

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS AWAITING DECISIONS WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN INCLUDED ON A PREVIOUS SCHEDULE AS AT 3 SEPTEMBER 2001**

APPL NO: **UTT/0020/01/FUL**  
PARISH: **DEBDEN**  
DEVELOPMENT: Conversion of barn to single dwelling. Construction of new vehicular access  
APPLICANT: W Bunting  
LOCATION: Barn at Broctons Farm, Rookend Lane, Debden  
D.C. SUB: 13 August  
REMARKS: Deferred to negotiate an acceptable solution following Members' site visit.  
**RECOMMENDATION: To be reported**  
*Case Officer: Richard Smith on (01799) 510465*  
Expiry Date: 5 March

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0326/01/FUL**  
PARISH: **HATFIELD BROAD OAK**  
DEVELOPMENT: Erection of replacement dwelling  
APPLICANT: J Schonberg  
LOCATION: Anthonys, Anthonys Lane  
D.C. SUB: 11 June  
REMARKS: Deferred pending receipt of information requested following last meeting and Members' site visit  
**RECOMMENDATION: To be reported**  
*Case Officer: David Jeater on (01799) 510464*  
Expiry Date: 25 May

---

APPL: **UTT/0343/01/FUL**  
PARISH: **MANUDEN**  
DEVELOPMENT: Two-storey side extension incorporating double garage. Ground floor rear extensions. Creation of vehicular access.  
APPLICANT: Mr D Farnham  
LOCATION: 18 The Street  
D.C. SUB: 23 July  
REMARKS: Deferred pending receipt of revised plans following Members' site visit  
**RECOMMENDATION: To be reported**  
*Case Officer: Hilary Lock on (01799) 510486*  
Expiry Date: 3 May

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0382/01/FUL**  
PARISH: **SAFFRON WALDEN**  
DEVELOPMENT: Erection of 72 no. dwellings comprising 20 no. 2-bed flats; 16 no. 1-bed flats; 28 no. 2-bed houses; 8 no. 3-bed houses  
APPLICANT: Monkbury Ltd  
LOCATION: Land off Thaxted Road, Harris Yard and allotments off Radwinter Road  
D.C. SUB: 2 July  
REMARKS: Deferred for ECC Transportation views following Members' site visit  
**RECOMMENDATION: To be reported**  
*Case Officer: Jeremy Pine on (01799) 510460*  
Expiry Date: 25 May

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0591/01/FUL**  
PARISH: **GREAT HALLINGBURY**  
DEVELOPMENT: Erection of detached two-storey dwelling and integral double garage, change of use from public house car park to residential and creation of new vehicular access  
APPLICANT: Mr P Cullen  
LOCATION: Land adjacent to The Hop Poles, Bedlars Green  
D.C. SUB: 2 July  
REMARKS: Deferred pending receipt of revised plans following Members' site visit  
**RECOMMENDATION: To be reported**  
*Case Officer: Paul Jackson on (01799) 510452*  
Expiry Date: 21 June

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0719/01/FUL**  
PARISH: **THAXTED**  
DEVELOPMENT: Demolish dwelling and outbuildings. Replacement dwelling and garage with room above  
APPLICANT: Mr D Wiggins  
LOCATION: Folly Mill Cottage, Folly Mill Lane, Monk Street, Thaxted  
D.C. SUB: 13 August  
REMARKS: Deferred at applicant's request pending further negotiations following Members' site visit  
**RECOMMENDATION: Deferred**  
*Case Officer: Hilary Lock on (01799) 510486*  
Expiry Date: 19 July

---

**UTT/0761/01/OP - TAKELEY**

Erection of a two-storey building for class B1 (business)  
Factory Building on Part of Zellweger Site - former Neotronics building, Parsonage Road.  
GR/TL 561-217. City and Westminster Developments Ltd.  
*Case Officer: Paul Jackson on (01799) 510452*  
Expiry Date: 30 July

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** This application relates to the southern half of the former Zellweger site, located on the eastern side of Parsonage Road.

