

MEMBERS' BULLETIN



Thursday, 18 April 2024/Issue No. 2024/16

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 22nd April 2024

	COMMITTEE, CONFERENCE, ETC	VENUE	TIME
Mon 22	Conservative Group Meeting*	St. George's Suite	8.00pm
Tue 23	CURRENTLY NO MEETINGS		
Wed 24			
Thur 25			
Fri 26			

Week Commencing 29th April 2024

	COMMITTEE, CONFERENCE, ETC	VENUE	TIME
Mon 29	Labour Group Meeting*	Labour Group Room	7.30pm
	Conservative Group Meeting*	St. George's Suite	8.00pm
Tue 30			
Wed 01			
Thur 02	* ELECTIONS *		
Fri 03			

Week Commencing 6th May 2024

	COMMITTEE, CONFERENCE, ETC	VENUE	TIME
Mon 06	**BANK HOLIDAY**		
Tue 07	CURRENTLY NO MEETINGS		
Wed 08			
Thur 09			
Fri 10			

Week Commencing 13th May 2024

	COMMITTEE, CONFERENCE, ETC	VENUE	TIME
Mon 13	Labour Group Meeting*	Labour Group Room	7.30pm
	Conservative Group Meeting*	St. George's Suite	8.00pm
Tue 14	CURRENTLY NO MEETINGS		
Wed 15			
Thur 16			
Fri 17			

**(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

Friday 19 th April	Thurrock's Charity Dinner	The Civic Hall, Grays
Tuesday 23 rd April	Cancer Research Superstore opening	Unit E, Pippis Hill Retail Park

~ 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
C01-24	Grant Funding Agreement Renewal: Basildon Borough Twinning Association (BBTA)	Cllr Sargent	15.04.24
C02-24	APPROVAL FOR FUNDING YEAR THREE OF THE BASILDON SIDE BY SIDE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT FOLLOWING DELIVERY OF YEAR TWO OBJECTIVES	Cllr Sargent	16.04.24
C03-24	Grant Funding Agreement Renewal: Basildon, Billericay and Wickford Council for Voluntary Service (BBWCVS)	Cllr Sargent	16.04.24
C04-24	Grant Funding Agreement Renewal: Basildon Community Transport Service (BCTS)	Cllr Sargent	16.04.24

~ 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>

HIGHWAYS HIGHLIGHTS

Please follow this link to access the latest issue of Highways Highlights - [Highways Highlights - April 2024](#).

~ 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 (4/03/2024) an ***application for a premises licence*** regarding:

Build on Brand Ltd (Crazy Golf)
Unit 43 The Galleries
Eastgate Shopping Centre
Basildon
Essex

Ward: St. Martin's

The Application requests the sale of alcohol for consumption on the premises and recorded Music .

Hours for Sale of alcohol	12:00hrs -20:00hrs
Hours for Recorded music	10:00hrs -20:00hrs
Opening hours	10:00hrs - 20:00hrs

Any representations must be received by the Licensing Authority by 2/5/2024. If you have any questions, please contact Licensing Officer Roy Robinson on 01268-208260.

BILLERICAY EAST WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00379/FULL	Land At Hillway	Erection of a detached two storey dwellinghouse, layout parking and amenity space
24/00403/FULL	1A Mons Avenue Billericay	Roof extension to provide first floor accommodation, new entrance to front and general alterations.
24/00413/FULL	15 Greens Farm Lane Billericay	Erection of a detached dwelling in garden adjacent to 15 Greens Farm Lane and layout parking to front

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
24/00199/PACU	First And Second Floor Unique House	Prior Approval sought under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class MA of the Town and Country Planning (GPDO) (England) Order 2015 for the change of use from Use Class E (Commercial, Business and Service) to Use Class C3 (Residential) comprising 8 x 1-bed and 2 x 2-bed apartments.	Refused

~ 0 ~

BILLERICAY WEST WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00398/FULL	225A Stock Road Billericay	Single storey side and rear extensions

