

MEMBERS' BULLETIN



Thursday, 8 February 2024/Issue No. 2024/06

For enquiries regarding The Members Bulletin, please call 01268 207934
The Basildon Centre, St Martin's Square, Basildon, Essex SS14 1DL

MEETINGS LIST

This is a list of meetings to be attended by Councillors.
Please note that meetings marked with an asterisk are
not open to the public.

Week Commencing 12th February 2024

	COMMITTEE, CONFERENCE, ETC	VENUE	TIME
Mon 12	Conservative Group Meeting*	St. George's Suite	8.00pm
Tue 13	Scrutiny Committee (People)	St. George's Suite	7.00pm
Wed 14	Joint Standards Committee	St. George's Suite	7.00pm
Thur 15			
Fri 16			

Week Commencing 19th February 2024

	COMMITTEE, CONFERENCE, ETC	VENUE	TIME
Mon 19	Labour Group Meeting*	Labour Group Room	7.30pm
	Conservative Group Meeting*	St. George's Suite	8.00pm
Tue 20			
Wed 21	Planning Committee	St. George's Suite	7.00pm
Thur 22	Council (Budget)	St. George's Suite	7.00pm
Fri 23			

Week Commencing 26th February 2024

	COMMITTEE, CONFERENCE, ETC	VENUE	TIME
Mon 26	Conservative Group Meeting*	St. George's Suite	8.00pm
Tue 27			
Wed 28	Miscellaneous Licensing Sub-Committee	Gloucester Park Room	11.00am
	Scrutiny Committee (Place)	St. George's Suite	7.00pm
Thur 29	Licensing Committee	St. George's Suite	7.00pm
Fri 01			

Week Commencing 4th March 2024

	COMMITTEE, CONFERENCE, ETC	VENUE	TIME
Mon 04	Labour Group Meeting*	Labour Group Room	7.30pm
	Conservative Group Meeting*	St. George's Suite	8.00pm
Tue 05			
Wed 06	Miscellaneous Licensing Sub-Committee	Gloucester Park Room	11.00am
Thur 07	Planning Committee	St. George' Suite	7.00pm
Fri 08			

(Please note that these lists are correct at the time of being printed and do not take account of any subsequent changes to the diary.)

~ 0 ~

LOCAL COUNCIL MEETINGS

Here are the links to all local council meetings:

https://www.billericaytowncouncil.gov.uk/Schedule_of_Meetings_9828.aspx

<https://e-voice.org.uk/bgnb-parishcouncil>

http://www.greatbursteadsouthgreen-vc.gov.uk/Meetings_28861.aspx

<https://e-voice.org.uk/lbpc/>

<https://e-voice.org.uk/noakbridgepc/meetings/>

<https://ramsdenbellhouseparishcouncil.co.uk>

<https://www.ramsdencrayspc.org.uk/>

www.shotgatepc.org.uk

www.wickfordtowncouncil.gov.uk

~ 0 ~

CIVIC EVENTS

None

~ 0 ~

MEMBER EVENTS

None

~ 0 ~

CABINET MEMBER DECISION RECORDS

Below is a list of CMDRs published this week

CMDR No.	CMDR Subject	Cabinet Member	Date Published
SPIPE 08-24	DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDER FOR THE NORTH BENFLEET PLOTLANDS	Cllr Moore	07/02/24 <i>(subject to call-in)</i>

~ 0 ~

GENERAL INFORMATION

ROADWORKS

For detailed information regarding Roadworks in your Ward, go to:-

www.roadworks.org

~ 0 ~

BUS TIMETABLE CHANGES

For up to date information on changes to bus timetables within the Essex area, go to the link below and sign up to the Essex County Council's Transport and Travel Update Electronic Newsletter, which includes the contents of Bus Passenger News, as well as Travel News, Offers and other information.

<http://www.essexhighways.org/Transport-and-Roads/Getting-Around/Bus/Bus-timetable-changes.aspx>

~ 0 ~

MEMBER TRAINING

None

~ 0 ~

WARD RELATED INFORMATION

The following sections provide information on planning applications and other Ward specific information which will be of interest to Members in their community leadership role. Members are reminded that further details on planning applications can be viewed on the Public Access for Planning pages of the Council's web-site, <http://planning.basildon.gov.uk/PublicAccess>. This includes associated documents, case officer details and the expiry date for consultations. Any written comments submitted by Members in respect of specific applications will be taken into consideration as part of the decision making process.

