

Appeals Report

Appeal Decisions received between 23/10/2025 and 24/11/2025

PLANNING APPEALS

Total Appeal Decisions Received	9	
Dismissed	4	44%
Allowed	5	56%
Split	0	0%

Written Reps

Oak Cottages Chalk Street Rettendon Chelmsford Essex

Reference	23/00820/CLOPUD
Proposal	Outbuilding with swimming pool, gym and bar.
Appeal Decision	Appeal Allowed - 20/11/2025
Key Themes	Definition of curtilage
Agreed with CCC on	
Disagreed with CCC on	definition of curtilage
Costs Decision	None

Land South West Of Brooklands Sheepcotes Lane Little Waltham Chelmsford Essex

Reference	24/01373/FUL
Proposal	Demolition of domestic storage building and replacement with single residential dwelling including bin store.
Appeal Decision	Appeal Allowed - 27/10/2025
Key Themes	Rural AreaGreen Wedge
Agreed with CCC on	Transitional strip between distinctly urban form of Great Waltham and the bucolic hinterland within which it liesPreviously developed landBuilding volume would be enlarged significantlyThe presence of a permanent, separate household within the site would be likely to lead to the introduction of more domestic paraphernalia than at present
Disagreed with CCC on	The presence of dwellings backing onto the lane undermines the ruralitySite well enclosed and contribution to wider area is limited by thisDwelling would retain, to a very great extent, its current appearance from the laneNot appear incongruous in its settingTreatment and structures to front could be controlled through conditionsMinimal change from parked carsAny residual visual effects would be very limited the proposal accords with the aims of Policies DM7 and DM8 of the Local Plan
Costs Decision	None

Land Adjacent Fairbanks School Lane Great Leighs Chelmsford Essex

Reference	24/01787/FUL
Proposal	Demolition of outbuildings and proposed construction of one new detached dwelling (Use Class C3), with retention of access, provision of driveway and parking, a shed, landscaping and associated works.
Appeal Decision	Appeal Allowed - 20/11/2025

Key Themes	Suitable locationCharacter and appearance of the Rural AreaEuropean designated site impact
Agreed with CCC on	Outside settlement boundaryAgreed conflict with aims of Policy S7 as seeks to focus development to locations set out in settlement hierarchyAgreed that with the funding for the proposed mitigation measures, the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the SPA and Ramsar sites.
Disagreed with CCC on	Great Leighs walkable, as only a short stretch would rely on grass vergesLocation of Strategic Growth Site with pedestrian and cycle access weighs in favour of site being sustainable, although not extant permissionProvides infill development and would not be harmful to character and appearance of the surrounding countrysideAccord with aims of Policies S1, S11 (c), DM8 and DM9.Benefits of the scheme outweigh the limited harm arising from conflict with S7.
Costs Decision	None

Land North West Of Oakview The Ridge Little Baddow Chelmsford Essex

Reference	24/01702/FUL
Proposal	New dwelling to north of existing house. New access way and drive to existing house (Oak View)
Appeal Decision	Appeal Allowed - 17/11/2025
Key Themes	- whether the proposal is an infill development in otherwise built up frontage and would comply with the NPPF and Policy DM8 of the Local Plan;- whether there be any adverse impact on biodiversity;- whether the proposal results in a sustainable development;- noted by the Inspector that the Council is unable to demonstrate 5y housing supply and para 11 of the NPPF applies in this instance;
Agreed with CCC on	- the proposal does not meet the definition of an infill development within a built up frontage due to the loose position of houses on this side of the road (but it still infills space between two houses);- the proposal would not result in harm to protected wildlife sites; appropriate mitigation measures are in place;
Disagreed with CCC on	- the proposal will not harm the character of the area and the street and would be an infill development (although not in a built up frontage);- the proposed self build condition is not legally sound so cannot be applied to the development;- due to the Council's inability to demonstrate 5 y housing supply the conflict with policy DM8 is demonstrably outweighed by the benefits of a new house;
Costs Decision	None

