

**UTT/0343/01/FUL – MANUDEN**  
***(Referred at Members' Request)***

Two-storey side extension incorporating double garage. Ground floor rear extensions.  
Creation of vehicular access.  
18 The Street. GR/TL 491-265. Mr D Farnham.  
Case Officer: Hilary Lock on (01799) 510486  
Expiry Date: 3 May

***(Members have agreed to visit this site on 23 July).***

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits, Conservation Area, Area of Special Landscape Value and Floodplain/Adjacent Listed Building.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** This application relates to an unlisted semi-detached house on the eastern side of The Street, approximately 50m north of the Primary School. A number of listed buildings are in the vicinity, with a Grade II thatched cottage immediately to the south.

The revised plans propose to extend this three-bedroom house to the side, to provide a double garage with room above. It would be 6.9m deep and 7m wide, and 7.2m high. The extension would be set back behind the front of the house, and would be a minimum of 1.5m from the boundary with the listed cottage to the south. The first floor would be served by a front dormer window. An existing 1m high frontage wall has been demolished, and will be reinstated with the exception of a new vehicular access. Rear first floor infill and ground floor extensions are also proposed, neither projecting further rearward than the main wall of the house.

**(The proposal is still being negotiated and a full report will be made to the next meeting).**

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0167/01/FUL – GREAT DUNMOW**

Replace existing tower with a 21m tower, installation of two equipment cabins, 1 meter cabinet and associated telecommunications equipment.  
NTL Transmitting Station, Eastern Electricity Sub-Station, Station Road. GR/TL: 633-214.  
Case Officer: Tony Ewbanks on (01799) 510494  
Expiry Date: 2 April

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits/Adjacent to Area of Special Landscape Value (ASLV).

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** The site is located to the south-east of the town centre, adjacent to the A120 bypass and its embankment. The land is fenced with a 1.8m high chain link and planting of various heights. There is an existing mast and antenna, totalling 18.1m in height, centrally located within the site with its own 1.6m high security fence. The immediate area slopes southward with residential properties in Station Road, Sunbank, The Avenue and Oakroyd Avenue to the northwest, on slightly higher ground. The existing mast and antenna is visible over the present vegetation from these residential areas and from various points along the Chelmsford Road and bypass bridge. The Flich Lane development and properties in Normansfield, across the A.120, to the south, are on a lower level and are screened by heavy mature planting.

This revised proposal is for a 21m high lattice mast, various associated antenna, two equipment cabins and two meter cabinets (one for each company sharing the mast), which are proposed to be surrounded by a 1.2m high chain link security fence. The mast would be positioned in the south-eastern corner of the site, approximately 38m to the south-east of the nearest residential property. The mast would replace the existing 15m monopole with 3.2m high antenna (total 18.2m) and provide better coverage for the existing Vodafone and One 2 One services along the A120 between Braintree and Bishop's Stortford, and the A130 and A120 areas to the south of Great Dunmow.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See agent's supporting letters and statement attached at end of Supplementary Schedule.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Erection of 20m replacement mast, associated equipment and security fencing refused 2000 on grounds of detrimental impact on character of townscape, impairing public views of eastern Area of Special Landscape Value and adversely affecting general visual amenity of approaches to town centre.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Independent Consultant: One2One has demonstrated a need for a site in the general area. The use of a shared site is often the less obtrusive of the range of options available. The proposed shared structure does not seem to be the minimum that could meet the operators' needs – but would undoubtedly offer room and capacity to accommodate more sharers.

**TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Object. The proposed mast would be in conflict with the surrounding houses and the environment.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has also been advertised. Period expired 22 March. 31 letters & 3 petitions with 174 signatures (Station Road, Sunbank, The Avenue, Oakroyd Avenue & Oakroyd House residents).

Summary: There is no proof that these masts do not affect people. The mast would be 1 metre higher than the one previously refused. Would be even more visually prominent and dominate the landscape. Unsuitable site within proximity to elderly persons' bungalows, children's play area and other residences. The Stewart Report considered young people should be subjected to non-ionising radiation. Would be clearly visible from our back garden.

#### **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

The main issues are whether the proposal is in accordance with

1. **Government Guidance in (PPG8 - Telecommunications & Circular 04/99 - Planning for Telecommunications) and**
2. **Complies with DP Policies a) DC13 (Large Telecommunications Equipment) [ESP Policy BE8] & b) DC14 (General Amenity).**

1. GOVERNMENT GUIDANCE.

The Government's general policy on telecommunications is to facilitate the growth of new and existing systems and that proposals for development should receive a positive response. PPG8 and Circular 04/99 reflect Government's promotion of practicable mast sharing as a method of reducing the proliferation and visual impact of new masts and associated equipment throughout the country. The existing mast, which is only capable of accommodating one company's equipment, would be replaced by a mast which would be shared between two companies. This is in line with Government advice regarding mast sharing. With regard to siting and design, Government Guidance advises that authorities be aware of an antenna's limited range. Development should also use sympathetic design to

minimise the impact of development on the environment, with careful consideration being given to screening and planting.

a) Siting

The submitted Network Coverage Plans show the existing gap in coverage. Although the applicant has not specifically confirmed why no other alternative site has been suggested, it is implied from the Coverage Plans that utilising the Station Road site would be the most appropriate. Considering the presence of existing infrastructure within the site, it would also avoid having to find and develop another site where new infrastructure would be required. The applicant confirms that there are no other suitable sites or buildings which would provide the necessary coverage provided. It is considered by Officers' that this is not an overriding reason to dismiss the Council's concerns on other grounds.

b) Design

Government Guidance outlines that in particularly sensitive areas, such as Conservation Areas or SSSIs, height, ancillary development, landscaping and screening are important considerations. In order to reduce the mast's visual impact and in response to the last refusal reasons, the mast has been reduced in width from 5m (base) tapering to 3m (apex) to 2.6m (base) tapering to 1.4m (apex). However the height of the '*slimline*' lattice design' has been increased by one metre to 21m. Regarding the possibility of reducing the height of the mast, the applicant contends that it would compromise the operators' ability for future expansion.