All letters received in response to the Council's consultations on planning applications are available for viewing by Members by contacting the Planning Technical Support Team on 01268 207968 or 01268 208241.

LICENSING APPLICATIONS

The Licensing Authority have received (1/02/2024) an application for a **Gambling Premises Licence** regarding:

***Bet Fred
17-18 The Willows Shopping Centre
Wickford
Essex
SS12 0RA***

Ward: Wickford Castledon

The Application requests a premises licence to operate a Betting shop.

Any representations must be received by the Licensing Authority by 29/2/2024. If you have any questions, please contact Licensing Officer Roy Robinson on 01268-208260.

~ 0 ~

BILLERICAY EAST WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00062/ABAS	Hill House 24 High Street	Advertising to front elevation consisting of: rear LED illuminated white individual letters and orange bar to be seen alongside existing plaque and existing hanging sign.

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00063/LBBAS	Hill House 24 High Street	Consent for front signage of individual letters and single illuminated back bar.
24/00083/FULL	Dorrond Break Egg Hill	Conversion of existing roof space incorporating dormers, side extension with room(s) in roof, alterations to fenestration including installation of Juliet balcony to rear, and porch canopy to front
24/00108/HEDGE	Anglian Water Authority Outwood Farm Road	To support a P-scheme to allow a temporary access track to be made onto our WRC site. A small (maximum 5m) section of hedgerow to be removed this has been found to be within a locally protected area.
24/00110/FULL	8 Cavell Road Billericay	First floor side extension, raised gable, rear dormer window and front rooflights
24/00119/FULL	89 High Street Billericay	Part change of use from commercial, business and service (Class E) to 3 x self-contained residential units (Class C3); facade amendments to side elevation incorporating new windows; removal of ATM and reinstatement of front facade window; plus associated cycle parking and refuse storage.
24/00135/NMABAS	6 Horace Road Billericay	To establish whether amendments to removal of side parapet gutters replaced with traditional soffit fascias and gutter in black, and if aligning the first floor with the ground floor on the left hand flank can be considered as an non-material amendments to planning permission 23/00068/FULL

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01533/LDCP	39 Chantry Way Billericay	To establish the lawfulness of a proposed single storey rear extension.	Granted

~ 0 ~

BILLERICAY WEST WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01251/FULL	310 Perry Street Billericay	Bay window and rooflights to front, and single storey rear extension and dormer window. (Amended Plans).	Granted
23/01418/FULL	4 Moat Edge Gardens Billericay	Proposed single storey rear extension and Juliet balcony	Refused
23/01510/FULL	45 Brightside Billericay	Single storey front, side and rear extensions, external alterations	Refused
23/01523/FULL	53 Knightbridge Walk Billericay	Single storey rear extension	Granted
23/01531/FULL	Pilton Buckwyns Chase	Two storey side extension	Refused
23/01538/TPOBAS	47-49 Stock Road	Felling of 2 x Oak trees of TPO/11/05	Refused

~ 0 ~

BURSTEAD WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00106/FULL	2 Rosslyn Road Billericay	Demolish conservatory and garage. Proposed single storey side and rear extensions
24/00107/FULL	29 Nuthatch Close Billericay	Single storey side extension (attached to rear of existing garage)

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00114/FULL	20 St Agnes Road Billericay	Proposed extensions to rear, new roof to accommodate habitable space inclusive of balconies/terrace and rooflights, alterations to elevations, new detached garage at rear
24/00120/FULL	Lyndhurst Broomhills Chase	Demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings and the erection of a replacement dwelling

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01515/FULL	Inglewood Southend Road	Proposed two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, front infill extension and front dormer extension	Granted

~ 0 ~

CROUCH WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00075/FULL	1 Fore Street Noak Bridge	Use of 1-23 Fore Street, Noak Bridge from sheltered housing to general needs housing.
24/00076/FULL	39 Fore Street Noak Bridge	Use of 39-69 Fore Street, Noak Bridge from sheltered housing to general needs housing.
24/00105/FULL	Parsonage Farm Cottage Church Lane	Proposed single storey rear extension, single storey rear/side extension. Proposed chimney flue to the rear extension. Proposed fenestration alterations to the north (side), front and rear. Proposed demolition of existing porch and erection of replacement porch. Alterations to the front driveway and new front gate/wall to be installed

