

1) UTT/0228/02/FUL & 2) UTT/0229/02/CA - STEBBING	6
UTT/0421/02/FUL – STEBBING	9
UTT/0555/02/FUL – ELMDON	11
UTT/0778/02/FUL - GREAT SAMPFORD	13
UTT/0360/02/OP - GREAT DUNMOW	15
UTT/0884/02/OP - GREAT DUNMOW	18
UTT/0722/02/FUL - SAFFRON WALDEN	21
UTT/0750/02/DFO - STEBBING	24
1) UTT/0698/02/FUL & 2) UTT/0699/02/LB - LITTLE SAMPFORD	26
UTT/0606/02/FUL - BERDEN	28
UTT/0618/02/FUL - GREAT CANFIELD.....	30
UTT/0265/02/FUL - GREAT EASTON	32
UTT/0885/02/FUL – FELSTED	35
UTT/0408/02/OP - GREAT HALLINGBURY.....	37
UTT/0704/02/FUL – NEWPORT	40

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AWAITING DECISIONS WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN INCLUDED ON A PREVIOUS SCHEDULE AS AT 22 JULY 2002

APPL NO: **UTT/1654/00/FUL**
PARISH: **GREAT DUNMOW**
DEVELOPMENT: Residential development (56 units), new road access to public car park, extension to public car park, pedestrianisation of existing access from High Street and erection of new public library
APPLICANT: Wilcon Homes Anglia Ltd
LOCATION: Land at Eastern Sector to rear of 37-61 High Street
D.C. CTTE: 26 November 2001 & 18 March 2002
REMARKS: Deferred for discussions
RECOMMENDATION: Deferral pending revised layout on fresh application
Case Officer: John Grayson (01799) 510455
Expiry Date: 31 January 2001

APPL NO: **UTT/0822/01/FUL**
PARISH: **GREAT DUNMOW**
DEVELOPMENT: Erection of four dwellings with associated garaging
APPLICANT: Mr D Lowe, Mrs McKinley and Mr C Blower
LOCATION: Land to the rear of 73-75 High Street
D.C. CTTE: 5 November 2001
REMARKS: Deferred for discussions
RECOMMENDATION: Deferral pending revised layout on fresh application
Case Officer: John Grayson (01799) 510455
Expiry Date: 20 August 2001

APPL NO: **UTT/1614/01/FUL**
PARISH: **THAXTED**
DEVELOPMENT: Installation of 25m high telecommunications tree mast, with 6 No. antennae, 2 No. dishes and 10 No. equipment cabins within a fenced compound.
APPLICANT: Orange Personal Communications
LOCATION: Park Farm, Park Street
D.C. CTTE: 10 June 2002
REMARKS: Deferred for Consultant's report
RECOMMENDATION: To be reported
Case Officer: Hilary Lock 01799 510486
Expiry Date: 18 March

APPL NO: **UTT/0213/02/FUL**
PARISH: **GREAT CHESTERFORD**
DEVELOPMENT: Erection of new freestanding Church Hall.
APPLICANT: PCC of All Saints Church
LOCATION: All Saints Churchyard
D.C. CTTE: 20 May
REMARKS: Deferred to await revised plans
RECOMMENDATION: To be reported
Case Officer: Charmain Harbour 01799 510458
Expiry Date: 8 April

APPL NO: **UTT/0285/02/FUL**
PARISH: **HATFIELD BROAD OAK**
DEVELOPMENT: Erection of equestrian barn for private use
APPLICANT: Mr P Rust
LOCATION: Broomshawbury.
D.C. CTTE: 10 June 2002
REMARKS: Deferred for negotiations re siting
RECOMMENDATION: **To be reported**
Case Officer: Richard Aston 01799 510464
Expiry Date: 30 April

APPL NO: **UTT/0536/02/FUL**
PARISH: **THAXTED**
DEVELOPMENT: Erection of chalet bungalow and detached garage
APPLICANT: Mr N Temple
LOCATION: Land adjacent to Harrow Croft, Watling Lane
D.C. CTTE: 10 June 2002
REMARKS: Deferred for negotiations re design and garaging
RECOMMENDATION: **To be reported**
Case Officer: Charmain Harbour 01799 510458
Expiry Date: 20 June

APPL NO: **UTT/0180/02/FUL**
PARISH: **HENHAM**
DEVELOPMENT: Resiting of two mobile homes and erection of replacement building for storage and repair of commercial vehicles and plant
APPLICANT: Mr W H Wood
LOCATION: Hill Top, Mill Road.
D.C. CTTE: 1 July 2002
REMARKS: Deferred for Members' Site Visit
RECOMMENDATION: **Approval with conditions**
Case Officer: Richard Aston 01799 510464
Expiry Date: 11 April

APPL NO: **UTT/0241/02/FUL**
PARISH: **CLAVERING**
DEVELOPMENT: Change of use of land and conversion of existing offices to 7 no. Class B1 light industrial/office units. Extension to joinery building to rear. Detached building to create 2 no. Class B1 units. Construct parking spaces and boundary wall/gates. Alterations to access.
APPLICANT: C E Funston Tractor Sales Ltd.,
LOCATION: C E Funston Tractor Sales Ltd., Arkesden Road.
D.C. CTTE: 1 July 2002
REMARKS: Deferred for Members' Site Visit
RECOMMENDATION: **Approval with conditions**
Case Officer: Hilary Lock 01799 510486
Expiry Date: 12 April