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
24/00092/FULL	9 Arundel Way Billericay	Single storey rear extension and part garage conversion	Granted
24/00233/TPOBAS	107 Norsey View Drive Billericay	TPO16/92 (T8 Oak) 1.Crown reduction by one metre 2.Crown thin secondary branches by 25-30% within the crown, and 3. Removal of epicormic growth	Application Permitted
24/00244/LDCP	22 Raven Close Billericay	To establish the lawfulness of a proposed hip to gable roof extension, rear dormer and rooflights to front	Granted
24/00282/COND	85 Marlborough Way Billericay	Application for approval of details reserved by Condition 4 (Desktop contamination study) and Condition 5 (Site Investigation) of planning permission reference 23/00890/FULL.	Granted

~ 0 ~

BURSTEAD WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00407/COND	Maitland Lodge Southend Road	Approval of details reserved by conditions 20 (Cycle Parking) and 25 (Refuse and Recycling) of planning permission ref. 21/01687/FULL granted on appeal (Appeal ref: APP/V1505/W/22/3296116)

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/00697/LDCP	6-7 The Cottage Laindon Common Road	To establish the lawfulness of rear and side single storey extensions. Rear dormer window and roof lights, and addition of front porch and west facing first floor window.	Refused
23/01147/FULL	Land At Southend Road	Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 99 residential dwellings (Class C3); provision of strategic landscape; provision of new vehicular and pedestrian access routes and associated infrastructure	Granted
24/00189/LDCP	1 The Hoe Billericay	To establish the lawfulness of a proposed timber frame chicken run	Granted
24/00231/TPOBAS	12 Weir Wynd Billericay	3/62/TPO - Blue Spruce - reduce crown by 1 metre and remove dead wood	Application Permitted

~ 0 ~

CROUCH WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01580/FULL	Woodbridge Branksome Avenue	New single storey detached dwelling	Granted
24/00258/FULL	Clayfields Pitsea View Road	Erection of single storey rear extension	Granted
24/00344/COND	1 Wayletts Cottages Brentwood Road	Application for approval of details reserved by Condition 3 (materials) of approved planning permission reference 23/01174/FULL	Granted

~ 0 ~

FRYERNS WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00319/FULL	519 Whitmore Way Basildon	Dropped kerb
24/00397/COND	Ghyll Grove Nursing Home Ghyllgrove	Approval details reserved by condition 29 (Secure by design) of planning reference 22/01485/FULL

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
24/00286/NMABAS	32 Cheshire Walk Basildon	To establish whether not painting the frontage of property, to remain buff brick instead of being painted white can be considered as a non-material amendment to 16/00898/OUT	Granted

~ 0 ~

LAINDON PARK WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00232/COND	Test Track At Ford Research And Engineering Centre	Discharge of conditions 5 (Construction Environmental Management Plan), 6 (Soft Landscaping Scheme), 10 (Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy), 12 (Surface Water Drainage Scheme), 15 (Soil Management Plan - see CEMP) and 16 (Construction Work Hours - minor variation to) of solar farm planning permission 22/00748/FULL
24/00364/FULL	22 Kennedy Avenue Laindon	Change of use from single family dwelling house (Class C3) to a children's home (Class C2) for 1 child or young person of 8-17 years of age receiving care (Including additional supporting information)
24/00412/FULL	11 Eisenhower Road Laindon	Change of Use from Dwellinghouse (C3) to children's care home (C2)

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
22/00424/LDCP	Sheddings Farm Church Road	To establish the lawfulness of Siting of mobile home(caravan) on residential	Refused

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
		land, within the curtilage of an existing dwelling, for use as an annexe	
24/00188/FULL	42 Menzies Avenue Laindon	Replacement PVCU windows	Granted

~ 0 ~

LANGDON HILLS WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
24/00151/FULL	1 Manning Grove Langdon Hills	Change the use from a House of Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Class C4) to a Family Residential Assessment Home (Class C2).	Granted

~ 0 ~

LEE CHAPEL NORTH WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
24/00200/LDCP	Janet Duke Primary School Markhams Chase	To establish the lawfulness of the proposed installation of 5no air conditioning units.	Granted

~ 0 ~

NETHERMAYNE

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

None

~ 0 ~

PITSEA NORTH WEST WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00362/FULL	22 Malyons Place Pitsea	Installation of a heat pump on rear elevation.
24/00389/TPOBAS	1 Headingley Close Nevendon	T1 (Lime) of TPO/06/90 Crown reduction of 3 meters. Remove lowest limb and all epicormic growth.