Although it is adjacent to an ASLV, the site is not itself a designated area. The applicant would be willing to paint the mast or use an appropriate coloured metal and provide additional screening, to help minimise its visual impact, but this would only be cosmetic and not overcome the Council's concerns.

c) Health

Many representations again raise concerns regarding the potential risks to the health of those, particularly the young and elderly, living in proximity to the proposal. The applicant has submitted documentation indicating that the level of emissions from the proposal would not exceed 0.63% of the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure. Members should note that this is five times more stringent than current NRPB (National Radiological Protection Board) guidelines. Consequently the proposal's transmissions could be 150 times greater and still conform to this standard.

Members will be aware that the Stewart Report (2000) prescribes a cautionary approach to determining telecommunication mast applications, particularly in respect of the perceived health risks. The June 2000 letter from the Secretary of State to Council leaders and MPs, regarding associated health issues, stated that in light of the Stewart Report '*it should not be necessary for a planning authority to consider the health effects further*'. In support of this PPG8 (July 2000) also indicates that such matters come under the remit of the Health and Safety Executive. Consequently, as with the last application, whilst the intensity of public objection regarding health risks are noted, they are not material to the determination of this application.

**CONCLUSION:**

The proposal is in accordance with the principles set out in Government Guidance.

## 2. DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

### a) DP Policy DC13

Although the setting up of telecommunications masts has been sanctioned by Central Government, DP Policy DC13 reflects the Council's current policy on masts within rural, but not urban, areas. The policy's preamble states the intrusiveness of a new mast in the landscape should be reduced as far as possible by selecting a site where existing trees provide partial screening. Regardless of the effectiveness of the existing and proposed additional planting, it would not be able to adequately screen the total height of the new mast, particularly the top portion.

### b) ESP Policy BE8

The emerging Structure Plan Policy BE8 (Telecommunications) states development for masts and antennae will be permitted, subject to other policies. Where there is potential conflict with environmental objectives, such development will only be allowed where there are no satisfactory alternative sites for telecommunications available; no reasonable possibility of sharing existing facilities; or erecting antennae on an existing building or other structure; and they would not materially affect sites of nature conservation importance, landscape quality, townscape and traditional character, residential amenities, or buildings and areas of special architectural, historic or archaeological importance.

Whilst 'The Close', a group of Grade II listed buildings, is sited 100m to the south-east, due to the topography and the existing vegetation to either side of the bypass, the proposed mast should not have any greater adverse impact on the setting or character of these listed buildings than the existing one.

The applicant's supporting statement outlines the lack of suitable alternative sites or buildings and the inadequacies of the existing mast. However it is your Officer's opinion that, as the site is only adjacent and not within the ASLV, the proposal cannot be considered to have any direct adverse effect on its special characteristics. However, due to the surrounding topography and the prominent height of the structure (regardless of the reductions in dimensions), the proposal would continue to infringe on the public views of the ASLV, particularly from several vantage points in the vicinity, such as the southern and south-eastern approaches to the town, i.e. Chelmsford Road, and the A120. The proposal's extra height would protrude a further 2.8m into the skyline, thereby increasing the prominence of the mast from these approaches.

The existing character of this area from any vantage point is predominantly trees and houses. Despite the applicant's contention that painting the mast may reduce the impact, it is considered that this would not significantly ameliorate its prominence and could address the impact of the added 'bulk' compared to the relatively low-key nature of the existing monopole. The proposed mast would more noticeable, adversely affecting the townscape and public views, particularly from the ASLV to the east.

### c) DP Policy DC14

Written representations have raised concerns about the proposal's impact on i) the visual character of the area and ii) residential amenity. Concern has been expressed that the proposal is higher than the previously refused mast, which would still be visually prominent, dominate the skyline and overbear on neighbouring gardens, thus adversely affect residential amenity. Policy DC14 seeks to prevent development which would adversely affect the reasonable occupation and enjoyment of a residential or other sensitive property, as a result of excessive noise, vibration, smell, fumes, dust, light, exposure to other pollutants, loss of privacy, loss of daylight or overshadowing. As the structure's non-solid lattice framework should not cause any overshadowing or significant loss of daylight it may not be strictly contrary to the wording of Policy DC14.

With regard to local representations, recent case law has upheld that, even if the applicant can confirm that the proposal meets ICNIRP guidelines, residents' anxieties about health effects are a valid consideration. Furthermore, another dismissed appeal noted that compliance with the Stewart Report guidelines meant that, whilst objection on health grounds had to be regarded as '*not founded*,' it did not mean that they were an unjustified planning objection. The Inspector concluded that such a mast would constantly remind residents of their concerns and anxieties, which would materially diminish their quality of life and amenity. Considering this new case law and the quantity of objection received from the public, it is your Officers' view that regardless of recent Government publications and research, residents remain concerned about the long term impact to their health. However, this is not a recommended reason for refusal on planning grounds at this time as it could not be adequately supported.

**CONCLUSIONS:** Whilst the amendments to this revised application are noted, the proposal's visual impact would still have a detrimental impact on the townscape's character, public views of the Area of Special Landscape Value to the east and the general visual amenity of the southern and south-eastern approaches to the town.

Whilst, it is appreciated that there are other telecommunications masts within the Great Dunmow area and that a refusal of permission may require that another site and new mast have to be found, the applicant's arguments are insufficient to overcome these fundamental policy objections.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS**

1. Contrary to ESP Policy BE8. Detrimental impact on character of the townscape, impair public views of Area of Special Landscape Value and adversely affect general visual amenity of southern and south-eastern approaches to town.
2. Contrary to Policy DC14: General Amenity. Adverse effects on residential amenity. Visual intrusion.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0727/01/DFO - TAKELEY**

Details relating to 2 detached dwellings with double garages (outline approved under ref. UTT/0871/99/OP).