APPL NO: **UTT/0266/02/FUL**
PARISH: **STEBBING**
DEVELOPMENT: Removal of Barn/store and erection of single-storey dwelling.
APPLICANT: J F Blackwell.
LOCATION: Land rear of Town Farm.
D.C. CTTE: 1 July 2002
REMARKS: Deferred for Members' Site Visit
RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions
Case Officer: Katherine Benjafield 01799 510494
Expiry Date: 8 May

APPL NO: **UTT/0274/02/FUL**
PARISH: **GREAT DUNMOW**
DEVELOPMENT: Change of use to dwelling and erection of extension
APPLICANT: Mr A McBride
LOCATION: 71 The Causeway.
D.C. CTTE: 1 July 2002
REMARKS: Deferred for Members' Site Visit
RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions
Case Officer: Michael Ovenden 01799 510476
Expiry Date: 15 April

APPL NO: **UTT/0370/02/FUL**
PARISH: **HATFIELD HEATH**
DEVELOPMENT: Replacement of residentially occupied shed by a permanent dwelling.
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs S King
LOCATION: Stonebridge Farm, Chelmsford Road.
D.C. CTTE: 1 July 2002
REMARKS: Deferred for Members' Site Visit
RECOMMENDATION: Refusal
Case Officer: Richard Aston 01799 510464
Expiry Date: 30 April

APPL NO: **UTT/0397/02/FUL**
PARISH: **FELSTED**
DEVELOPMENT: Change of use of agricultural building to B1/B2/B8 Use.
APPLICANT: Messrs R A & N Smith
LOCATION: Chaffix Farm, Braintree Road, Felsted
D.C. CTTE: 1 July 2002
REMARKS: Deferred at applicants' request re revised proposal
RECOMMENDATION: To be reported
Case Officer: Richard Aston 01799 510464
Expiry Date: 6 June

APPL NO: **UTT/0500/02/FUL**
PARISH: **GREAT DUNMOW**
DEVELOPMENT: Demolition of former petrol filling station and erection of 9 x two-bedroom apartments, cycle store, car parking and alterations of existing access.

APPLICANT: Higgins Homes Ltd.
LOCATION: 77-79 High Street
D.C. CTTE: 1 July 2002
REMARKS: Deferred to publicise revised plans
RECOMMENDATION: **Deferral**
Case Officer: John Grayson 01799 510455
Expiry Date: 21 May

1) UTT/0228/02/FUL & 2) UTT/0229/02/CA - STEBBING
(Revised Report referred at Officers' Discretion)

- 1) Erection of one replacement dwelling.
 - 2) Demolition of existing dwelling.
- Dorval, High Street, GR/TL 660-243. Mr E R Butler
Case Officer: Richard Aston 01799 510464
Expiry Date: 11/04/2002

NOTATION: ADP & DLP: Within Development Limits, Settlement Boundaries and Conservation Area.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is a wide fronted plot of some 700 sq m facing the High Street at the northern end of the Conservation Area, about 60m south of the primary school. It is occupied by an undistinguished brick and pantile chalet bungalow built in 1967. There were two sizeable Lime trees on the northern boundary with Brick House, but one was felled recently following a misunderstanding with the Council. Immediately to the south of the site is Hillside House, a pair of listed seventeenth century cottages with twentieth century pargetting. There are other Grade II listed houses opposite.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: This revised proposal details the demolition of the existing property and its replacement with a single dwelling of two-storeys and five bedrooms of render, plain tiles and slate. The proposal has been amended again following the comments made by members at the DC & L Committee meeting on the 10 June 2002. The height of the dwelling has been reduced further from 8.2m to 7.5m so that its height would be 0.23m below the neighbouring property of Hillside House. Furthermore the proposed garage has been re-sited following Members' comments and would now be located on the opposite side of the site to the rear of the proposed dwelling.

APPLICANT'S CASE: Further to the refusal of permission for a second dwelling last year, a revised application taking on board comments made by the LPA for a single replacement dwelling on the site is now being made on the lines of the previously proposed Plot 1. The development proposed would improve the appearance of the Conservation Area. Through the use of traditional detailing, consideration has been given to ensure the amenity of the adjacent properties is not adversely affected. The application has since been amended again taking into account comments made by members at the DC & L Committee meeting on 10 June 2002.

RELEVANT HISTORY: The chalet bungalow on the site was built under a permission given in 1966. An application for the erection of one replacement dwelling and one new dwelling was refused in November 2001, contrary to Officers' recommendation, following a Members' site visit.

CONSULTATIONS: Design Advice: No design objections subject to conditions relating materials and design requirements.

Environment Agency: Makes advisory comments relating to surface water drainage.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: Original Plans: Objects on the grounds that the proposed building would be too large for the site, the dormer windows would not enhance the appearance of the Conservation Area and would be generally out of keeping. The garage wall replacing the current boundary would affect the setting of the adjacent Listed Building and the garage access would be unsightly.

Revised Plans: To be reported (due 19 July).

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised and five representations have been received regarding the original plans. Period expired 14 March.

1. CPRE Essex: Objects on the grounds that it does not conform to UDP Policies DC1, DC2 and DC5a and would have an adverse effect on the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Listed Building. The proposal would remove the attractive view of the village and overall sense of spaciousness when approaching the village from Bran End.

