



Appeal Decisions

by Thomas Shields DipURP MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st January 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/C1570/C/24/3349568

Appeal B Ref: APP/C1570/C/24/3349569

Squirrels Brick End, Broxted, Dunmow, CM6 2BJ

- The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeals are made by Mr Martin Ringwood (Appeal A) and Laura Ringwood (Appeal B) against an enforcement notice issued by Uttlesford District Council.
 - The notice was issued on 15 July 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission, the operational development including earthworks and the laying of a membrane and loose hardcore, the installation of high posts with CCTV cameras on them, the installation of a fence and alterations to a detached outbuilding within the curtilage of a Grade II listed building.
 - The requirements of the notice are:
 1. Cease carrying out earthworks and the laying of a membrane and loose hardcore
 2. Remove the membrane, hardcore and loose tarmac
 3. Remove the posts, CCTV and lights
 4. Remove the fence along the front boundary on the site identified by the blue line on the attached map.
 5. Restore the land to its previous state
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 2 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Formal Decision

1. In the banner heading above I have used numbers to replace the bullets in the enforcement notice requirements for ease of referencing.
2. It is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected by:
 - in Section 3 after the word “permission” delete the word “and”;
 - in Section 3 after the word “them” insert the following words “(shown in the approximate position with a blue cross on the attached plan)”
 - in Section 3 after the word “detached” delete the word “outbuilding” and replace it with the following words: “garage, comprising alterations to the windows, removal of a garage door and installation of a door and window”;
 - in Section 5.2 after the word “membrane” delete all the following words and replace them with the words “loose hardcore”;
 - in Section 5.3 after the word “posts” delete all the following words and replace them with “with CCTV cameras on them”;
 - delete all of Section 5.5;

- substitute the plan annexed to this decision for the plan attached to the enforcement notice.

Subject to the above corrections the appeals are dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Preliminary Matters

3. For the sake of clarity I have corrected the terms and requirements of the enforcement notice and plan as set out in the Formal Decision above. No injustice arises to any party as a result of the corrections.

Appeal on ground (g)

4. The ground of appeal is that the period of time for compliance with the enforcement notice requirements falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. The notice requires compliance within 2 months.
5. At the date of submitting their appeal form (6 August 2024) the appellants indicated due to financial constraints a period of 6 months (6 February 2026) would be more reasonable.
6. I see no reason why the notice requirements could not physically be complied with within a 2 months period of time, and no argument is made that such remedial activities would take any longer. Moreover, the 2 month period for compliance runs from the date of this decision and hence runs beyond February to 21 March 2026.
7. Overall I find that a period of 2 months is reasonable and the appeal on ground (g) therefore fails.

Thomas Shields

INSPECTOR

Annex – substitute plan to attach to enforcement notice.