Land adjacent to Thorncroft, Takeley Street. GR/TL: 542-212. Mr I Jacks.

*Case Officer: Tony Ewbanks on (01799) 510494*

Expiry Date: 19 July.

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits/Group Tree Preservation Order.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** The 0.17ha (0.4 acre) site is located on the southern side of the A120 between Takeley and the M11. To the east is a group of three modern houses with open land beyond. To the west there is mainly ribbon residential development. The site has a frontage to the main road of approximately 46m and a depth of some 37m. The Flitch Way runs to the rear, beyond which is Hatfield Forest. The site is overgrown and heavily planted with preserved specimens.

This application forms the reserved matters for the erection of 2 two-storey, five-bedroom dwellings with integral double garages.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Outline application for three dwellings and new access dismissed at appeal 1989 as overdevelopment. Outline application for two dwellings refused on loss of trees and allowed at appeal 2000.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Landscape Advice: Recommends refusal as proposal is closer to the frontage than the Planning Inspector recommended and would result in significant harm to the woodland character of the site.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objection to principle, but concerned for Thorncroft's privacy. Western elevation shows no first-floor window, however first-floor floor plan shows a bathroom window which should be obscured glazed. Accept need to remove TPO trees for development, but object to removal of TPO35 (Ash), TPO94 (Ash), TPO95 (Hawthorn), TPO118 (Laurel).

**REPRESENTATIONS:** One. Notification period expired 5 July.

Summary: Object to the bathroom window as shown on the first floor plan which would overlook both living areas and a ground floor bedroom leading to loss of privacy. Object to removal of TPO trees 114, 113, 112, 108, 105, 104, 103, 99 & 118, which would lead to loss of privacy to both houses. The houses are too large for the site and are over intensification for this plot.

#### **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

**As the Planning Inspector determined the principle of two dwellings on site was acceptable, the main issues are whether the details of this application comply with DP Policies -**

- 1) **S1: Development Limits & DC8: Open Spaces & Trees [ESP Policy NR9],**
- 2) **DC14: General Amenity, and**
- 3) **T1 & T2: General Highway Considerations & Parking Standards [ESP Policies T3 & T12].**

1) The principle of developing this site for residential purposes has been established by the allowing of the appeal. Whilst the planning authority contended that development would have an adverse impact on the preserved trees and open spaces, the Planning Inspector noted that subject to *'appropriate design and materials.'* *development would permit the generally well wooded appearance of the land to be maintained'. In particular, the houses could be set back and well spaced so as not to be too prominent and to allow ample room for existing and new planting in the front parts of the site to develop maturely. Furthermore, planning conditions could provide for additional planting to be integrated into the development and management of existing trees to ensure their healthy future growth.*

However, the Inspector based his decision on an indicative site plan, which showed dwellings with an approximate footprint of 82m<sup>2</sup>, 19m apart from each other. The eastern unit would have been about 2m from the Thorncroft boundary. Although the current application indicates the eastern unit approximately 8.5m from the Thorncroft boundary, the submitted plans show the dwellings to have footprints of approximately 210m<sup>2</sup> and only 4m apart. Officers have expressed in previous correspondence that whilst the Planning Inspector made no specific reference to the dwellings' scale or size limit (except the details included in the appeal plans) the spatial restrictions of the site and the protected trees and other specimens to be retained would dictate, to some degree, scale and position.

As the present proposal would be considerably closer to the site frontage, there is little room for new tree planting, (as cited by the Planning Inspector). The proposal would *'significantly harm the woodland character of the site'*. Officers are of the opinion that the present proposal bears little resemblance to the details considered at appeal; that the size and scale

of the dwellings, would represent over-development resulting in built form which would reduce the wooded and low key nature and appearance of the site and would detract from the important environmental and visual characteristic of the locality.

2) Concern has been raised that a first-floor eastern window would overlook the Thorncroft property leading to a loss of privacy. The relevant elevation does not include this detail, but as this would be a bathroom window, a condition could ensure obscured glazing is used. The distance between the eastern dwelling and 'Thorncroft' should provide a buffer to ensure overlooking or overbearing impact does not adversely affect residential amenity. The position of the western unit would result in approximately 11m of its side elevation being exposed above the existing boundary planting. However, its proximity to the boundary (1.3m at its closest) has not raised any objections from the western neighbour.

3) Essex Transportation expressed no objection to the position of the access in the outline application. As no response has been received regarding the current application, it can be concluded no objections are presently raised. There is sufficient space within the site to accommodate parking spaces to satisfy Council standards.

**CONCLUSION:** The proposal is contrary to Policies S1 & DC8.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASON**

Contrary to Policies S1 & DC8. Inappropriate development involving loss of open space and trees. Scale, position and spacing of proposed dwellings would constitute over-development, resulting in built form which would reduce wooded and low-key nature and appearance of site, detracting from important environmental and visual characteristics of rural locality.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0546/01/FUL – ELSENHAM**

Change of use of former stables to form light industrial B1 units  
Home Farm. GR/TL 550-255. Mr R Greenall.  
*Case Officer: Paul Jackson, on (01799) 510468*  
Expiry Date: 25 June

**NOTATION:** Within Countryside Protection Zone.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** Home Farm is located at Gaunts End and lies in open countryside on the north-eastern side of the road from Takeley to Elsenham, opposite Elsenham Quality Foods. The existing farmhouse is Grade II listed and forms part of a complex of buildings which occupies a site extending to some 2ha. It contains a number of outbuildings, including a large barn to the north-east and a large redundant stable block to the north-west. The former stable block stands on a footprint extending to over 40m in either direction and is focussed around a central courtyard. It is accessed via an existing driveway to the south.