2. Stebbing Society: Objects because the proposal would be out of keeping and would appear obtrusive.

3-5. Local residents: Object. The points made in these representations are: [a] the proposal would overdevelop or over intensify the use of the site; [b] the 'end-on' building would block views of Brick Cottage and the listed building at Hillside House; [c] the style of the buildings proposed is incongruous; [d] the proposal involves the removal of a fir tree on the southern edge of the site next to Hillside House; [e] the proposal involves the retention of two lime trees on the northern edge of the site, which are dangerous; [f] the construction of buildings on the northern edge would affect the garden of Brick Cottage.

Revised Plans: To be reported (due 19 July).

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether the proposal:

- 1) is of a good standard of design which would preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area (ADP Policies DC2 & DC7 and DLP Policy ENV1),**
- 2) would cause a material loss of amenity to occupiers of the immediately adjoining houses (ADP Policy DC14 and DLP Policy GEN4) and**
- 3) would adversely affect the setting of adjacent Listed Buildings (ADP Policy DC5 and DLP Policy ENV2).**

1) The building would have pitched roofs with clay tiles, rendered and weather boarded walls, windows/doors, and external decoration which meet the detailed requirements of the policy on development in Conservation Areas. The issues, which are raised by objectors principally, relate to the volume of the building and its position in relation to surrounding properties. This particular section of High Street is characterised by older buildings, many of them listed, close to the highway, some of them 'end-on' [including Honeysuckle Cottage opposite], some facing it. Other houses, more recently built, are set well back from the frontage. It is, therefore, considered that the new dwelling would enhance the character of the Conservation Area. The application has also been revised after it was noted that the height of the dwelling originally shown would be some 3m higher than the adjacent ridge height of Hillside Cottage. Subsequently after taking into account Members' comments, the plans have been amended further so that the height of the building would now be 0.23 below the level of Hillside House. In addition, the proposals meet the District Plan requirements for amenity space and parking.

2) The revised proposal involves retaining the existing driveway and relocating the garage to the rear of the property with access along the northern boundary. It provides for turning space within the site, so that unlike the present situation, vehicles can readily enter and leave in forward gear. There would be no additional traffic from one replacement house. The revised siting of the building on the plot and its relationship with surrounding buildings would mean that there would be no adverse loss of light, privacy, overshadowing for adjoining occupiers. Although the proposal shows the inclusion of a first-floor window in both of the side elevations, these can be conditioned to be obscure glazed to prevent any overlooking of adjacent properties.

3) After negotiations, the application has been revised so that the height of the new building would be 0.23m below the ridge height of Hillside House. The original position of the double garage has been relocated on the opposite side of the site, away from Hillside

House. Accordingly, the proposal would have no adverse impact on the character or setting of the adjacent listed building of Hillside House.

CONCLUSION: The proposal involves the removal of an unremarkable chalet bungalow on the edge of the Conservation Area. The design and materials of the proposed new house would preserve and enhance the character of the area, and would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers. The proposal would not have an adverse impact on traffic generation nor create a traffic hazard. The Officers' negotiations have produced an acceptable scheme.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) UTT/0228/02/FUL - APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.2. To be implemented in accordance with revised plans.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
5. C.6.2. Excluding all rights of Permitted Development without further permission.
6. C.5.2. Details of materials to be submitted and agreed, including roofs to be of hand-made plain clay tiles, walls to be of smooth render, bricks to be soft clay and garage roof to be natural slate.
7. C.7.1. Details of external ground and internal floor levels.
8. No development shall take place until details of the side windows in the dwelling hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The windows shall be fitted with obscure glazing in accordance with the approved details and their design and materials shall not subsequently be changed without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.
Reason: In order to protect and enhance the visual character of this part of the Conservation Area, and to prevent overlooking of adjoining properties.
9. All external joinery to be painted timber.
Reason: In order to protect the visual character of this part of the Conservation Area.
10. C.11.7. Standard parking requirements.
11. C.23. Demolition of existing dwelling.

2) UTT/0229/02/CA – CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT WITH CONDITION

All the buildings on the site shall be demolished and all the materials arising from the demolition shall be completely removed from the site before the development hereby permitted is occupied.

Reason: In order to protect the visual character of this part of the Conservation Area.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0421/02/FUL – STEBBING

Erection of replacement two-storey dwelling and triple garage
Longcroft, Whitehouse Road. GR/TL 666-243 Shire Hall Homes Ltd
Case Officer: Michael Ovenden 01799 510476
Expiry Date: 21/05/2002

NOTATION: ADP & DLP: Outside Development Limit/Settlement Boundary.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is located along Whitehouse Road in open countryside 2km (1 mile) east of the village, about 270m from its junction with Warehouse Road. The plot measures 2 ha (5 acres), mostly laid to grass, with an established hedgerow along the east, south and west boundaries. Currently on the site is a former bungalow (16m long, 9m wide and 5.8m high), with three south-facing dormers and two north-facing rooflights. This is sited close to the northern boundary and immediately to the west is a double garage.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: The proposal is to demolish the dwelling and garage and erection a two-storey H-plan form dwelling in a more central position on the site. A triple garage would be erected on the site of the existing bungalow. The new dwelling would be 17m long, 11.5m wide and 7.7m high. It would have dining room, utility room, kitchen, hall, living room, study and drawing room on the ground floor with 5 bedrooms, 2 en-suites and 1 bathroom on the first floor. The new dwelling would be about 8m from the existing property. A double garage and store would straddle the position of the existing dwelling and garage.