Permission is sought, in outline, to erect a two-storey B1 (business) building to the south-eastern corner of the site to the north of the rear gardens to residential properties located on North Road. The existing building, an extensive single-storey unit totalling some 1,911 sqm, would be demolished. The existing entrance would be utilised to provide access to parking and servicing facilities on both the frontage and the northern boundary. The southern boundary, adjacent to residential properties in North Road, would be remodelled and landscaped, with the existing hedgerow retained. Siting and means of access are not reserved for subsequent approval, but all other details are.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** This site has an extensive planning history and was most recently occupied by Zellweger Analytics. The existing unoccupied factory, together with its ancillary offices and storage facilities, was allowed in outline on appeal in 1977. Detailed consent was granted in 1978, with extensions being permitted in 1980. The car park was extended in 1984 and 1993. Proposals for redevelopment for office purposes were further granted in 1987, together with a new access, although this was not implemented. Various consents exist for the temporary siting and retention of portacabins. An application for residential redevelopment was refused in April 2000 on grounds of loss of employment. Consent was granted in July 2001 for B1 office use of the existing two-storey industrial unit to the north of the site.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Environmental Services: No objections.

Environment Agency: No objections in principle subject to conditions.

ECC Transportation: To be reported.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objection, subject to the imposition of conditions regarding days/hours of operation and delivery times.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** One. Notification period expired on 5 July 2001.

Potential overlooking and concerns expressed regarding noise and disturbance.

#### **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

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

- 1) **S1 Development Limits,**
- 2) **E1 Location of Future Employment [ESP Policies BIW 1 & 3],**
- 3) **T1 Traffic [ESP Policy T3],**
- 4) **T2 Provision of Car Parking [ESP Policy T12],**
- 5) **DC1 Design of Development and**
- 6) **DC14 General Amenity.**

1) Within the defined development limits, Policy S1 normally permits proposals that are not detrimental to any important environmental or visual characteristic of the locality so long as these proposals accord with other relevant policies within the Development Plan. This outline proposal seeks consent for the redevelopment of an existing B1 business use together with a 30% expansion of overall floorspace. Whilst the proposals themselves are in

outline, it is considered that a scheme of two-storey height within this location would be consistent with the characteristics of the locality. The site itself is bounded to the north and south by existing two-storey development.

2) Policy E1 seeks to concentrate new industrial and commercial development within the defined development limits of the Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow, Stansted Mountfitchet and Stansted Airport. However, E1 (b) normally permits employment uses of an appropriate scale and type in other settlements so long as there is no conflict with other policies in the Plan. In this regard, the proposed redevelopment of this site would be consistent with the overall aims of Policy E1. Takeley is one of the District's largest villages, where the retention and enhancement of employment provision should continue to be encouraged.

3) Policy T1 seeks to resist new development proposals if the nature and volume of traffic likely to be generated creates traffic hazards, causes unreasonable delays and inconvenience to other road users, or leads to a significant reduction in the environmental quality of the locality. The existing premises (to be demolished) comprise some 1,900 sqm of B1 business floorspace. The redevelopment proposals seek consent for an additional 690 sqm, an increase of some 30%. The existing access is of a satisfactory standard and these proposals would comply with Policy T1, subject to the views of ECC Transportation.

4) All development proposals are expected to make provision for on-site parking in accordance with the operative standard. Business premises in the form of offices are expected to provide a minimum of one space for every 30 sqm. Overall, some 2,600 sqm of floorspace is indicated and the Council's parking standards require some 87 spaces. The indicative layout shows 100 car parking spaces together with provision for servicing. In this regard, compliance is achieved with Policy T2.

5) Development proposals are expected to reflect the scale, proportions, appearance and materials of buildings in the locality and the environmental characteristics of their setting in accordance with Policy DC1. Whilst these proposals are in outline, the proposal for two-storey development on a site bounded to the north and south by two-storey development would be acceptable in principle. The detailed design can be addressed through the imposition of appropriate conditions.

