Appeal Decision

by Ken McEntee

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 3 November 2020

Appeal ref: APP/A1910/L/20/1200405

- The appeal is made under section 218 of the Planning Act 2008 and Regulation 117(1)(a) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).
- The appeal is brought by Borough Council.
- Planning permission was granted on 20 October 2017.
- A Liability Notice served on 3 November 2017.
- A revised Liability Notice was served on 27 June 2018.
- A further revised Liability Notice was served on 6 March 2020.
- A Demand Notice was served on 6 March 2020.
 The relevant planning permission to which the CIL surcharges relates is
- The description of the development is:
- The alleged breach that led to the surcharge is the failure to submit a Commencement Notice before starting works on the chargeable development.
- The outstanding surcharge for failing to assume liability is

Summary of decision: The appeal is dismissed and the surcharge is upheld.

Procedural matters

1. I note that as well as the imposition of the surcharge, the appellant is aggrieved by the withdrawal of his CIL self-build exemption. For the avoidance of doubt, I have no powers to reinstate a self-build exemption. I can only determine the appeal on the ground made in relation to the surcharge.

Reasons for the decision

2. An appeal under regulation 117(1)(a) is that the alleged breach which led to the surcharge did not occur. Regulation 67(1) explains that a Commencement Notice (CN) must be submitted to the Collecting Authority (Council) no later than the day before the day on which the chargeable development is to be commenced. In this case, the appellant contends that he submitted a CN on 18 April 2019 stating an intended commencement date of 3 May 2019. Unfortunately, it appears the Council did not receive the notice and the appellant concedes that he cannot provide any proof of postage. While I have sympathy with the appellant, if he genuinely posted a CN in good faith, I take the view that his decision to press ahead with the development without having received an acknowledgement of

receipt was a risky strategy to take. On the evidence before me, I cannot be satisfied that a CN was submitted before works began on the chargeable development. Therefore, I can only conclude that the alleged breach occurred. The appeal fails accordingly.

3. The appellant is clearly unhappy with the service he has received from Dacorum Borough Council. That being the case, he may wish to make a complaint through the Council's established complaints process in accordance with local government accountability.

Formal decision

4. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed and the surcharge of is upheld.

K. McEntee