APPLICANT'S CASE: Early sketch plans detailed a house of large size with both attached garaging, extended living accommodation and further single storey projections to the South East facing elevation. Preliminary Officer-level advice suggested reducing the footprint of the building by approximately 25%. This has been achieved by proposing a detached garage divorced from the main house together with the removal of the Sun Room to the garden facing elevation. Application drawings attempted to accommodate adverse representations made prior to submission of plans and now detail a house of traditional H shaped plan surfaced in a selection of native vernacular materials. Currently, view into the South West aspect of the site are exposed and it is proposed to extend existing hedgerow planting with new native specimens to all boundaries. My clients purchased the existing property for the purposes of redevelopment as structural failing in the existing building rendered it un-mortgageable.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Permission for retention of works of reconstruction and extending dwelling 1986; permission for double garage 1987; permission for three dormer windows 1997.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: Original Plans: Object on the basis that it is quite considerably larger than the existing property and will have a major visual impact in a rural setting.

Revised Plans: To be reported (due 5 July).

REPRESENTATIONS: Original Plans: One.

Stebbing Society: The present proposal is at right angles to the road and faces south, presenting its least likely aspect. Any design of a replacement dwelling should, both in bulk, height and design, reflect the rural character of the setting. The proposed design clearly does not do so.

Revised Plans: Any received will be reported (due 5 July).

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issue is whether the proposal complies with ADP Policy H8 on replacement dwellings (DLP Policy H6).

The first part of the policy requires replacement dwellings to be in proximity to the original structure (which it is) and to be in scale with neighbouring properties. There are no properties that could be described as neighbouring. Outside development limits, as is the case here, larger dwellings that through their size or appearance impair the rural characteristics of the countryside will not be permitted. The deposit plan policy requires the proposal not just to not impair the countryside but through its location, appearance and associated scheme of landscaping to protect or enhance the character of the countryside.

Whilst the larger dwelling in a slightly different location would change the appearance of the site, the revised proposal would not change the character of the countryside, in other words would succeed in at least protecting the character of the countryside in which it is set. With regard to landscaping, a new hedge is proposed along the northern boundary. This together with supplementary landscaping, all to be required by condition, would succeed in protecting the character of the countryside.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The proposal has been negotiated and whilst larger than the existing dwelling, it is considered to protect the character of the area.

CONCLUSIONS: The revised proposal complies with Development Plan Policy.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

1. C.2.1. Standard time limit.
2. C.3.2. To be implemented in accordance with revised plans except in relation to condition 8 below.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
5. C.5.5. Clay plain tiles.
6. C.6.2. Excluding all rights of Permitted Development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse without further permission.
7. C.8.27. Drainage Details to be submitted and agreed.
8. C.17.1. Revised plan required re design of garage roof.
9. C.23. Demolition of existing dwelling.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0555/02/FUL – ELMDON

Erection of replacement dwelling and garage.
White Friars Cottage, Duddenhoe End. GR/TL 457-362 Pelham Structures Limited
Case Officer: Charmain Harbour 01799 510458
Expiry Date: 10/06/2002

NOTATION: ADP: Outside Development Limits/Within an Area of Special Landscape Value.
DLP: Outside Settlement Boundary.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is located in open countryside south of the village. It is accessed via a private driveway which serves White Friars Farm. The farm itself consists of a main farmhouse with out buildings to the east. The site is currently occupied by White Friars Cottage, a single-storey dwelling with rooms in the roof. It is located to the north of the farmhouse and is unoccupied and boarded up.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: The application is for the construction of a replacement dwelling which would be located just north of the existing. A two-storey dwelling is proposed with a footprint of about 130sq.m compared to the existing of 75sq.m. The dwelling would have an access leading off the private drive using the existing entrance. A double cart-lodge style garage is proposed to the south-west of the dwelling. The garage would measure 6m square with an additional 2m side store. It would measure 5.89m high to the ridge and the roof would be clad in clay tiles. The house would be constructed with a cellar and two floors of accommodation with part of the second floor being incorporated in the roof space. It would have four bedrooms. The main windows would be to the north and western elevations and to the eastern side a single-storey sunroom is proposed. The design of the unit is a modern production of a timber framed jetted house with a rendered external finish, but the fenestration is of a modern design. The dwelling would be have a 50m rear garden to the north.

APPLICANT'S CASE: See supporting letter from Pelham Structures dated 2 April 2002 attached to end of report.

CONSULTATIONS: The Environment Agency: No objections but make advisory comments.

Building Services: No adverse comments with regard to fire access. They note there is no mains drainage in Duddenhoe End so the property would have to be served by a different means of drainage than as specified on the forms.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: They draw to the local authority's attention that there is no mains drainage here. They consider that the height of the structure is too large, and that with the roof space four floors of accommodation would be created. They consider the scale should be restricted to one and half storeys.

REPRESENTATIONS: One. Notification period expired 7 May 2002
Concerned that the cottage has to be demolished as it dates from the 18th Century and was the original farm; the plans are seeking to conceal use of the roof space which can easily be accessed by a continuation of the main stairs to form additional living space. This would transform the dwelling from a three to a five-bed unit and the scale is considered to be excessive with a ridge height similar to that on White Friars Farm, which is out of keeping with the contour of the land.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether:

- 1) **the replacement dwelling would be in accordance with the Development Plan and in scale with the neighbouring properties or, by virtue of its size, it would impair the rural character of the countryside (ADP Policy H8 and DLP Policy H6),**
- 2) **the design of the unit would be acceptable (ADP Policy DC1 and DLP Policy GEN2) and**
- 3) **the issue of drainage for the site would be satisfactory.**

1) Given its location away from the main settlement, the property has only the main farmstead and an adjacent barn to relate to. The scheme as originally submitted proposed a dwelling with a roof scape in line with the main farmstead. This has now been revised to be over 1m lower than the main farm building and to drop the eaves height. It is considered that this lower ridge height would be visually better. The formation of rooms in the roof space does not normally require planning permission and it is acknowledged as part of the original design this would have been easy to achieve. The roof has therefore been lowered so that the rooms at first-floor level are in the roof area with dormer windows being included in the revised design. This would still create a loft area, but of far lesser proportions and more likely to be used for storage than habitable space given the limited headroom. Being thus reduced the revised overall scale of the unit is considered to respect its surroundings.