6) Policy DC14 seeks to resist development which would adversely affect the reasonable occupation and enjoyment of a residential property as a result of excessive noise, smell, fumes, dust or other pollutants or result in a loss of privacy, daylight or overshadowing. The proposal seeks consent for two-storey development for use for business purposes. The existing premises are single-storey, but the site is bounded by two-storey development. The proposed siting is considered to be acceptable in relation to near neighbours, so long as a high standard of design is achieved which reflects the specific concerns of neighbouring development, particularly residential properties in North Road. The imposition of appropriate conditions to ensure a high standard of design and suitable buffering to the residential properties to the south in the form of bunding and landscaping should achieve a suitable form of development which should not cause harm to the amenities of these neighbours. Whilst these are matters which will need to be resolved through a detailed application, the principle of this development is considered to be acceptable in this location.

**CONCLUSIONS:** Overall, the proposed redevelopment of this existing B1 business site would be appropriate and could be conditioned in order to ensure a development of high visual quality, which should not adversely affect the amenities of near neighbours nor the free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1 Time Limit for commencement of development.
2. B.1 use only; no B8 storage without further approval.
- 3-7. C.41 Landscaping scheme to be submitted and approved.
8. C.5.1 Samples of Materials to be agreed.
8. C.7.1 Slab Levels.
9. C.8.4 No deliveries before 0800hrs Mondays to Fridays and 0800 hours on Saturdays, nor after 8 pm Mondays to Fridays and 5pm Saturdays, nor at any time on Sundays or Bank/Public Holidays.
10. C.8.15 Restriction on hours of operation: 0800 hrs and 2000hrs Mondays to Fridays, 0800 hours and 1700 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, Bank/Public Holidays.
12. C.9.1 No outdoor storage.
13. C.10.2 Junction requirements to be agreed.
14. C.10.8 Details of parking provision to be agreed.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0686/01/OP - WIMBISH**

Demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of detached dwelling  
Land adj. Villa Clemilla, Lower Green. GR/TL 605-352. Mr J Ridlington  
*Case Officer: Michelle Guppy on (01799) 510477*  
Expiry Date: 10 September

**NOTATION:** Outside Development Limits

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** This 50 x 20m site is located in open countryside on the eastern part of Wimbish Green, approximately 2km south of Radwinter. It comprises outbuildings dated back to the Second World War.

This outline application proposes the demolition of existing outbuildings and the erection of a bungalow. It is intended to use existing access to the site.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** The application site falls within the domestic curtilage of Villa Clemilla and the proposed dwelling would be located on the site of some redundant outbuildings. Whilst these buildings are in a reasonable state of repair it is suggested that to demolish them and rationalise their volume into a compact and attractive dwelling house would be the most appropriate way of developing the site. The site is within the built up area of Wimbish Lower Green and this proposal would enhance the area insofar that the redundant outbuildings would be removed from view, all in compliance with Policy H6. There is an existing access and no highway problems affect this proposal.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** To be reported (due 28 August).

**REPRESENTATIONS:** Two. Notification period expires 31 August.

1. No objections. Strongly support. Request condition to retain front hedge screening.
2. I have no major objection to construction of new houses per se, in fact in this particular case a well constructed dwelling might be more in keeping with the character of the area than the existing outbuildings. It could be seen as an important precedent which might open the door for development of nearby agricultural land, notably Field 6734 opposite, then I would be strongly against it.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

**The main issue is whether the proposal complies with DP Policies:**

- 1) **S2 [ESP Policies CS2 and C5] relating to development in the countryside and**
- 2) **H6 relating to infilling [ESP Policy BE1].**

1) The erection of a dwelling on this site would not conform to any of the criteria in Policy S2. The proposal would add to sporadic residential development in the countryside, detrimental to the character and appearance of the rural area by domestication and suburbanisation.

2) The proposal does not qualify under Policy H6 as the applicant suggests. The plot is not regarded as an infill plot because it is not a small gap within a small group of houses. There is one dwelling to the south of the plot and open fields in all other directions.