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01466/FULL	18 Chalvedon Avenue Pitsea	Erection of a two-storey 2-bedroom dwelling house at land adjacent to 18 Chalvedon Avenue.	Refused

~ 0 ~

PITSEA SOUTH EAST WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00400/FULL	Majola Clarence Road	Alterations to roof including increase to the ridge height to create first floor and with roof window to side elevation
24/00408/FULL	1 Popes Crescent Pitsea	Change of use from (Class C3) dwelling house to (Class C2) Care Home for adults with Dementia or Learning Disabilities.

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01267/FULL	The Paddocks Grange Road	Subdivision of existing traveller site to provide pitch for stationing of up to 4 static caravans.	Granted
24/00263/COND	Land North Of Bowers Close London Road	Application for approval of details reserved by condition 22 (badger survey), condition 23 (badger protection measures), condition 26 (Land Contamination), condition 27 (Land Contamination (Site Investigation)), condition 28 (Land Contamination (Submission of Remediation Scheme)) and condition 29 (Land Contamination (Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme)) of consent reference 22/01143/FULL	Granted
24/00312/COND	Land North Of Bowers Close London Road	Approval details reserved by condition(s) 18 (Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP), 24 (Air Quality Assessment) and 25 (Noise Assessment) of 22/01143/FULL	Granted

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION

~ 0 ~

ST. MARTIN'S WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
24/00208/COND	Land Lying North West Of Napier Close And North West Of Fairlop Gardens Napier Close	Application for approval of details reserved by condition 22 (CEMP) of 21/00645/FULL	Granted
24/00270/COND	Land Lying North West Of Napier Close And North West Of Fairlop Gardens Napier Close	Application for approval of details reserved by Condition 25 (CEMP and biodiversity site walk over) in relation of consent reference 21/00645/FULL	Granted
24/00310/COND	Land Lying North West Of Napier Close And North West Of Fairlop Gardens Napier Close	Approval details reserved by condition 26 (Biodiversity enhancement strategy) of 21/00645/FULL	Granted

~ 0 ~

The Licensing Authority have received (4/03/2024) an **application for a premises licence** regarding:

**Build on Brand Ltd (Crazy Golf)
Unit 43 The Galleries
Eastgate Shopping Centre
Basildon
Essex**

Ward: St. Martin's

The Application requests the sale of alcohol for consumption on the premises and recorded Music .

Hours for Sale of alcohol 12:00hrs -20:00hrs
Hours for Recorded music 10:00hrs -20:00hrs
Opening hours 10:00hrs - 20:00hrs

Any representations must be received by the Licensing Authority by 2/5/2024. If you have any questions, please contact Licensing Officer Roy Robinson on 01268-208260.

~ 0 ~

VANGE WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01079/FULL	1 Oldwyk Basildon	Change of use from dwelling house (Class C3) to residential children's care home (Class C2).	Granted

~ 0 ~

WICKFORD CASTLEDON WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00342/FULL	5-7 Willowdale Centre High Street	Residential development of 3 new flats on the first floor of the building
24/00416/FULL	4 Goodmayes Walk Wickford	Single storey garage extension and new roof to garage

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
23/01495/FULL	120 Castledon Road Wickford	Demolition of existing storage buildings, removal of external storage and construction of one detached dwelling with parking (Amended Plans)	Granted
24/00224/LDCP	8 Azalea Avenue Wickford	To establish the lawfulness of a proposed loft conversion with hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer and front rooflights	Granted
24/00225/ABAS	Wych Elm House Nevendon Road	Non-illuminated fascia sign	Granted

~ 0 ~

WICKFORD NORTH WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

None

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
24/00180/FULL	7 Glebe Road Wickford	First floor side and rear extension	Granted
24/00202/LDCP	54 Long Meadow Drive Wickford	To establish the lawfulness of the proposed construction of a single storey rear extension, new ground floor side windows and 3 no. Velux rooflights	Granted
24/00203/FULL	18 West Beech Avenue Wickford	Single storey rear extension with lantern rooflight	Granted

~ 0 ~

WICKFORD PARK WARD

Planning Applications Submitted:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION
24/00415/FULL	23 Murray Way Wickford	Outbuilding to front for storage

~ 0 ~

Planning Applications Decided:

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
24/00217/LDCP	3 Macgregor Drive Wickford	To establish the lawfulness of a proposed single storey rear extension with 4 no. rooflights and additional windows on both ground floor side elevations	Granted