2) The design of the unit follows the local vernacular tradition in using a timber-framed unit, but introduces some modern elements to make it of its time. It is considered to be an acceptable design for the location. None of the adjacent buildings surrounding the site are listed as being of special architectural or historic interest.

3) The drainage of the site will be primarily addressed at the Building Regulation stage. The applicant has been made aware that mains drainage is not available here and a condition can be imposed requiring approval of details.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The existing cottage has been assessed by the Conservation Officer and is not considered to be of listable quality. The concerns regarding the height and scale of the development have been addressed in the revisions to the scheme. It is proposed to remove Permitted Development rights to control any extensions to the property. The Parish Council's comments are noted, but this dwelling would only have three floors: basement, ground and first (in the roof space).

CONCLUSIONS: The revised scheme is considered to meet the policy requirements and the design and form of the new dwelling are considered to be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.2. To be implemented in accordance with revised plans.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
5. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted and agreed.
6. C.5.5. Clay plain tiles
7. C.5.11. Smooth rendered walls
8. C.5.9. Stained wood
9. C.6.2. Excluding all rights of Permitted Development within the curtilage of a dwelling house without further permission.
10. C.8.27. Drainage details to be submitted and agreed.
11. C.23. Demolition of existing dwelling.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0778/02/FUL - GREAT SAMPFORD

Demolition of existing cottages. Erection of two-storey replacement dwelling and detached garage.

Land at Moor End Cottages, Moor End. GR/TL 638-359. Mr J Curtis.

Case Officer: Charmain Harbour 01799 510458

Expiry Date: 17/07/2002

NOTATION: ADP: Outside Development Limits/Within Area of Special Landscape Value.
DLP: Outside Settlement Boundary.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is located on the north western edge of the village on the northern side of the B1053 road to Radwinter at Moor End. The site is currently occupied by a pair of semi-detached brick cottages, which date from the post-war period and forms the first dwellings entering the village from the north-west on this side of the road. The cottages are set back from the road on an embankment. The plot runs west parallel to the road and tapers to a point. To the road frontage it is enclosed by a hedge on top of the bank. To the north are open fields.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: The application is for the demolition of both properties and their replacement with a single detached dwelling. The footprint of the new house would be west of the existing and it would be a two-storey property with four bedrooms and a similar ridge height to the existing. It would have a rendered finish with plain roof tiles and the proposed volume of the unit would be 650 m³ compared to the volume of the existing of c700m³. Vehicular access would be via the existing and one of the driveways which runs on top of the bank. A detached garage is proposed with on-site turning facility.

APPLICANT'S CASE: See letter dated 17 May 2002 from John Martin and Associates attached at end of report.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Outline planning permission was allowed on appeal for one dwelling on the adjacent site to the east (edged in blue on the submitted plans) in January 2002. The Inspector held that an infill dwelling on this adjacent site would not be contrary to Policy H6 and would not harm the character or appearance of the surrounding countryside.

CONSULTATIONS: Essex County Council Archaeology: The site lies next to a Late Prehistoric and Roman site therefore it is recommended any ground works should be monitored so that any archaeological deposits can be recorded prior to destruction.
Environment Agency: No objections only advisory comments.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: None received (expiry date 21 June 2002).

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised as likely to affect the setting of a Listed Building and 1 representation has been received. Period expired 20 June 2002.

CPRE Essex: Do not object in principle to the scheme but raise concerns that the siting will not overlap the existing footprint, but open up the space between the site and the existing neighbouring property to the east, which would impair the visual characteristics of Moor End by removing the relationship between the dwellings at the entrance to the village.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether:

- 1) the proposal would accord with the replacement dwelling criteria, i.e. that the proposals are in scale and do not impair the character of the area (ADP Policy H8 and DLP Policy H6),
- 2) the proposal would have a satisfactory relationship with the adjacent Listed Building to the east (ADP Policy DC1 and DLP Policy GEN2), and
- 3) the potential impact of the proposal on the locality would be acceptable (ADP Policy C2 and DLP Policy GEN 8).

1) The proposed dwelling would be the same height as the existing dwellings on the site and is not considered to be out of scale with the locality. The location within the site has regard to the outline permission on the adjacent land to the east and is in close proximity of the footprint of the units to be demolished. The design of the replacement unit is considered to be in character with the locality.

2) The new dwelling would be located over 35 m from the Listed Building and is located following a similar building line to the Listed cottage. It would not adversely affect the setting of this building.

3) The replacement dwelling would relate to the existing settlement of Moor End and would mark the outward extent of development on this side of the road. The siting and form of the dwelling is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the surrounding countryside.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The CPREssex concerns focus on the positioning of the units the west of the existing dwellings which they consider would not relate well to the existing settlement. However this view does not have regard to the infill dwelling allowed on appeal to the south-east, which would in effect fill in the gap thus created. The siting of the unit is therefore not considered to harm the settlement pattern for the locality.