Permission is sought to change the use of the now redundant stable block for use as B1 light industrial/office purposes. The proposals would involve internal refurbishment and the creation of 11 individual B1 workshop units facing onto the central courtyard. Each unit would average less than 100sqm and would contain B1 business floorspace with attendant toilet facilities and a small kitchen. Parking provision for some 32 vehicles would be provided within the courtyard itself.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** The existing stables are well preserved, but are no longer required for agricultural or stabling purposes. The proposed B1 business units could easily be incorporated into the existing buildings with only minor alterations being required to the interior and internal façades. This presents an opportunity to bring back into use a now redundant building, whilst at the same time providing an ideal location for small businesses who wish to remain in the locality. The existing access is good and parking and landscaping can be provided on site with little visible alteration to the premises when viewed from the exterior. This would be compatible with other business uses both on site and in the immediate locality and would have little impact on the surrounding open countryside.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Change of use of agricultural buildings on adjoining site to joinery workshop, storage of vintage vehicles and bulk timber store refused in 1989 on grounds of effects on listed building, amenity of adjacent residents and detrimental visual impact: allowed on appeal in 1990. Waste transfer station adjacent to Home Farmhouse refused in 1994 and dismissed on appeal in 1995 on grounds of detrimental effects on open area. Change of use of barn to north of Home Cottage to use for B2 industrial use and B8 storage approved in 1997 subject to personal condition. On cessation of this use, change of use of the same barn to use for B1 light industrial, B2 general industrial and B8 storage and distribution refused in 1999 on grounds of detriment to amenity of nearby residents and effect on highway safety and free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway: allowed on appeal in 2000.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Building Surveying: Confirms that buildings are suitable for conversion.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Strong objections on grounds of over-intensification of use of the site and increase in vehicle movements. Comment that site could be further expanded given proximity to Stansted. Any permission granted should be limited in terms of hours of use.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has also been advertised and 1 representation has been received. Period expired 7 June.

CPREssex : Object on grounds of an inappropriate countryside use which would lead to an unacceptable increase in traffic. Adversely affect the setting of the listed Home Farmhouse. Set an undesirable precedent for further similar development.

#### **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

**The main issues are whether the proposal would be acceptable in relation to DP Policies:**

- 1) **S4: Countryside Protection Zone (CP2) around Stansted Airport,**
- 2) **C5 & 5: Promotion of rural economy and conversion of rural buildings [ESP Policies CS3 and RE2],**
- 3) **T1: Traffic [ESP Policy T3] and**
- 4) **DC14; general amenity**

1) Policy S4 seeks to prevent development within the CPZ which would promote coalescence or adversely affect the open characteristics of the zone. There would be no coalescence since no new buildings are proposed. As all parking would be within the existing courtyard, there would be no material effect on the openness of the Zone.

2) Policy C4 seeks to promote development which diversifies and enhances the rural economy, whilst Policy C5 normally permits the appropriate re-use of soundly constructed rural buildings for non-residential purposes. In the context of the above this application is considered to be acceptable. The proposed alterations to the physical fabric of the building



would be limited. The proposed use for B1 business units would be compatible with this location and provide a suitable alternative use for the premises. It should also be noted that consent was recently granted on appeal for B1, B2 and B8 use of a large barn to the north-east of the site. Furthermore, parking can be provided within the site and hidden from outside public view. The development itself would therefore have little impact upon the character of the surrounding rural area.

3) These policies come with the caveat that the site is adequately accessed and capable of accommodating the proposed use without causing harm to the characteristics of the surrounding countryside. With regard to highways issues, the proposed business units would total 600sqm in all. Parking is shown to be provided for 32 vehicles within the existing courtyard, which would comply with the operative parking criteria of the Council. As regards the existing access, this would be adequate to cater for the 120 or so vehicular movements per day, subject to a condition requiring the provision of adequate visibility splays. In this regard it should be noted that, in allowing the recent appeal for the barn to the north-east of the Farmhouse, the Inspector had regard to highway safety. It was his conclusion that the main road through Gaunts End was relatively busy but that, subject to the provision of adequate visibility, the addition of extra vehicular traffic onto this road would not be problematic. A new alternative access is shown on the plans but the provision of this would have an unacceptable impact on the rural area and would be close to the turn to Elsenham Quality Foods and should be omitted by imposition of a condition.

4) The proposals would have negligible impact upon amenity. The existing access is physically separated from the nearest residential access. Further, the access road and stable block themselves are located some distance from the nearest residential dwelling, Home Farmhouse. This issue was also considered in relation to the recent appeal decision on a nearby site referred to above, when the Inspector concluded that there would be no detriment to residential amenity, even when the proposed means of access to the barn involved movements much closer to residential property.

**CONCLUSION:** Despite the objections received from the CPRE and Parish Council, the terms of this application accord with the thrust and aims of both national guidance and adopted local policy. The application itself is consistent with the nature of those proposals recently allowed on appeal on the same site. Overall, this application is considered acceptable subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions to reduce the effects of cumulative commercial impact in the CPZ.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1 Time Limit for the commencement of development.
2. C.4.1 Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
3. C.4.2 Implementation of landscaping.
4. C.5.1 Samples of materials to be submitted and agreed.
5. C.9.1 No outdoor storage.
6. Details of visibility splays to be agreed and implemented.
7. C.10.26. Access surfacing.
8. Car parking provision and no parking outside courtyard.
9. No airport-related car parking.
10. Permission does not extend to creation of an alternative access.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **1) UTT/0634/01/FUL & 2) UTT/0635/01/LB – LITTLE DUNMOW**

1) Conversion of barn to dwelling, alterations to boundary wall & use of adjacent building as garaging.

2) Conversion of barn to dwelling, alterations to boundary wall.