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01374/FULL	Stansell View Gardiners Lane North	Proposed single storey front, side and rear extensions and a new raised clipped hipped roof incorporating rooflights (amended scheme)	Granted
23/01535/FULL	Willow Lodge Homestead Road	Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of single storey rear extension	Granted
23/01543/LDCP	Parsonage Farm Cottage Church Lane	To establish the lawfulness of a proposed single storey side extension	Granted

~ 0 ~

FRYERNS WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00046/FULL	1 The Hatherley Basildon	Drive way and dropped kerb

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01560/ABAS	Carnival Park, Unit 16 Carnival Close	7 x fascia signs, 3 x aluminium poster frames, 1 x Silver anodised aluminium Owners plaque, 12 x digitally printed vinyl	Granted
24/00010/COND	Ghyll Grove Nursing Home Ghyllgrove	Application for approval of details reserved by condition 31 (bus infrastructure enhancements) of consent reference 22/01485/FULL.	Granted

~ 0 ~

LAINDON PARK WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00103/FULL	28 Suffolk Drive Laindon	Extension and part garage conversion

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
24/00061/COND	The Christadelphian Hall Basildon Drive	Approval of details reserved by condition (8) (Construction Management Plan) of application 21/00991/FULL	Granted

~ 0 ~

LANGDON HILLS WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01414/FULL	168 Great Berry Lane Langdon Hills	Proposed single storey rear and side extension and first floor extension to convert chalet bungalow to house.	Granted

~ 0 ~

LEE CHAPEL NORTH WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00113/FULL	23 Orchid Place Laindon	Change of Use from Class C3 Dwellinghouse to Class C2 Children's Care Home (up to 2 children up to the age of 16)

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01463/LDCP	58 Markhams Chase Basildon	To establish the lawfulness of a proposed single storey rear extension	Granted

~ 0 ~

NETHERMAYNE

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00118/TPOBAS	Woodland North Of Witchards	TPO/05/98 Item A 5 x hornbeams 1. Reduce branch over-hang by 2-4 meters to avoid branches encroaching into gardens. 2.Crown raise branches overhanging fence line up to 4 meters to manage canopy and avoid encroaching into gardens. Item B Hornbeam 1. Over-extended limb at 2 meters growing over fence line. Remove back to source to reduce risk of failure. Item C Hornbeam 1. 2x Over-extended limbs at 2 meters growing over fence line. Remove back to source to reduce risk of failure. 2.Crown raise over footpath to 3 meters. Item D Oak: 1.Primary branches under 6 meters and over-hanging fence line. Reduce by 3 meters and crown raise to give up to 2 meters clearance over fence height.

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00136/NMABAS	79 Bebington Drive Langdon Hills	To establish whether amendments including the introduction of a side door within the flank elevation of the approved rear extension. Enlargement of the extension from 4.5 meters to 4.6 meters can be considered as non-material amendments to granted consent 23/00038/FULL

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
24/00014/PVPA	First Bus Cherrydown East	Application for prior approval (Class J, Part 14) for installation of Solar Photovoltaic array to existing pitched roofs comprising 266 No. Solar Photovoltaic panels with a maximum output of 102.41 kWp.	Prior Approval Not Required

~ 0 ~

PITSEA NORTH WEST WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00074/FULL	5 Felmore Court Felmores	Use of 5 - 38 Felmores Court, Pitsea from sheltered housing to general needs housing.
24/00121/FULL	18 Great Leighs Way Pitsea	Garage conversion with changes from hip to gable roof

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01402/TPOBAS	27 Bishops Close Basildon	T1 (Oak) of TPO/26/90 Crown reduction of 2-3 metres.	Application Permitted

~ 0 ~

PITSEA SOUTH EAST WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00066/FULL	14 Gordons Pitsea	First floor side extension to facilitate change of use from a 6-unit HMO to a 7-unit HMO.