~ 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

This page is intentionally left blank

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 1 March 2024

by G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/W/23/3327027

Elizabeth Villa, Meadow Way, Wickford SS12 9HA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Jones against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00101/FULL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a chalet style dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Government published a recently revised National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") and all references in this decision relate to the revised document. I am satisfied that the parties will not be prejudiced by the changes to the national policy context as there are no material changes relevant to the substance of this appeal.
3. The evidence indicates that the appeal site lies within the Zone of Influence of the Benfleet and Southend Marshes Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, and the Crouch and Roach Estuary SPA and Ramsar site. These sites are subject to statutory protection as European sites of nature conservation importance under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). I will return to this matter later in this decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - Whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to any relevant development plan policies and the Framework.
 - The effect of the proposed development on the openness and purposes of the Green Belt.
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
 - If the proposal is inappropriate development, 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 it.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

5. Policy BAS GB1 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007 ("the BDLP"), defines the extent of the Green Belt, including the appeal site. However, it does not set criteria for judging whether the appeal proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Therefore, I find no conflict with this Policy.
6. In terms of the Framework, the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, subject to a number of exceptions. These exceptions include buildings that constitute 'limited infilling in villages' as set out in Framework Paragraph 154.e). 'Limited infilling in villages' is not defined in the Framework or the BDLP. Therefore, whether a proposed building would constitute 'limited infilling in a village' is a matter of judgement for the decision maker, based on a site's particular characteristics and its context when assessed 'on the ground'.
7. The proposed dwelling would be limited in scale and would occupy a relatively small gap between existing dwellings set within a continuous row of dwellings fronting a metalled road. As such, it would constitute limited infilling as a matter of judgement and consequently my attention turns to whether the proposed dwelling would be located in a village.
8. The appeal site is set within a cluster of buildings, predominantly dwellings, that are arranged around the mostly hard surfaced roads of Meadow Way and The Chase, that form a 'loop' extending off Cranfield Park Road via the single road connection of Fairway. This cluster is mostly surrounded by countryside of open fields interspersed with sporadic small groups of buildings, often set along cul-de-sacs, that separate it from the built-up area of Wickford to the north and the A127 to the south.
9. It is argued that the proposed dwelling should be considered part of the village of Nevendon. However, despite the existence of a formal road name sign of 'Fairway' at the junction with Cranfield Park Road, there are no obvious features or clear boundaries, such as a formal name sign, to identify this relatively small sized cluster of buildings, including the appeal property, as within a village. The appeal site is situated within a discernible row of tightly spaced dwellings within the cluster, however this is not necessarily indicative of a village and the forms of villages can vary,
10. Furthermore, I did not observe any services, facilities or amenities in the locality of the appeal site or within or around the cluster of buildings which might be expected to characterise a village. The number and type of services and facilities within villages can vary and might be relatively limited in some. However, their absence from the cluster of buildings at the appeal site is not indicative of it being within a village.
11. The map of the SS12 postcode district of Nevendon covers an extensive area of land, including a large proportion of the built-up area of Wickford and stretching beyond the A127 to the south. Although the appeal site lies within it, it does not appear to relate to any physical characteristics 'on the ground' or follow the boundaries of a settlement. As such, the postcode district does not

identify the appeal site as within a village and it has limited relevance to my considerations and holds very little weight in favour of the proposal.