**CONCLUSION:** The proposal would be contrary to DP Policy S2 and would not preserve the countryside for its own sake as required under ESP Policies CS2 and C5. The demolition of outbuildings is not sufficient justification for the erection of a dwelling which is contrary to Policy. This could be used on similar sites throughout the District.

**RECOMMENDATION (F): REFUSAL REASON**

R.3. Contrary to DP Policies S2 and H6, [ESP Policies CS2, C5 and BE1]: Unsuitable development in the countryside. Adverse effect on rural character. Precedent.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0791/01/FUL – STANSTED**

Conversion of Class B1 workshop and office to Class C3 dwelling. Demolition of single storey workshop and erection of 2-storey dwelling.

No. 3 (Workshop) Industrial Unit and Office, Woodfield Terrace. GR/TL: 511-249.

Mrs P Chick.

*Case Officer: Richard Smith on (01799) 510465*

Expiry Date: 13 August

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits/SM8 Policy Area re Woodfields.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** These workshop and office buildings are located on the eastern side of Woodfield Terrace in the centre of the village. They comprise a small single-storey workshop at the front of the site and a two-storey office building at the rear. The remainder of the land is used for car parking. The site is surrounded by dwellings and is attached to another office building.

Permission is sought for the conversion of the existing two-storey B1 workshop and office building at the rear of the site to a two-bedroomed dwelling, the partial demolition of the single-storey workshop at the front and erection of a two-bedroomed two-storey dwelling with integral garage in its place. This front dwelling would have an L-shaped floorplan, with dimensions of 3.5m along its frontage, extending to 8.5m at its rear and 10.5m in depth. Both houses would have small patios and share a parking area at the rear. The existing access would be utilised to serve both dwellings as well as an area of car parking outside the site to serve the adjoining office.

**APPLICANT’S CASE:** See letter dated 6 June 2001 attached at end of schedule.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Change of use of former builder's yard and ancillary office to drawing office first floor and storage area ground floor approved 1979. Retention of premises as offices and garage without complying with personal occupancy condition approved 1982.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Environment Agency: No objection subject to conditions.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objection as long as parking standards are met.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** 6 objections received and 1 in support. Notification period expired 17 July.

1-6. The plans submitted intrude upon the right of way to properties leased at the rear of the site. The parking and garden areas infringe on the right of way. Parking would not be possible. Concerned about construction traffic. Existing access is very narrow. Working environment severely disrupted during construction. Office building and yard stand 6ft higher than my house thereby exaggerating the extent to which I am overlooked. Increased noise as new patio and parking spaces would be in close proximity to my garden. New two-storey building would overlook my garden and block out light. Plans are unclear. Would add to the feeling of being enclosed. Loss of privacy.

7. Road is already used for business and residents, Plans would be in keeping with the building and not affect parking in the road.

#### **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

**The main issues are whether the proposal would:**

- 1. constitute over-development of the site contrary to DP Policies S1, DC1, T1 and T2 [ESP Policies BE7, T4, T8],**
- 2. have an adverse effect on the amenity of existing residential properties (DP Policy DC14) and**
- 3. accord with the criteria contained in DP Policy SM8.**

1. The proposed two-storey at the front of the site would create a cramped and overcrowded appearance, detrimental to both the street scene and neighbours' amenities. The site is not considered to be large enough to satisfactorily accommodate the two proposed detached dwellings both of which would be capable of housing small families. Neither dwelling would have a private garden, with only a small patio area with no privacy. There would also be little space for outbuildings or storage, normally required with dwellings of this size. The applicants refer to other recent examples of new dwellings with no garden areas, but these were flats.

(A more appropriate example is the recent dismissal at appeal on the St. Teresa's Church site in Silver Street).