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01424/FULL	34 Westlake Avenue Bowers Gifford	Attached garage.	Granted

~ 0 ~

ST. MARTIN'S WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00080/ABAS	Empire Cinemas East Square	Item A1: 1 off built up internally illuminated fascia sign, Item A2: 1 off built up internally illuminated fascia sign, Item A3: 1 off built up internally illuminated fascia sign and Item B: 1 off built up internally illuminated fascia sign

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/00436/VAR	Ghyllgrove Community Primary School The Gore	Variation of condition 4 (The MUGA shall be used in association with the existing school use as per the application details and between the hours of 09:00-16:15 Monday to Friday inclusive) of consent reference 22/00541/FULL to allow opening up on a weekend Saturdays between 08:30-13:30 and Sundays 09:30-13:30.	Granted
23/01534/ABAS	Westgate Park, Unit 1 Fodderwick	Installation of 1No. internally illuminated pole sign.	Granted
23/01539/LDCP	23 Tinkler Side Basildon	The proposal is to establish the lawfulness of a proposed front porch	Granted
23/01547/FULL	23 Tinkler Side Basildon	Retrospective application for the replacement of conservatory with single storey extension.	Granted

~ 0 ~

VANGE WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01338/FULL	Mopsies Park East New Cricket Pavilion Timberlog Close	Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of a single storey side extension to enlarge existing changing rooms and internal alterations.	Granted

~ 0 ~

WICKFORD CASTLEDON WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

None

~ 0 ~

Licensing Matters:

The Licensing Authority have received (1/02/2024) an application for a **Gambling Premises Licence** regarding:

***Bet Fred
17-18 The Willows Shopping Centre
Wickford
Essex
SS12 0RA***

Ward: Wickford Castledon

The Application requests a premises licence to operate a Betting shop.

Any representations must be received by the Licensing Authority by 29/2/2024. If you have any questions, please contact Licensing Officer Roy Robinson on 01268-208260.

WICKFORD NORTH WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00070/FULL	33 Harold Gardens Wickford	First floor side and rear extension
24/00112/FULL	18 Beauchamps Drive Wickford	To convert and extend existing bungalow into a 3 bedroom chalet bungalow with raised roof, dormers to rear and front, and porch to front
24/00116/FULL	53 Mount Close Wickford	Single storey front extension, part single and part two storey side extension

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01509/FULL	6 Ilgars Road Wickford	Single storey side and rear extension	Granted

~ 0 ~

WICKFORD PARK WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

None

~ 0 ~

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION WEBSITE

Up to date information on Local Government issues can be found on the following websites:

Local Government Association - www.lga.gov.uk
Direct.gov.uk - what's new - www.direct.gov.uk

BASILDON BOROUGH COUNCIL WEBSITE

The Council's website address is: www.basildon.gov.uk

Councillor Call in form – Planning Committee

All call ins must be made within **28 days** from the date of validation of a planning application (as set out in the Member Bulletin).

I wish to call-in the following application for determination by the Planning Committee.

Application Number:	
Application Site Address:	

My reasons for requesting call-in are as follows. Please tick appropriate box(es):

Impact on neighbouring properties	
Impact on character of the street scene	
Residential amenity	
Car parking	
Highway issues	
Impact on trees and landscaping	
Impact on Listed Building/Conservation Area	
Other reasons (please specify below):	

Name:

Date:

This form should be emailed to the Development Team Manager charles.sweeny@basildon.gov.uk and to the Technical Support Team planning@basildon.gov.uk

If you have not received acknowledgement within 1 working day please contact the Technical Support Team at planning@basildon.gov.uk

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Authorised: Yes [] No []

Signature of the Chairman of Committee.....

Date signed.....