12. The Oxford Dictionary definition provided by the appellant states that a village is a group of houses and associated buildings, larger than a hamlet and smaller than a town, situated in a rural area. Given the relatively small scale of the cluster of buildings in which the appeal site is situated, and taking account of my findings above, the cluster has the scale and characteristics that are akin to a hamlet under the definition provided. The absence of services, facilities or amenities which might be expected to characterise a village, adds further weight to this finding.
13. The site in the Branksome Avenue appeal¹ ("the Branksome Avenue appeal") was located on the edge of Wickford and within an area where existing development was extensive and well consolidated, and displayed the predominant character of a well-ordered residential suburb. The site was situated within an area with a network of roads and very few undeveloped plots, formalised street name signs throughout, mains drainage and services, and many of the features and characteristics of a village.
14. some general similarities can be drawn between the Branksome Avenue appeal and the appeal proposal before me in terms of the scale and type of development proposed, and their plotland origins in the broader Wickford area. Neither were formally identified in the BDLP as villages. However, each case must be determined on its own merits and such decisions are subject to various site-specific considerations and judgements.
15. Compared to the Branksome Avenue appeal site, I have found the site in this appeal to be set within a relatively small sized cluster of buildings in the countryside some distance from Wickford and where development is not extensive and does not display the features and characteristics of a village. As such, the Branksome Avenue appeal site is materially different in location and context to the appeal site before me and of limited weight and relevance to my considerations in this appeal.
16. In taking account of all the above and based on the evidence before me and my experiences at the site visit, I find that the proposed dwelling would not be located within a village. I note that my findings on this matter generally accord with an unsuccessful appeal decision² for a bungalow at the nearby property of 'Patricia', Meadow Way, Wickford.
17. I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would not constitute limited infilling in a village. As such, it would not meet the exception in Framework Paragraph 154.e) and would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. An absence of conflict with BDLP Policy BAS GB1, does not alter this conclusion or weigh in favour or against the appeal proposal.

Openness and purposes

18. The appeal site comprises undeveloped land set around a modestly sized blockwork structure in the centre of the site which the evidence suggests was a former dwelling that has fallen into disrepair. The Council's evidence indicates that an appeal decision of several years ago found that any residential use of

¹ APP/V1505/W/21/3278853

² APP/V1505/W/20/3262753

this structure appears to have been abandoned and no substantive contrary evidence on this matter is before me in this appeal. Set within this structure was what appeared to be a timber shed in a poor condition. A separate timber building is positioned to the front of the site.

19. In spatial terms, the proposed dwelling and associated vehicle parking area would partly occupy space on the appeal site that is currently undeveloped, reducing the openness of the Green Belt. In visual terms the proposed dwelling would be seen as part of the established row of dwellings and set against the backdrop of a stable-type building on land at the rear. Nonetheless, its built form would be clearly visible in close distance views from the road where its scale and massing would cause a loss of visual openness in the Green Belt, albeit to a relatively modest and localised extent.
20. Compared to the existing conditions at the appeal site, the scale of the proposed dwelling would be considerably, and materially, larger than the existing relatively small buildings, including the blockwork structure on the appeal site. It would therefore have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. Consequently, it would not meet the exception in Framework Paragraph 154.g) and would be inappropriate under this exception, even if it was located on previously developed land.
21. The appeal proposal would not result in the sprawl of a large built-up area or towns merging into one another. Nonetheless, for the reasons given above the proposed development would, in totality, harm the openness of the Green Belt in spatial and visual terms, and lead to a very small degree of encroachment into the countryside in conflict with this purpose of the Green Belt.

Character and appearance

22. The character and appearance of the area is defined predominantly by rows of modestly sized bungalows intermingled with the occasional undeveloped plot. Along the section closest to the appeal site, the buildings are constructed to different designs with sloping roofs of either gabled or hipped forms, and generally consistent roof heights. Several dwellings appeared to have accommodation within their roofs, although very few have roof dormers and the dormers that were visible further along Meadow Way were relatively modest in size.
23. The gabled form of the proposed dwelling would reflect the mixed roofscape in the area. However, the height, width and massing of the front gable would be noticeably greater than that of the other gable fronted dwellings on this section of Meadow Way. The proposed roof dormers, notwithstanding their sloping sides, would add considerable elevated mass and bulk to the roof slopes of the proposed dwelling. They would be highly visible in the street scene and together with the massing of the front gable would result in a dwelling that would be visually dominant and discordant by comparison to the modestly sized bungalows in the area with their simple forms and undisrupted roof slopes.
24. The approved dormers at 'Charal', are smaller than those proposed in this appeal and would be seen in the context of the taller and relatively large roof of the adjacent dwelling at 'Cranlea'. Furthermore, there would be limited intervisibility between the appeal dwelling and 'Charal', which is located some distance away. As such, the dormers at 'Charal' are materially different in

scale, design and visual context to the appeal proposal and they do not justify the harm that the proposed development would cause.