Grange Farm. GR/TL: 650-212. Mr J Kirby

Case Officer Tony Ewbanks on (017990 510494

Expiry Date: 12 July

**NOTATION:** Outside Development Limits/Area of Special Landscape Value/Curtilage of Grade II Listed Building.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** This two-storey, five-bay timber framed barn is sited within the farm yard of Grange Farm, located along Grange Lane to the west of the village. The main listed farmhouse is located 35m to the northwest of the barn. A listed cart shed is sited 27m to the north, and various agricultural buildings converted to a mixture of holiday lets, fitness centre and light industrial uses are located in proximity to the south.

This proposal is to convert the barn to residential and utilise the existing open bay structure as garaging. The conversion works propose the demolition of an old dilapidated shed and corrugated iron roofing structures over the northern yard.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See agent's dated 2 May attached at end of Supplementary Schedule.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** (on other structures in complex). Change of use of redundant pig building to light industrial and office use approved 1989. Conversion and repairs to structure to form holiday accommodation approved 1990. Change of use from light industrial use to gymnasium approved 1990. Conversion of cart shed to farm office approved 1990. Change of use of farm buildings to holiday accommodation approved 1993. Change of use from Class B1 to Class D1 (fitness suite) and erection of connecting corridor refused 2000 on traffic grounds following Members' site visit (appeal decision awaited).

**CONSULTATIONS:** Design Advice: Building of environmental group merit. No objections subject to conditions.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objections to the conversion but are concerned about extra traffic in narrow part of Grange Lane. Farm is still working and a condition should be imposed so that no subsequent conversion of the barn to holiday let is permitted.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and one representation has been received. Period expired 5 July.

Object. In our opinion the road access is already congested and dangerous due to the existing volume of traffic.

### **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

The main issues are whether the proposal complies with DP Policies,

- 1) C6: Residential Conversion of Rural Buildings [ESP Policy RE2],
- 2) DC5 & C2: Development affecting Listed Buildings & Areas of Special Landscape Value [ESP Policy HC3],
- 3) DC14: General Amenity and
- 4) T1 & T2: General Highway Considerations and Parking Standards [ESP Policies T3 & T12].

1) Policy C6 permits conversion of rural barn structures providing they are structurally sound whose historic, traditional or vernacular merit would enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding rural area. The barn appears to be in good structural condition, and the proposed conversion works would make use of the existing structural gaps, which would not constitute substantial building reconstruction. The removal of the unsightly modern and poorly maintained lean-to sheds, as well as the alterations to the attached brick wall, should help respect and conserve the important rural characteristics of the building. The barn is located within a traditional farmyard setting with various ancillary agricultural buildings converted to a variety of uses. This barn plays an important role within the historic farmstead of Grange Farm.

2) There should be no adverse impact on the character of the listed buildings or its setting within the Area of Special Landscape Value.

3) The barn is sited approximately 35m south east from the main farmhouse, 27m south of a listed cart shed, and close to a variety of agricultural buildings converted to holiday lets, fitness centre and light industrial uses to the south. Although the farmyard is to remain open in nature and the conversion works would introduce new window details, Officers are of the opinion that the residential amenity of the permanently occupied dwellings (to the north west) should not be significantly or adversely affected.

4) A representation and the Parish Council (who have not objected to the principle of the conversion) have raised concerns that Grange Lane is already congested with the mixture of uses and that the proposal would potentially add to further traffic problems. Whilst the lane is narrow, the amount of traffic generated by the resulting four-bedroomed barn should not significantly increase the nature and volume of traffic the overall site generates and should not create traffic hazards or cause unreasonable delays or inconvenience to other road users. In addition to the space surrounding the barn, the existing open shed structure to the north (which is to be renovated) should provide adequate parking space to satisfy Council standards. The Parish Council's concerns over the potential for the barn to be holiday lets in the future would be determined through a change of use application.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The proposal complies with Policies C2, C6, DC5, DC14, T1 & T2.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**1) UTT/0634/01/FUL - APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1. Time limit for the commencement of development.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
5. Excluding all PD rights of extension, outbuildings, garage or enclosure.
6. Parking requirements.
7. Drainage requirements.

**2) UTT/0634/01/LB - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.2. Time limit for the commencement of development – listed buildings.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans.
- 3-6. Detailed design requirements.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0749/01/FUL - SAFFRON WALDEN/SEWARDS END**

Erect house and double garage; change of use of land to garden and alteration to vehicular access

Chapel Cottage, 46 Walden Road, Swards End. GR/TL 570-382. Mr & Mrs Landridge.

Case Officer: *Hilary Lock on (01799) 510486*

Expiry Date: 27 July

**NOTATION:** Part of site Within/Development Limits/Area of Special Landscape Value/Adjacent Grade II Listed Building.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** The site is on the eastern side of Walden Road, south of the new Village Hall. It has a frontage of approximately 17m and depth of 26m. There is a disused former chapel/shop adjacent to a listed thatched cottage to the north (Chapel Cottage).

The proposal is to replace the chapel building with a three-bedroom house with cellar and detached double garage to serve both the new house and Chapel Cottage. The access would be modified to create turning and parking for both dwellings. The house would have a footprint of 85m<sup>2</sup> (plus garage) and height of 7.5m (excluding cellar). There would be 3 north side-facing bedroom windows, but two of these are secondary and could be obscured by condition to prevent overlooking. Amenity space in excess of Council standards would be provided for both dwellings. Car parking provision would be adequate for both properties.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See agent's letter dated 31 May attached at end of Supplementary Schedule.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Outline permission for replacement of building with house refused 1978; Conversion and extension to form dwelling refused 1981; Outline permission for house in garden of 48 Walden Road to north refused and dismissed at appeal 1995; all on Policy grounds.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Design Advice: Recommend refusal. Size and design would be very prominent and have overpowering effect on diminutive and simple listed thatched cottage. The double garage would erode the spacious quality which contributes to rural setting. See full comments attached at end of Supplementary Schedule.

**TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS:** To be reported (due 9 July).

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and no representation has been received. Period expired 10 July 2001.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

The main issues are whether the proposal would -

- 1) **comply with DP Policies S1 (Development Limits) & S2**
- 2) **adversely affect the setting of the adjacent listed dwelling: DP Policy DC5; [HC2 of ESP] and**
- 3) **be acceptable in highway terms: DP Policy T1 [T3 of ESP].**

1) The rear wall of the existing chapel building forms the Development Limit boundary (VDL) designated in the District Plan. Approximately half the application site is outside the VDL, containing a significant portion of the house and the whole garage. There would be no objection in principle to the replacement of this chapel with a dwelling, provided that the new house was contained within the VDL.

2) Although the existing structure does not enhance the setting of the listed building, it is relatively modest and its impact is minimal. However, its replacement with a significantly larger and more prominent building would overpower this diminutive and simple thatched cottage. The impact would be exacerbated as this part of Walden Road is more sparsely developed and rural in character and appearance than the opposite side of the road. The introduction of the double garage between the 2 sites would further erode the spacious character of the curtilage. It is not considered that relocation of the dwelling so that it fell wholly within the VDL would overcome these concerns, as it would increase its prominence in the street scene and harmful impact on the listed building.

3) There is presently no turning space to serve Chapel Cottage, but access to that site could be improved without the need to construct a further property.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The proposal would be damaging to the setting of the adjacent listed building, and would involve the unacceptable construction of a dwelling partly beyond Development Limits. There is no objection to the change of use of land to garden, subject to conditions.

**RECOMMENDATION : REFUSAL REASONS**

1. R.3. Contrary to Policy S2: Unsuitable development in the countryside as part of site beyond Village Development Limits. Intrusion into open rural area.
2. R.21. Contrary to Policy DC5: Inappropriate design affecting the preservation of the character of a listed building or its setting. Size, scale and design of dwelling in prominent location would overpower adjacent listed cottage. Garage would erode open rural character of curtilage.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0687/01/FUL – SAFFRON WALDEN**

Removal of condition C.91C of planning permission UTT/2076/89 (restriction on use)  
Mitchell Hangar, Audley End Airfield, Wenden Road. Audley End Development Ltd.  
GR/TL: 527-368  
*Case Officer: Hilary Lock on (01799) 510486*  
Expiry Date: 1 August

**NOTATION:** Outside Development Limits/Area of Special Landscape Value/Existing Airstrip.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** This application relates to a building at the Audley End airstrip, located in open countryside southwest of the town. The building has been in use for the restoration and repair of aircraft. It has floorspace of 720m<sup>2</sup>, and is accessed via a hardened track off Wenden Road. There are parking and turning areas surrounding the building.

The proposal is to remove a condition which restricts use of the building to aircraft restoration and storage. At this stage the intended operator is a manufacturing company, Swaine Adeney Brigg (SAB), currently occupying premises at Nursery Road, Great Chesterford, although an alternative user may arise. SAB produce leather ware and travel goods, and in terms of noise, the only machinery operated from the site would be sewing machines and leather cutting equipment. The proposed hours of operation would be 8am – 6pm Monday to Friday.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See agent's letter dated 11 May 2001 attached at end of Supplementary Schedule.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Permission granted for hangar 1990, and extension 1994.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Environmental Services: No adverse comments.

Building Surveying: No adverse comments on Fire Service access.

**TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS:** To be reported (due 16 July).

**REPRESENTATIONS:** None. Notification period expired 12 July.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

The main issues are whether the proposal would comply with DP policies

- 1) S2 (Development in the Countryside) [CS2 & C5 of ESP] & C5 (Re-use of Rural Buildings) [RE2 of ESP],
- 2) T1 (Highway considerations) [T3 of ESP] & T2 (Parking) [T12 of ESP],
- 3) T6 (Intensified Use of Airstrips) [BIW9 of ESP] and
- 4) DC14 (General Amenity).

1) Policies S2 and C5 allow for appropriate changes of use of rural buildings, and it is considered that the type of activity operated by Swaine Adeney Brigg, or any other Class B1 use, would be an appropriate re-use of a hangar of this size. However, more intensive or B2 use at this site would not be acceptable, given the exposed location and access constraints, and the use should therefore be restricted by condition.

2) Vehicular access is via an unclassified but well used road between Saffron Walden High School and Cambridge Road, near its junction towards Audley End Station. Visibility is restricted due to mature planting (Conduit Plantation is to the west of the access), but the information outlined in the application suggests a relatively low level of traffic, and not materially greater than the number and size of vehicles generated by the previous user. Historic Flying employed 17 staff on site, and SAB would relocate its existing 40 staff. Although there is parking available for 18 cars, a minibus to and from the site is to be provided for many staff as is the Company's current practice. The agent advises that all movements of goods produced by SAB is by Parcel Force delivery vans rather than HGVs, and traffic generation should not be materially greater than that generated by the previous user. Use of the airstrip by light aircraft will continue. This would also likely to be the case with any alternative future B1 use. Seventeen parking spaces are required and can be accommodated on site without them being unduly prominent.

3) Policy T6 opposes any expansion of activities and facilities at the airfield, on the basis that more intensive use of the site would conflict with the aim of protecting the character of the countryside around Saffron Walden. However, as this proposal involves the replacement of an authorised commercial business with another, it is not considered that any material increase in activity should arise which would harm the character of this area. However, there should be a limit on the size of vehicles and a limit on the amount of outdoor parking.

4) The site is in an isolated location and there are no residential properties in close proximity. The closest are over 600m from the hangar, and it is not considered that the relatively low level of activity should adversely affect amenity.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The re-use of this site for an alternative B1 use is considered acceptable and in accordance with Council policies.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. Restriction to use as set out in application or other uses within Class B1(C).
3. Excluding Future Permitted Development Changes to Class B8.
4. C.8.3. No outdoor working.
5. C.8.14 Hours of Operation as applied for.
6. C.9.1. No Outdoor Storage.
7. Retention of parking area shown on plan and limit on extent of outdoor parking
8. Restriction on size of vehicles.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0724/01/FUL – WHITE RODING**  
***(Referred at Officers' Discretion)***

Erection of two-storey side and rear extensions  
Prows Farm Cottages, Marks Hall Lane. GR/TL: 563-144. G Eastlake.  
*Case Officer: Michael Ovenden on (017990 510476*  
Expiry Date: 19 July.