In calling an application to the Planning Committee the Councillor is not pre-determining the planning application. Rather the Councillor is expressing a legitimate concern about an application and will reach a final conclusion, having considered all of the matters presented at the meeting and being genuinely open to persuasion on the merits of the application when a decision comes to be made by the Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2024

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/23/3333646
1A Clay Hill Road, Basildon, Essex SS16 5DA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Miron Sergui against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00927/FULL, dated 12 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is fence to front including front gates and metal railing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. As the development has been undertaken, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that it involves an application for retrospective planning permission.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the boundary treatment that has been built on the character and appearance of the street scene; and on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey end-of-terrace dwelling located in a residential cul-de-sac. There is a green wooded area with a footpath between the side of the appeal property and the road to the north.
5. Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon Local Plan Saved Policies (2007) states that permission for the alteration and extension of existing dwellings will be refused if the development causes material harm to the character of the surrounding area, including the street scene.
6. There is a good degree of uniformity along Clay Hill Road, with the original layout, design and appearance of properties readily apparent. The street is characterised by unaltered terraced properties with open frontages to the street, providing a visual coherence and consistency to the street scene.

7. The development that has been undertaken comprises a brick boundary wall adjoining the fence that runs along the side boundary. This extends across the front of the property with two metal gates incorporated and a lower boundary wall with pillars and metal railings to the other side. As the appeal property is at the closed end of the road next to the wooded area, it is less conspicuous than would be the case if positioned elsewhere in the street.
8. Nonetheless, the changes to the front boundary are substantive and due to the solidity and height of the boundary treatments, they are prominent within the street scene. In particular, the extent of the full enclosure of the front boundary and the materials used contrasts unfavourably with the uniform open appearance of all the other properties' front boundaries in the street. Consequently, the development to the front of the appeal property harmfully undermines the original layout and appearance of the street scene.
9. I acknowledge that the changes to the boundary seek to respond to security concerns arising from use of the wooded area and footpath next to the appeal property. However, the principal boundary providing separation is to the side and, therefore, the harmful effect of the full enclosure of the frontage is not overcome by these concerns. The appellant provides a photograph of a similar boundary wall and gate, but this is not part of the same street scene as the appeal property and I am unaware of the wider context. As such, this other example does not alter the above findings.
10. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the boundary treatment that has been built has a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. Therefore, it is contrary to Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies, as described. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes good design.

Highway safety

11. The Council indicates that the boundary treatment impinges on the existing highway boundary and will, therefore, have a detrimental impact on highway safety. However, I am not aware that a plan has been provided of the extent of the highway land involved. From the site inspection it is clear that on-street parking is prohibited in front of No 1A and there appears to be sufficient space for vehicles to manoeuvre and turn at the end of the cul-de-sac.
12. Consequently, on the basis of the available information and the inspection, I conclude that the development does not result in unacceptable harm to highway safety. As such, there is no conflict with the Highway Authority's *Development Management Policies* supplementary guidance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above concerning the first main issue, it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2024

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/23/3327836

9 Sandown Road, Shotgate, Wickford, Essex SS11 8PA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jonas Brunza against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00499/FULL, dated 11 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is part single/two storey rear and two storey side extension with front addition (revised scheme).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached chalet bungalow close to the junction of Sandown Road with Bridge Road. The surrounding area is residential in character with a mix of chalet bungalows and two storey dwellings.
 4. Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon Local Plan Saved Policies (2007) states that permission for the alteration and extension of existing dwellings will be refused if the development causes material harm to the character of the surrounding area, including the street scene.
 5. Except for the first floor front extension, the Council indicates that the proposal would not be harmful. I see no reason to disagree about the other elements of the overall proposal. No 9 currently has a prominent front roof slope with a central modest flat-roofed dormer. The same form of dormer is present on the adjoining property, reflecting a uniformity of character and appearance between the paired dwellings.
 6. The proposed front extension involves placing an additional larger dormer directly next to the existing one, above the garage. This would have a larger window than the existing dormer and a hipped roof. Consequently, it would
-

pay little regard to the existing design of the host dwelling or the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Due to its size within the roof slope, larger window and different roof form, the proposed dormer would fail to integrate effectively with the host dwelling, particularly the smaller, flat-roofed dormer directly next to it. It would also unbalance the current uniform appearance of the paired dwellings. The additional dormer would be prominent from surrounding views and, therefore, its incongruous and uncharacteristic appearance would harm the street scene.