CONCLUSION: The proposal is considered to accord with the Development Plan Policies and is not considered to adversely affect the surrounding area.

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.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
6. C.4.5. Retention of hedges.
7. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted and agreed.
8. C.16.1. Watching archaeological brief.
9. C.6.2. Excluding all rights of Permitted Development within the curtilage of a dwelling house without further permission.
10. C.6.7. Excluding conversion of garages.
11. C.11.2. Standard parking requirements.
12. C.19.1. Avoidance of overlooking.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0360/02/OP - GREAT DUNMOW

Outline application for erection of 6 dwellings and means of access and retention of two existing bungalows.

22 - 24 Ongar Road. GR/TL 631-210. Hutton Homes Ltd.

Case Officer: *Richard Aston 01799 510464*

Expiry Date: 26/04/2002

NOTATION: ADP & DLP: Within Development Limits/Part of committed Residential Site.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: This site of 0.34ha (0.85 acres) fronts onto Ongar Road (B184), towards the southern edge of Great Dunmow. Two inter-war bungalows with gardens approximately 95m long currently occupy the site, which abuts the entrance road to the Ongar Road Industrial Estate.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: The original scheme was for 8 dwellings. This revised proposal now seeks outline permission for the redevelopment of the site for 6 dwellings. The applicants seek determination at this stage for the means of access and the number of units only. A full 'Reserved Matters' application to include details of the siting, external appearance, design and landscaping would be submitted at a later date.

APPLICANT'S CASE: Proposal has been negotiated several times with the local planning authority and the site is considered suitable for residential development in line with the Adopted District Plan.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Outline application for erection of 5 detached dwellings and garages, refused 1994 on backland and access grounds. Outline application for three detached dwellings, approved 1994 (not implemented).

CONSULTATIONS: UDC Policy- Proposal is broadly consistent with Local and Structure Plan policies. The site is within the settlement boundary and in principal residential use is acceptable subject to design it is recommended that approval be given.

Environment Agency & Anglian Water: Details of foul and surface water drainage required.

Environmental Services: No objections subject to suitable access.

ECC Highways: No objections to the revised proposal. The access should be formed and constructed by way of a dropped kerb layout as shown in green on submitted plan. The private drive should be surfaced so as to avoid the 'tracking out' of materials onto the adjoining public highway. There should also be no obstruction above a height of 600mm above the level of the adjoining carriageway within a 2.4m x site boundary visibility splay on either side of the proposed access road. Access road not suitable for adoption.

TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS: Original Plan: Objects on the grounds that the proposal is over-development of the site and there would be too many accesses onto Ongar Road.

Revised Plans: To be reported (due 19 July).

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised and ten representations have been received regarding the Original Plans. Period expired 4 April 2002.

1. Any access onto Ongar Road should be via the Lukins Mead estate road onto the new roundabout. Over-development will lead to an increase in traffic congestion at peak times with the risk of accidents also being increased at any proposed entrance. Adverse effect on my own and surrounding properties and will also effect the privacy and enjoyment of our gardens along with obstruction of light and increased noise levels.
2. Noise during and after. Safety of property will then have road backing on to my garden. Invasion of privacy houses will overlook my house. Increased traffic.
3. I believe that there already exists a dangerous element in this area due to the road into the Industrial Estate which is directly opposite my house, this is due to extremely large

lorries and coaches entering and existing to say nothing about the smaller vehicles that come and go.

4. Don't let it be forgotten that within the last few months you have given permission for three further industrial units to be erected on the industrial estate which will generate their own additional traffic.

5-10. Similar comments to above.

Revised Plans: To be reported (due 19 July).

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether

- 1) the site is suitable for residential development (ERSP Policies BE1 & H3, ADP Policies S1 & H10 and DLP Policies S1, GEN1, H1 and H3) and**
- 2) the access would be acceptable (ERSP T8, ADP Policy T1 and DLP Policy T4).**

1) The site is within the Development Limits of Great Dunmow and is generally in line with advice given in PPG3: Housing, as the site is within an existing urban area and its redevelopment would maximise the use of a previously developed site with good access to public transport and other facilities. However, the scheme does not meet PPG 3 requirements in relation to density of development. The number of dwellings has been reduced from 8 to 6 to overcome Highway's original objections and to meet the requirements of the County Council in relation to access. This means that the density would now be reduced to 20 dwellings per hectare which falls short of the PPG target. However, other development along the Ongar Road is low density in character and therefore on balance the revised proposal for 6 dwellings is acceptable. The proposal for residential use would therefore be acceptable in this location, subject to the exact siting, design, external appearance and landscaping being approved under a 'Reserved Matters' application.

Turning to the potential impact that an intensified residential use may have on the visual and residential amenity of surrounding occupiers, the scheme includes the retention of the two existing inter-war bungalows, which would preserve the existing street scene, and proposes the access as being shared surface, therefore giving the impression of a private driveway between the two properties further reducing any potential visual impact. Furthermore, the new Deposit Local Plan seeks to retain the adjacent Ongar Road Industrial Estate for employment and it is now considered that any new development permitted on this applicant site could be designed in such a way so as to minimise any potential disturbance to occupiers.