**NOTATION:** Outside Development Limit.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** The site is located approximately half a mile north of White Roding village on the road to Cammas Hall. It is in a fairly remote location in generally open attractive countryside, close to a sharp bend in the road.

This revised proposal is for the alteration and extension of this pair of almost identical, relatively small semi-detached dwellings.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See statement dated 9 May 2001 attached at end of Supplementary Schedule.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Replacement of existing semi detached dwellings by two detached dwellings and change of use of agricultural land to garden, refused and dismissed on appeal 1995 following Members' site visit. Extensions to dwellings approved 1999. Extensions refused 2000 for reason of disproportionate size and suburban appearance.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** None (due 2 July).

**REPRESENTATIONS:** None. Notification period expired 12 July.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

The main issues are whether

- 1) the proposal complies with DP Policy H7 on extensions,
- 2) the scale of works are such that the development should be viewed as the replacement of existing dwellings and whether the scheme is acceptable under DP Policy H8 and
- 3) the design is appropriate for its rural surroundings under DP Policy DC1.

1) Policy H7 allows proportionate extensions to dwellings and requires proposals for large extensions to be compatible with their countryside setting. The existing dwellings are a

pair of relatively small semi detached dwellings, which have had lean-to rear extensions added across their rear elevations in the past. The properties have the benefit of an extant permission for extensions, approved after negotiations. Whilst the size of these approved extensions would be significant, the two-storey elements would be at the rear and the modest, semi detached character of the dwellings would be retained from public view. In contrast, this current proposal completely alter the character of the dwellings so that they would cease to be recognisable as the existing dwellings.

2) The works to these dwelling are so comprehensive that they are tantamount to replacement dwellings. Policy H8 allows replacement dwellings subject to various criteria, including that they should not impair the rural characteristics of the area. In contrast to the existing dwellings, which have a joint front two-storey elevation measuring 12.5m, the proposed dwellings would present a two storey front elevation of 19.5m. This significantly greater width would be detrimental to the rural characteristics of the countryside.

3) With regard to the design of the proposed extended dwellings, they would have a very ungainly, asymmetric appearance with a jumble of architectural features – gables, different gable widths, jetties, hipped roofs, dormers, gablets, weatherboarding, enclosed and exposed porches. PPG1 advises authorities to reject obviously poor design and it is considered that the proposed design falls below acceptable standards required to protect the rural character of this area.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The alterations to the dwellings are so significant that the proposal should be considered as the replacement of the existing dwellings, but in any event the design is so poor as to fail to protect the rural characteristics of the area. The previously approved extensions are the most which can be appropriately accommodated on this site.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS**

1. R.7. Contrary to Policy H7. Unacceptable additions to a dwellinghouse. Disproportionate extensions to this pair of almost identical, relatively small semi-detached dwellings incompatible with their countryside setting.
2. R.8. Contrary to Policy H8. Unacceptable replacement dwellings. Larger than existing modest properties, which, due to their size, would impair the rural characteristics of the countryside.
3. R.19. Contrary to Policy DC1. Poor design. Inappropriate appearance detract from visual character of this rural area.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0757/01/FUL – HATFIELD HEATH**  
***(Referred at Officers' Discretion)***

Erection of covered shelter  
Camp Farm, Mill Lane. Mr S Fish. GR/TL: 518-155.  
Case Officer: David Jeater on (01799) 510464  
Expiry Date: 30 July

**NOTATION:** Green Belt

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** Camp Farm is located to the north-west of the village. It is a site of 2.2ha, occupied by some 25 buildings, many of which were once part of a Prisoner of War camp, and later a poultry farm. The main occupier of the site is Greenway Eggs, an egg storage and distribution business. The site is off Mill Lane on the northern



edge of Hatfield Heath; the lane is only 4m wide in places and has some ten houses facing or abutting it.

The proposal involves the erection of a canopy of lightweight construction which would be 16m long, 4m wide and 4m high next to two of the sheds more or less in the centre of the site. The canopy is proposed to replace a scaffold and corrugated metal structure covering about twice the size, which was refused permission in December last year. This is currently the subject of enforcement action and is due to be moved by 16 August.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See letter from FPD Savills dated 29 May attached at end of Supplementary Schedule.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Demolition of some sheds and their replacement by buildings for egg packing, storage and dispatch refused in 1997 and the subsequent appeal dismissed in 1998 on Green Belt policy and traffic grounds. Certificate of Lawfulness for use of land and buildings for storing, packing and despatching eggs and egg packing approved in 1999. Enforcement investigations relating to the existing canopy were started in March 2000.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** It sees nothing in the application which overcomes the objections which the Council had to the unauthorised canopy. The site is within the Green Belt, where District Plan Policy S3 states that permission will not be given, except in very special circumstances, for purposes other than agriculture and forestry, and that building extensions which adversely affect its open characteristics will not be permitted.