The remaining land to the rear which is proposed to be block paved is also considered to be of insufficient size to accommodate three car parking spaces or adequate turning area (6m) without vehicles having to encroach onto the proposed patio areas, raising both pedestrian safety and general amenity questions. As a consequence vehicles may have to reverse into Woodfields Terrace to exit the site, which would be detrimental to highway safety. There are also concerns about the suitability of access itself, which would be shared with the commercial users adjacent.

2. The separation distance between the additional first-floor accommodation proposed to be created at the front of the site and existing properties opposite would be approximately 7m. This would result in an overbearing impact and loss of privacy to these properties, which

would further intensify its enclosed nature. The rear part of this accommodation would also overshadow a flank window in the adjoining drawing office premises. The back-to-back distances to properties to the rear would be in excess of 25m thus meeting operative layout standards.

3. Policy SM8 requires any new dwellings within the Woodfields to also provide additional car parking or access improvements for existing residents. The applicants argue that, as the site is currently used for office and workshop purposes, its replacement with two dwellings would reduce both the number and size of vehicles visiting the site. In this regard the parking requirement for the two dwellings would be 4 spaces as compared to 5.5 for the current commercial use. On this basis it is considered that, whilst additional floorspace is proposed, Policy SM8 could not be applied in this instance given the likelihood of a small reduction in traffic movements.

3. With regards to the points raised by neighbours concerning the right of access at the rear of the site to adjacent offices, the applicants have agreed to respond in writing clarifying the situation. This would normally be a private matter between the two parties, but since it may have implications for access to existing commercial parking adjacent, requires clarification.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The applicant's argument that the advantages of this redevelopment scheme would outweigh its disadvantages has been considered, but is not accepted by Officers.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS**

1. Contrary to DP Policies S1 & DC1, T1 and T2 [ESP Policies T3 and 12]: Over-development. Cramped form of re-development on a restricted site. Inadequate turning area would be provided to serve the future occupiers would cause vehicles to reverse into Woodfields Terrace detrimental to highway safety. Lack of adequate garden areas and storage space would result in an unsatisfactory arrangement for future occupiers of these family sized houses.
2. Contrary to DP Policy DC14: Loss of privacy to residents of properties opposite on Woodfields Terrace and overbearing effect on flank window of adjacent drawing office.

\*\*\*\*\*

**1) UTT/1026/01/FUL & 2) UTT/1027/01/CA – GREAT CHESTERFORD**

1. Erection of replacement two-storey detached house and detached garage.
  2. Demolition of existing bungalow.
- October Lodge, Carmel Street. TL/GR: 508-428. Mr and Mrs M Dunn.  
*Case Officer: Charmain Harbour on (01799) 510458*  
Expiry Date: 19 September

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits, Conservation Area and Area of Special Landscape Value.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** The site is located within the centre of Great Chesterford on the northeastern side of Carmel Street. The plot is currently occupied by a detached post-war bungalow which is positioned to the rear of the site. To the front and rear boundaries there are trees which are important to the visual amenities of the area. To the north of the site there is a modern housing estate of two-storey dwellings and in Carmel Street the dwellings are a mix of ages. To the northwest beyond a public footpath is Orchard



Cottage and to the south-east is Carmelstead, both 2-storeys and set back. The site measures 56m long and approximately 20m wide.

1) The proposal is to erect a replacement two-storey dwellinghouse with rooms in the roof in a more central position to the plot. The trees to the front and rear would be retained. The dwelling would be in an H plan format and is intended to be a modern representation of double jettied house. It would have a rendered finish with a clay tile roof. To the street elevation the house would have two gabled wings joined by a central cross wing. The height would be 7.5m to the main roof ridge, compared to a height of 5m of the existing bungalow. The foot print of the bungalow covers 140sq m compared with 110sq m. for the house (floor area would be 290sq m.) The unit would have five bedrooms, including two in the roof space. A detached double garage is proposed in the northern corner of the site. The principal windows would be to front and rear. The rear elevation would be 28m from the closest residential unit in Pilgrims Close, which is considered to be an acceptable privacy distance between two-storey units. The rooms in the roof of the new dwelling would only have windows to the front. It is proposed to retain the flint and brick wall on the frontage, which is important to the character of the Conservation Area.