25. Although the existing blockwork structure is in a poor physical condition, it is a small structure that is set well back into the site and has a relatively limited visual impact. Any beneficial effect of its removal, together with the tidying-up of the site, which I am not persuaded would be contingent on the appeal proposal, would be small and firmly outweighed by the appeal proposal's harmful visual effect.
26. For these reasons, I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to BDLP Policy BAS BE12, which amongst other objectives, seeks to refuse development that causes material harm in respect of the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the street scene.
27. For the same reasons, the proposal would conflict with Paragraph 135 of the Framework, which states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Other considerations

28. The proposal would make efficient use of land and could be built out relatively quickly. In the context of the housing supply in the Council's area, where there is a shortfall against the housing requirement, this is a matter of significant weight in its favour.
29. The construction and occupation of the proposed development would provide a family home and generate employment opportunities during construction and lasting economic activity through occupation. The new resident household would provide beneficial financial support to businesses and services, and make a small contribution to sustaining rural services. The proposed dwelling could be adaptable to provide an accessible living environment for occupiers with restricted mobility. However, given the scale of the proposed development, these benefits would be modest and attract limited weight in its favour.
30. The proposed dwelling could be built from locally sourced materials and to a very high standard in respect of its environmental sustainability. The latest technology for minimising energy and water usage, and generating renewable energy could be incorporated. There is no obvious impediment to meeting current Building Regulations standards. The proposal would appear to be capable of securing a net gain in biodiversity at the site, including through native planting. However, given its scale, any environmental benefits arising from these aspects of the proposal would be modest and attract limited weight in its favour.
31. A dwelling of an appropriate size and design would not, in principle and in isolation of Green Belt considerations, be inconsistent with the character of the area, and the removal of the existing blockwork structure would represent a small beneficial effect to the openness of the Green Belt. However, this would be firmly outweighed by the appeal proposal's harmful effect on Green Belt openness that I have identified above.
32. Limited evidence is before me to explain the Council's reasoning for permitting a new detached 1-bedroom bungalow in lieu of an existing workshop, garage

and storage building at 'Charal', near to the appeal site. In any case I am not bound by the decisions of the Council in determining this appeal. As such, this planning permission has limited relevance and weight to my considerations in this appeal.

33. The current status of the Basildon Draft Local Plan 2016, which reportedly identified the plotlands around Wickford for infill housing development, is not clearly established in the evidence. As such, any support given by it to infill development in the Green Belt has negligible weight in favour of the appeal proposal when set against the Framework.
34. I have not been provided with any substantive evidence that the appeal property has been affected by a persistent problem of fly tipping or antisocial behaviour, or that redevelopment of the site would be the only means of resolving such issues. Therefore, such concerns have very little weight in favour of the proposal.
35. On the evidence before me and based on my observations at the site visit, I am satisfied that the proposal would safeguard the living conditions of nearby occupiers and provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers. Furthermore, it would cause no harms to highway safety. However, an absence of harm in these respects would be requirements of any well-designed scheme and does not carry positive weight in favour of the appeal proposal.

Other Matters

36. The appellant has expressed a willingness to make payment to the Council of the requisite tariff-based contribution towards the delivery of the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) to mitigate the proposal's potential adverse in-combination effects on the nature conservation interests of the SPAs referred to above. However, there is no mechanism before me to properly secure this contribution and therefore I cannot be certain that the proposed development would not harm the integrity of the SPAs. Nevertheless, in light of my findings on the main issues above, it is not considered necessary to look at the harm to the SPAs in detail, given that the proposal is unacceptable for other reasons.

Green Belt Balance

37. Paragraphs 152 and 153 of the Framework state that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances, and that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. I must therefore give substantial weight to the proposal's harm to the Green Belt.
38. Even if the proposal's contribution to housing supply were afforded the same substantial weight as that given in the Branksome Avenue appeal decision, the benefits attributed to this, and to the other considerations above, do not clearly outweigh the totality of the harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness, harm to openness and encroachment into the countryside. The harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area adds further weight against the proposal and would be contrary to BDLP Policy BAS BE12. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.

39. Under Footnote 7 to Paragraph 11.d)i. of the Framework, the appeal proposal's adverse effect on the Green Belt would provide a clear reason for refusing to grant planning permission. Therefore, the proposal does not benefit from the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Conclusion

40. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would conflict with BDLP Policy BAS BE12 and the Framework. This results in conflict with the development plan as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with that plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sylvester

INSPECTOR

This page is intentionally left blank