**REPRESENTATIONS:**

1. CPREssex: Object. The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The purpose of the building is industrial/commercial rather than agricultural. The proposed use is as a shelter for loading large delivery lorries. As a commercial development it does not fall within any of the categories of development that may exceptionally be permitted in the Green Belt. Consolidation of operations through a building extension on this site would have an adverse effect on the open nature of the countryside.
2. The site is unsuitable for access and unsuitable for a wholesale business such as bulk products. HGV's 50 feet long and some 40 tonnes in weight, treble axles which also have to be unloaded when delivering. Not for agricultural purposes. Steel and a roof of PVC covered fabric awning would not be in keeping with the countryside environment.
3. The height and nature of the proposed covered shelter would have a detrimental effect on this Green Belt land and its surroundings. The shelter would be used to facilitate the loading and unloading of the articulated lorries which are driven into Camp Farm via Mill Lane and which in so doing cause a danger to Mill Lane residents and other land users. The noise, dust and fumes and general disturbance caused by these vehicles prevents residents from enjoying the country lane. permission for the erection within Camp Farm of a facility to accommodate these vehicles would be an encouragement for their use. The scaffolding and corrugated iron shelter is an eyesore and it should be removed. Nothing of this height and size should be allowed to replace it.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

The main issues are whether

- 1) the proposed canopy would adversely affect the open characteristics of the Green Belt : DP Policy S3 and
- 2) approving the canopy would facilitate the 'consolidation' of this unsatisfactory use which would lead to additional adverse environmental effects.

1) The application site covers more than 2ha and has some 25 buildings which have a total floor space of about 2,400 sq m. There are further former PoW huts on land to the south between the village and the site, and a small warehouse building occupied by an electrical contractor and a private house nearby, all on Green Belt land. This application involves an open-sided canopy covering some 72 sq m, which would add to the covered area on the site by just 3%. Because it lies near the middle of the site, and its top would be at the same level as the roof ridge of most of the sheds, it would scarcely be visible to people outside it, for example the nearest public footpath is some 100m distant

2) To the extent that the canopy would enable vehicles to be loaded and unloaded out of the elements, the proposal would benefit the business as identified in the supporting statement. The proposed canopy is not high enough to accommodate larger trucks which visit the site. Because of the established nature of the activities and the relatively small size of the works and their position well within the site, it would be difficult to sustain a claim that the effect on the open characteristics of the Green Belt would be significant.

**CONCLUSION:** Whilst it may be unsatisfactory in terms of the traffic it generates along Mill Lane, its appearance, and its 'non-conforming' position as a commercial activity in the Green Belt, the egg-packing business is lawfully established on its site. The proposed canopy would have little material effect on the external environment because of its small scale and location within the site. It cannot therefore be said that it would cause demonstrable harm to the openness of the green belt.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0690/01/LB - SAFFRON WALDEN**  
***(District Council Proposal)***

Installation of wall-mounted CCTV camera.  
Post Office, High Street. GR/TL 536-384. Mr C D Cooper. Uttlesford District Council.  
*Case Officer: Michelle Guppy on (01799) 510477*  
Expiry Date: 12 July

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits, Within Conservation Area & Town Centre / Designated as Principal Shopping Frontage / Listed building.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** The building is located within the town centre on the western side of the High Street opposite the junction with King Street.

The proposal is for the installation of a CCTV camera on the northeast facing corner of the property at first-floor level.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** This application is made in the interests of public safety and the reduction of anti social behaviour.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Design Advice: Original location: One of the special features of this listed building is the particularly fine brickwork, tuck-pointed on the front elevation. Concern that fixings for bracket holding the camera would harm the brickwork by creating holes which, when the camera is eventually removed, will need to be repaired. The camera would

harm the appearance of this finely proportioned and detailed building. Suggests consider an alternative location.

Revised location: acceptable provided that wiring/pipe work is painted black and is run up the recess in the brickwork.

**TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objection. Notification period expired 25 June.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and no representations have been received. Period expired 21 June.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

**The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the setting, character and appearance of the listed building and Conservation Area: DP Policies DC2 & 5 [ESP Policies HC2 & 3].**

The camera is required to look up and down the High Street, King Street and Park Lane. A site meeting was held to see if there was a possible alternative location for the camera in order to safeguard the listed building. No other location for the camera could be found that would enable it to cover all four directions and see the other cameras in the vicinity. Therefore methods to mitigate the effect on the listed building were investigated. Locating the camera on an arm attached to the side of the building should safeguard the brickwork on the front elevation and minimise the impact. All wiring could be run up the recess in the brickwork and be black. The revised proposal should not detrimentally affect the setting of the listed building or impair the special characteristics of the listed building or Conservation Area.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The proposal is in accordance with Policy DC5.

**RECOMMENDATION: LISTED BUILDING CONSENT TO DTLR**

1. C.2.2. Time limit for commencement of development - listed buildings & conservation areas.
2. C.3.2. To be implemented in accordance with revised plans.
- 3-6. Design requirements.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0777/01/FUL – HIGH RODING**  
***(Officer's Interest)***

Erection of conservatory at rear.  
2 Broadfields. Mr and Mrs B Byford. GR/TL: 603-171  
*Case Officer: David Jeater on (01799) 510464*  
Expiry Date: 3 August

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached ex-Council house which forms part of a small estate. The house stands in a sizeable plot 12m wide and nearly 80m deep. There is a small single-storey bay window about 1m deep at the rear of the property and a detached double garage.

It is proposed to erect a small conservatory (2.7m deep x 3.2m wide) to the rear of the dwelling with a hardwood framework and 'lean-to' roof shape, to be positioned where the existing bay window is to be demolished.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Most of the permitted development rights have been taken up by the double garage built some ten years ago.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** None received (due 6 July).

**REPRESENTATIONS:** None. Notification period expired 5 July.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

The main issues are whether the proposed conservatory would

- 1) respect the scale and appearance of the house and other buildings in the locality : DP Policy DC1 and
- 2) whether it would adversely affect the amenity of adjoining housing: DP Policy DC14

1) The style of the conservatory would reflect that of the house.

2) It would be positioned so that it would be 2.5m from the western boundary and 7.5m from the fence from the eastern. The appearance of the proposal would therefore be acceptable, and it would have only a very limited effect on immediate neighbours.

**CONCLUSIONS:** This conservatory is a small-scale extension which many householders build as permitted development, and involves no conflict with policy.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.1 To be implemented in accordance with approved plan.

\*\*\*\*\*