2) The Conservation Area Consent application seeks the demolition of the existing bungalow. The building is not of any significant architectural merit and being located to the rear of the site the current building has little impact on the street scene.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See letter dated 16 July 2001 attached at end of schedule

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Permission granted in 1998 for two front dormer windows, a dormer to the rear, a front bay window and alterations to chimney stack (not implemented).

**CONSULTATIONS:** Design Advice: would enhance character of Conservation Area.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** To be reported (due 12 noon 3 September).

**REPRESENTATIONS:** These applications have been advertised and 1 representation has been received. Period expires 30 August .

Concerns re:

- the mass of the building would be significantly larger than existing unit,
- building would have three floors of accommodation which would intensify use of the site and create too high a roof line,
- it would be dominant in the street scene and
- it would cause loss of light and privacy to houses to rear.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

The main issues are whether

- 1) the proposal would satisfy DP Policy S1 and be acceptable redevelopment ,
- 2) the design would accord with DP Policy DC2 [ESP Policy C1] and be in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area, and
- 3) the development would adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding residential units (DP Policies DC1 [ESP Policy BE7] and DC14).

1) The existing bungalow is not of any architectural merit to warrant its retention. The site is within development limits where the principle of a one for one replacement is acceptable. The proposal would relocate the dwelling forward on the plot, would enable a greater privacy distance to be created to the houses to the north. There is no strong building line to Carmel Street.

2) The proposals would retain all the existing trees to the front and rear of the plot and the frontage wall, which are important to the character of the area. The design follows a traditional format which the developer has successfully employed on other sites in the District at Elmdon and Little Bardfield. The materials would be compatible with the location. The area is predominantly one of two-storey units with steeply pitched roofs, therefore the scale and form of the development would be in keeping with this character.

3) The unit would still be set back from Carmel Street so as not to dominate this street scene but more in the centre of the plot rather than at the rear. The scale of the dwelling would be in keeping with the properties either side of the plot. By locating the unit more centrally to the plot, it is not considered the existing units to the rear would suffer a significant loss of light or privacy. The main ridge height would be increased by 2.5m from that of the existing bungalow, which is mitigated by the re-siting of the building.

**CONCLUSION:** The demolition of the existing unit is considered to be acceptable as the building is not of any architectural merit and its loss would not harm the character of the Conservation Area. The new building is considered to be respectful of the residential amenities of the adjacent units. The form of building, materials to be used and existing features to be retained should result in the development being in keeping with the locality and an acceptable replacement scheme.

**RECOMMENDATION (S): 1 UTT/1026/01/FUL - 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.
- 3. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted and agreed.
- 4-8. Detailed design requirements.
- 9. C.6.2. Excluding all rights of permitted development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse without further permission.
- 10. C.11.7. Standard vehicle parking facilities.
- 11. C.19.1. Avoidance of overlooking.
- 12-14. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
- 15. Demolition of existing dwelling.
- 16. Slab levels to be agreed.

**2. UTT/1027/01/CA - CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS**

- 1. C.2.2. Time limit for commencement of development.
- 2. Protection of front boundary wall.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0681/01/OP - FELSTED**  
***(Subject of an appeal against non-determination)***

Outline application for erection of a dwelling.  
 Fairfield House Bakers Lane. GR/TL: 681-100. Exors. J P Guthrie-Dow.  
*Case Officer: Michael Ovenden on (01799) 510476*  
 Expiry Date: 20 July.

**NOTATION:** Outside Development Limit / TPO 9/98 (3 Oaks & 1 Willow)

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** The site is located to the southeast of the main part of the village between it and Causeway End. Bakers Lane is a single-track loose surfaced road which loops round from Chelmsford Road prior to Causeway End. The plot

lies on the northern side of Bakers Lane where there is an established Hawthorn hedge with some sizeable protected Oak trees. It forms the main eastern side garden to Fairfield House and has a 30m frontage x 25m depth. Then a site which forms the majority of the existing curtilage of the existing dwelling which dates from around the middle C20th. To the north is a strong field hedge; backing onto open countryside; a good though slightly patchy hedge runs down the eastern boundary, with some fruit trees along the proposed boundary with the existing dwelling. A short distance into the site the land dips down, and then rises towards the rear.

