter tenacious burglar and other potential means of enclosure, and other areas of the plot where the appellants dog could be exercised without risk- the other examples of walls and gates close to the appeal site are lower and less visually intrusive- |
| Disagreed with CCC on | |
| Costs Decision | None |