Bridleway Cottage Broomwood Lane Stock Billericay CM11 1JR

Reference	24/01627/FUL
Proposal	Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement dwelling
Appeal Decision	Appeal Dismissed - 19/11/2025
Key Themes	Green belt - replacement dwelling, substantially bigger - substantial harm
Agreed with CCC on	Green belt - replacement dwelling, substantially bigger - substantial harm
Disagreed with CCC on	
Costs Decision	None

52 - 52A Maldon Road Great Baddow Chelmsford Essex CM2 7DL

Reference	25/00288/CUPAMA
Proposal	Determination as to whether prior approval from the local planning authority is required for the proposed change of use from Salon (Class E) to Residential (Class C3) two new dwellinghouses. No exterior changes are proposed.
Appeal Decision	Appeal Allowed - 11/11/2025

Key Themes	effect on the character or sustainability of Great Baddow Conservation Area.
Agreed with CCC on	
Disagreed with CCC on	effect on the character or sustainability of Great Baddow Conservation Area.
Costs Decision	None

Householder

7 Joseph Clibbon Drive Chelmsford Garden Community Chelmsford CM1 6AS

Reference	25/00506/FUL
Proposal	First floor rear extension
Appeal Decision	Appeal Dismissed - 10/11/2025
Key Themes	Effect on the character and appearance of the area
Agreed with CCC on	Effect on the character and appearance of the area
Disagreed with CCC on	N/A
Costs Decision	None

Deshmukh Cottage Cherry Garden Lane Danbury Chelmsford Essex CM3 4QP

Reference	25/01049/FUL
Proposal	Erection of front porch with overhang roof and the replacement of existing flat-roofed dormers with pitched.
Appeal Decision	Appeal Dismissed - 21/11/2025
Key Themes	Design change of dormers from flat to pitch. Impact of proposal on character of property and surrounding area.
Agreed with CCC on	Dormers poorly designed.
Disagreed with CCC on	
Costs Decision	None

10 Souther Cross Road Good Easter Chelmsford Essex CM1 4RX

Reference	25/01032/FUL
Proposal	Construction of open sided car port
Appeal Decision	Appeal Dismissed - 21/11/2025
Key Themes	Impact on street scene
Agreed with CCC on	Harmful impact on street sceneDesign does not overcome harm Conflicts with Policy DM23
Disagreed with CCC on	
Costs Decision	None

ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

Total Appeal Decisions Received	1	
Dismissed	1	100%
Allowed	0	0%
Split	0	0%

Written Reps

Land South Of Hobbits Hole South Hanningfield Road Rettendon Chelmsford Essex

Reference	21/00233/ENFB
Proposal	Without planning permission, the change of use of the land for sale and storage of motor vehicles with associated development, comprising the construction of a hard surface, concrete pad, fencing and the siting of a portacabin and storage containers
Appeal Decision	Appeal Dismissed - 24/11/2025
Grounds of Appeal	whether copies of the enforcement notice were served as required by section 172; whether the matters alleged constituted a breach of planning control; whether the development was immune from enforcement action; whether planning permission should be granted; whether the steps required by the notice are excessive; whether the time for compliance falls short of what is reasonable.
Agreed with CCC on	the notice was served as required by section 172; the matters alleged constitute a breach of planning control; the alleged use is not immune from enforcement action; the alleged development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. There is conflict with CLP policies SPS1, SPS11, DM6 and DM10, and therefore planning permission should not be granted; the steps required achieve the purpose of remedying the breach of planning control and are not excessive nor are they disproportionate;
Disagreed with CCC on	The fence along the eastern boundary is immune from enforcement action due to the passage of time, so this element was removed from section 5 sub-paragraph (4). The time period for compliance (of 6 months) was too short, and this was extended to 8 months.
Costs Decision	None