The proposal, made at outline with all matters reserved, is for the erection of a single dwelling. A garage is shown along with the proposed dwelling on the indicative site plan although this forms no part of the current application.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See agent's letters dated 11 May and 9 July attached at end of schedule.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Current application for felling of an Oak tree.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Landscaping: Unlikely to fundamentally affect preserved trees on site frontage, dependant on detailed siting, but lopping may be required.

Environment Agency: no objections subject to conditions.

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

**REPRESENTATIONS:** None. Notification period expired 29 June.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

**The main issues are whether the proposal complies with DP Policies:**

- 1) **S2 and H6 relating to development in rural areas and infilling [ESP Policies CS2, C5 and BE1]**
- 2) **DC8 relating to Trees [ESP Policy NR9].**

1) The distance between the dwellings on each side of the site is of the order of 45m and two other dwellings are set further to the east, each interspersed with gaps. The location plan shows only 4 dwellings along Bakers Lane, spread over a distance of about 230m. It is considered that the site is not a small gap, nor within a small group of houses. Furthermore a fundamental part of Policy H6 is that new development should not affect the character of the locality. The erection of a dwelling on the site, particularly one unrestricted in size by condition (the applicant has not offered to restrict the size of the dwelling or garage), would substantially alter the undeveloped leafy character of the site and which contributes to the rural character of Bakers Lane.

2) Four trees at the front of the site are protected and would require significant lopping in order to avoid excessive shading of the site. This may threaten their long-term survival and the rural character of this lane. (An application has been submitted to fell one of the Oak trees and further information on the matter will be given at the meeting.)

**CONCLUSIONS:** The proposal fails to comply with Policies S2, H6 or DC8 (and their Structure Plan equivalents C5 & NR9).

**RECOMMENDATION (F): INFORM PLANNING INSPECTORATE THAT THE PROPOSAL WOULD HAVE BEEN REFUSED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS**

1. R.3. Contrary to Policy S2: Outside development limit. Detrimental effect on loosely-knit rural character.
2. R.6. Contrary to Policy H6: Unsuitable infill development. Gap too wide to satisfy criteria leading to consolidation of scattered development.
3. R.22. Contrary to Policy DC8: Loss of trees. Potential harm to or loss of preserved trees. Adverse long-term effects on leafy nature of area.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0956/01/LB - SAFFRON WALDEN**  
***(District Council Proposal)***

Installation of external light over front entrance door.  
Tourist Information Centre, Market Place. GR/TL 538-385. Uttlesford District Council  
*Case Officer: Richard Smith on (01799) 510465*  
Expiry Date: 18 September.

**NOTATION:** Grade 2 Listed Building/Within Development Limits and Conservation Area.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL:** The Tourist Information Centre forms part of the old Town Hall on the southern side of Market Place.

This application is for the installation of an external down light over the entrance door. The light would measure 460mm (l) x 120mm (b) x 120mm (h).

**CONSULTATIONS:** Design Advice: No objections.

**TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objections.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and no representations have been received. Notification period expires 30 August 2001.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:**

**The main issue is whether the proposal would be sympathetic to both the appearance of the listed building and this part of the conservation area, thus complying with DP Policies DC2 and DC5 [ESP Policies HC2 and HC3].**

The down light would be of the modest proportions and located within a recess above the door. As such it should have no adverse impact on the overall appearance of the listed building or the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.

**CONCLUSION:** This proposal would comply with Policies DC2 and DC5.

**RECOMMENDATION : LISTED BUILDING CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS (TO DTLR)**

1. C.2.2. Standard Time Limit.
2. C.3.1. In accordance with approved plans.

\*\*\*\*\*