2) Although the comments relating to the problems that a new access on Ongar Road would cause, have been taken into account, there are no objections from the County Council for this type of access subject to no obstructions to visibility and the satisfactory surfacing of the access. It is considered that the traffic created as a result of residential development in this area would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The comments of both the Town Council and local residents have been taken into account. However, it is considered that a new access in this form off Ongar Road would not affect public safety and accordingly there are no objections from EC Highways to the proposed access route. In addition the two inter-war bungalows have been retained protecting the existing street scene.

CONCLUSIONS: The site is considered acceptable for residential development in accordance with National Planning Policy Guidance and Structure, District and Emerging Local Plan Policies subject to an application for the siting, design, external appearance and

landscaping (Reserved Matters) being submitted at a later stage but no longer than three years from the date of consent.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

1. C.1.1. Submission of reserved matters.
2. C.1.2. Submission of reserved matters.
3. C.1.3. Time limit for submission of reserved matters.
4. C.1.4. Time Limit for commencement of development.
5. Six new dwellings only.
6. C.8.27.Details of drainage to be submitted and approved.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0884/02/OP - GREAT DUNMOW

Outline application for erection of 14 two-bedroom flats.
83 High Street. GR/TL 629-216. Exors of Late Mrs D M Harris.
Case Officer: John Grayson 01799 510455
Expiry Date: 02/08/2002

NOTATION: ADP & DLP: Within Development Limits, Settlement Boundaries and Town Centre Development Opportunity Site (ADP only)/Outside Principal Shopping Frontage (ADP only).

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is located on the northern corner of the junction of the High Street/Chelmsford Road and Braintree Road. It forms a derelict builder's yard and empty dwelling house, measuring 0.1ha (0.27 acres). To the north lies the town centre with two and three-storey buildings in commercial use, to the east a 3-storey elderly persons' home, on the opposite side of Braintree Road to the south is a modern 3-storey office block (Melville House) and on the opposite side of the High Street are 2-storey dwellings.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: It is proposed to residentially redevelop the site with 14 two-bedroomed flats. The indicative plans show that there would be a predominantly 3-storey building, with the top floor within the roof space, and a 2-storey element at the northern end (towards the town centre) where it abuts an existing 2-storey building. It would curve round following the frontage, similar to the offices opposite. A private amenity area with 25sqm per flat would be provided at the rear. The indicative materials would be brick, render, weatherboarding and tiles. The means of access is the only detail for approval at this outline stage, and this would be at the northern end to the High Street serving a car park with 21 spaces.

APPLICANT'S CASE: See supporting statement attached at end of report.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Builder's yard (now derelict).

CONSULTATIONS: ECC Transportation : no objection subject to conditions requiring a Sec 106 Agreement to allow for a financial contribution towards traffic management measures and footway widening; pedestrian access from the rear only (or railings) and widened access to the High Street.

ECC Learning Services: no objection subject to Section 106 Agreement to allow for a financial contribution towards educational provision in the town.

Environment Agency: informative notes only.

Anglian Water: No objections subject to condition.

UDC Environmental Services: Hives would need to reverse in which could be dangerous off this busy road. Car park surface should be able to take 26 tones for refuse collection.

TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS: To be reported (due 11 July).

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised and 3 representations have been received. Period expired 11 July.

1. Proposed building is too large for the site and too close to the pavement. Although in keeping with Melville House (opposite) it would have an overpowering effect on the area. Concern about vehicular access to site of the high street, where traffic already becomes congested at peak times.
2. Complain about the application to knock down 83 High Street, Great Dunmow. This building is nearly 100 year old. Knocking these barns down and converting the area is a good idea but its not good to demolish 83 High St. Leave our history alone the last twenty years the council have make huge mistakes with our heritage.

3. Object intensity of use; over-development very dominant structure especially when viewed from Braintree Rd. Concerned on highway grounds because the development would be constructed almost up to the pavement leaving no splay lines to see around the corner.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether the proposal would:

- 1) be in accord with the allocated land use for this site (ADP Policy GD5),**
- 2) enhance the character of the area and be a good neighbour (ADP Policy DC1 and DLP Policies GEN2 and GEN4) and**
- 3) meet the required standards relating to access, parking and amenity space (ADP Policies T1, T2 & DC1 and DLP Policies GEN1, GEN9 & GEN2).**

1) The site lies within the town centre on the ADP and Policy GD5 states that shops, offices, suitable commercial uses and appropriate residential development including flats, supported by adequate off-street parking, will be permitted. New building should respect the surrounding scale and character and be comprehensive where possible. However, the site does not fall within the town centre in the DLP and it is considered that it is too far from the principal shopping frontage to insist on retailing. Whilst some form of commercial office use would be appropriate, there is no reason in principle why residential should not be acceptable. The scale, character and comprehensive aspects are considered in 2) below.

2) The relevant Policies advise that the design should respect the scale, proportions, appearance and materials of buildings in the locality and the environmental characteristics of the setting. Although the application is in outline, indicative details have been submitted showing a 3-storey building curved to follow the footpath, with 14 two-bedroomed flats. The overall appearance, design, layout and materials indicate that this number of units could satisfactorily be accommodated on the site in keeping with the character of buildings in the vicinity. The redevelopment of this unattractive site is to be welcomed and would provide some smaller dwellings close to the town centre. The Policies also advise that standards relating to distance from neighbours should be agreed. Without full details, these aspects cannot be finalised, but it appears that the amenities of neighbours would not be unduly affected.