7. There are examples of large dormers on properties across the junction on Bridge Road, but these are present in matching pairs. There are no apparent examples of dormers next to each other on the same property of a materially different design, size and appearance as is the case with the appeal proposal. The limited examples of mismatched dormers on paired dwellings do not provide a positive precedent for the appeal proposal. The appellant makes a comparison with No 11 Sandown Road, but this is a two storey dwelling without a front dormer. For these reasons, I give little weight to comparisons with development in the surrounding area.
8. I accept that the proposal would result in the creation of more living space and that it would make the appeal property more environmentally sustainable, using appropriate materials. While I have had full regard to these benefits, they do not outweigh the harm resulting from the built form of the extended dwelling proposed in this location. The fact that there were no objections to the proposal from neighbouring occupiers or other interested parties is not sufficient reason to set aside the above findings.
9. Accordingly, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed first floor front extension would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies, as described. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes good design.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2024

by C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/23/3319817

Stead Hall Farm, Laindon Common Road, Billericay, Essex CM12 9TD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Lovell against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01586/FULL, dated 7 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is demolition of garage and outbuilding, construction of single storey extension, construction of basement, re-cladding of existing house and construction of chimney stacks.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner above is taken from the original application form. I have slightly amended it to remove words not describing acts of development.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated in December 2023, during the course of this appeal. Other than paragraph numbering, the wording about proposals affecting the Green Belt and heritage assets has not changed. Therefore, I am satisfied no party would be disadvantaged by not having the opportunity to provide observations on the new Framework.

Main Issues

4. The parties agree the proposal would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt as defined in Section 13 of the Framework and saved Policy BAS GB4 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007 (BLP). I concur.
5. Therefore, the main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt;
 - whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Little Burstead Conservation Area, and its effect on the significance of non-designated heritage assets; and
 - whether any 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.

Reasons

Openness

6. A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy, as set out in paragraph 142 of the Framework, is to keep land permanently open. Openness can be perceived spatially and visually. The openness of the appeal site lies in its spacious layout and gaps between the buildings, which afford clear views of the open countryside and trees beyond. This includes a direct view from the road along the driveway and through the gap between the house and its detached garage.
7. The proposed extension in place of the garage would close the current gap between the house and that outbuilding. This would eliminate the current view from the road towards the open countryside, which would be detrimental to the visual openness of the site. The addition of an extension and chimneys would also increase the mass of the main house, thereby reducing spatial openness around it. Even if I accept that demolition of the garage and garden store would result in a modest net positive contribution to the spatial openness of the site¹, and that there would be sufficient alternative storage space, this would not fully off-set the loss of visual openness I find.
8. The proposed basement would be comparable to a basement previously allowed at the site². I accept this part of the proposal would have little material impact on openness.
9. Overall, I find the proposal would result in moderate harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

Little Burstead Conservation Area and non-designated heritage assets

10. Having regard to the Little Burstead Conservation Area (CA) Character Appraisal, the CA comprises much of the village of Little Burstead, with its two main roads and village green at their junction. With medieval and agricultural origins, the village is small and rural in character and includes several timber-framed buildings characteristic of Essex. Laindon Common Road retains a country lane character with buildings mostly of modest 'working' origins set back behind hedges and trees. The grander houses in the village are generally grouped on the other side of the settlement and around the green. This historic layout of roads and buildings contributes to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.
11. The appeal site was originally known as Jackson's Farm, with dilapidated buildings including a stable and the remains of a timber-framed 'in-line' medieval hall house. The hall house has been restored, extended and brought back into residential use with the stable block used as a garden store³. The Council has identified the hall house and the former stable block as non-designated heritage assets (NDHA), which also make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. The significance of the former stable block includes being a good example of a small, vernacular mid-19th century outbuilding. The hall house's significance includes its unusual crown-post roof

¹ Having regard to appeal Refs APP/H1515/D/19/3231700 and APP/Y3615/A/12/2170959, and to *Sevenoaks DC v SSE and Dawe* [1997] EWHC Admin 1012

² Ref 18/00198/FULL

³ Granted on appeal, reference APP/V1505/A09/2118446 dated 26 April 2010

- design, which is one of very few such structures in Essex and one of the oldest buildings in the village.
12. The understated lines and cross-wing form of the current house set off the historic timber frame within and enhance enjoyment of it, as acknowledged by the Inspector who allowed it. This effect is notwithstanding the modern construction of the house and irrespective of whether everyone would recognise what they are looking at. The current house is therefore part of the setting of the hall house as a NDHA, which contributes to its significance.
 13. Paragraph 205 of the Framework requires great weight to be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposed development on its significance. Paragraph 209 states that, in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect NDHAs, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset.
 14. The proposed replacement house would have the appearance of a fairly grand building dating back several centuries, with oak framing, lime render, clay tiles and large, added chimney stacks. I acknowledge the design is not intended to be historically accurate. I also accept that newer buildings and adaptations sometimes borrow architectural styles from the past, as recognised in national design guidance. However, even if the design would be of high quality, the style and details would be discordant in the context of the other dwellings on Laindon Common Lane which, although varied, are generally of a later and/or more under-stated appearance.
 15. This incongruity would be greater because of the generally modest 'working' origins of this part of the CA. There is little before me to demonstrate the proposed design would make an appropriate historic reference to the appearance of the former hall house, notwithstanding that building's recognised high status. Consequently, I do not agree the proposed design would be an improvement over the current appearance of Stead Hall Farm, regardless of the quality of the proposed materials and craftsmanship. Furthermore, the large new house and its prominent chimneys would be readily seen from the road, even allowing for the set-back of the site. Overall, the proposal would not respect the coherence of the CA so would detract from its character and appearance.
 16. I acknowledge the timber frame of the hall house would be retained unchanged within the new house. I also accept there may be more than one appropriate way to contain the historic structure. However, the ornate new building would be considerably more eye-catching and assertive than the current house, which would compete with rather than complement the rare structure within. Even though the frame of the old hall house would not be seen from outside, this harmful change to its setting would undermine its significance as a NDHA and its contribution to the significance of the CA.
 17. The former stable block would be demolished. Even if I accept there is little left of the original structure in the current building, its form, size, location and relationship as an outbuilding with the main house provide a link to the past, which would be completely lost. This harm to the significance of the NDHA would also harm the character and appearance of the CA.

18. The site in the other appeal decision brought to my attention⁴ is in a different settlement in Essex and a different Conservation Area, with significance specific to that heritage asset. Therefore, the circumstances in that appeal are not sufficiently closely related to be directly comparable to those before me. In any event, I am required to determine this appeal on its own merits.
19. I therefore conclude there would be harm to the significance of both the hall house and the former stables as NDHAs. I also conclude the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance either the character or the appearance of the CA and would therefore harm its significance. The harm to the CA would be less than substantial.
20. Paragraph 208 of the Framework states that, where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal would make a modest contribution to economic growth during the construction process, to which I give limited weight. However, this public benefit would not outweigh the harm I find to the significance of the CA. It would also not outweigh the harm to the significance of the NDHAs. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with the Framework.
21. I also conclude the proposal would conflict with saved Policy BAS BE12 of the BLP, which states planning permission for the alteration and extension of existing dwellings will be refused if it causes harm to the character of the surrounding area.

Other considerations

22. I have given limited weight to the modest economic contribution of the proposal noted above.
23. The scheme would increase available living space at the site. However, the improvement would primarily cater for the private requirements of the appellants and carries little weight in the scheme's favour.
24. I note the proposal has evolved following previous unsuccessful applications⁵ and an appeal⁶. Nevertheless, I am required to consider this appeal on its merits based on the evidence before me, so the planning history of the scheme is a neutral factor. The Council's approach to site visits and decision-making is outside my remit in considering this appeal and is also a neutral factor.

Green Belt Balance

25. According to paragraphs 152 and 153 of the Framework, inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances. These will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, are clearly outweighed by other considerations.
26. I am required to give substantial weight to the harm the development would cause to the Green Belt by virtue of its inappropriateness and to openness. I also give great weight to the harm to the significance of the CA and NDHAs. The weights I have attached to the other considerations, individually or

⁴ Appeal ref APP/H1515/A/14/2219012

⁵ Refs 16/00681/FULL, 16/01589/FULL, 21/01113/FULL, 21/01684/FULL

⁶ Ref APP/V1505/D/17/3173106

cumulatively, do not clearly outweigh these harms. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.

Conclusion

27. I have found the proposal conflicts with the development plan, read as a whole. No other material considerations, including the Framework, have been shown to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

C Carpenter

INSPECTOR

This page is intentionally left blank