3) County Highways require minor amendments to the indicative layout and access arrangements, which can be accommodated without prejudice to the overall scheme. The requirement to avoid pedestrian access from the front would be better met with the railings option. The parking provision would be 150%, in line with Government advice for small units. The amount of private amenity space would meet the Council standard.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The concern of a neighbouring resident on the opposite side of the High Street is understood, but to reduce the eaves level would make the building too squat on this important site on the entrance to the town centre, and setting it back would affect other neighbouring properties to the rear as well as reducing the parking and amenity spaces. It would also be out of keeping with Melville House on the opposite side of Braintree Road. The existing dwelling is of no architectural, historic, or environmental interest and its replacement as proposed would enhance this semi-derelict part of the town. The visibility has been considered by County Highways who have required a minor set-back.

CONCLUSION: The residential redevelopment of this site would be in accordance in principle with Development Plan Policies. A Section 106 Agreement will be needed to facilitate the financial contributions the Country Council require for highway works and education.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS and SECTION 106 AGREEMENT

1. C.1.1. Submission of reserved matters.
2. C.1.2. Submission of reserved matters.
3. C.1.3. Time limit for submission of reserved matters.
4. C.1.4. Time limit for commencement of development.
5. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plan except as required by conditions below.
6. C.4.1. Scheme of floorscaping to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
7. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted and agreed.
8. C.5.5. Clay Plain tiles.
9. C.5.9. Stained wood.
10. C.5.11. Smooth rendered walls.
11. C.5.14. Black rainwater goods.
12. The bricks to be used in the construction of this building shall be high quality Essex Reds or Cambridge Yellow Gaulds.
Reason: To ensure the development is in keeping with the character of the area.
13. C.7.1. Slab levels to be submitted and agreed.
14. C.8.27. Drainage details to be submitted and agreed.
15. The footway in front of the site shall be widened to a minimum width of 2m before the first flat is occupied.
Reason: To provide safe pedestrian passage around this junction.
16. All the pedestrian accesses to the flats hereby approved shall either be from the rear, or railings shall be erected along the back line of the widened footway without gaps.
Reason: To avoid short-term parking near this junction in the interests of highway safety.
17. C.10.5. The access shown on the plan hereby approved shall be widened as shown before the first flat is occupied.
Reason: To provide safe entry and exit from the car park.
18. C.10.7. Standard visibility splays.
19. C.11.2. Standard parking requirements.
20. C.12.1. Boundary screening requirements, including railings to frontage.
21. C.16.1. Watching archaeological brief.
22. C.23. Demolition of existing dwelling.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0722/02/FUL - SAFFRON WALDEN

Change of use from design studio and office use to residential with part office use.
The Old Control Tower, Little Walden Airfield. GR/TL 558-433. Catherine Markey.
Case Officer: Charmain Harbour 01799 510458
Expiry Date: 16/07/2002

NOTATION: ADP: Outside Development Limits / Within Area of Special Landscape Value.
DLP: Outside Settlement Boundaries.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is located on the eastern side of the B1052 between Hadstock and Little Walden on the open plateau area north of Little Walden which served as Station 165 for the US 9th Air Force comprising the 409th Bomb Group in World War II. The airfield was closed in 1946 and the main road follows the line of the former runway. The site includes the former airfield control tower, a two-storey flat-roofed building with an external viewing platform set in a fenced compound, which has vehicular access from the main road via a driveway. There is parking within the compound. An additional single-storey wooden barn structure, which is not included in the application site is located to the south of the site and shares the vehicular access. The site is screened on three sides by a belt of conifers and is in an isolated location with mainly commercial and agricultural uses close by. The nearest residential units are located to the south of the site at Monks Hall. To the south-east lies Nunns Wood SSSI.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: Permission is sought for change of use of the Old Control Tower to a residential premises with an ancillary drawing office for one of the occupiers landscape and garden design practice. The building was last occupied as an architectural design studio with no residential use. The proposal would create a four bedroom dwelling with the principal living space on the first floor to take advantage of the views and three of the bedrooms on the ground floor adjacent to the commercial use. The proposal would include some alterations to the elevations including the enlargement of the windows to the ground floor on the front elevation and the formation of a new doorway to the southern side elevation to serve the commercial area.

All the parking will be within the security compound where a hard surfaced area could accommodate at least six vehicles. The existing conifer hedging to the site is to be replaced with a beech/laurel hedge. A new septic tank would be provided within the grounds of the property as part of the drainage for the site.

APPLICANT'S CASE: See letter dated 17 April attached at end report.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Permission was granted from use as Control Tower to design studio and offices in 1983. Removal of a condition which tied the use to a specific company approved in December 2001. Members may recall an application was submitted for conversion of the unit into residential use with a drawing office in April this year, but the proposals were deferred to resolve some issues with English Nature. That application has now been withdrawn as the site has been sold to the current applicant.

CONSULTATIONS: Environment Agency: No objections. They advise that the applicant should ensure that the existing sewage treatment plant has a consent to discharge is obtained.

English Nature: No objections. A member of the Essex Bat Group has visited the site and confirmed that there is no evidence of bats present so no protected species will be affected by the proposals. The sewage disposal arrangements are not considered to adversely affect Nunns Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest.

Defence Estates: No safeguarding objections to the proposal

TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS: To be reported (due 20 June).

REPRESENTATIONS: None. Notification period expired 13 June.

Under the provisions of the previous application the CPREssex had asked for the building to be Listed and the building has been put forward to the Department of Culture Media and Sport for listing. They have declined to spot list it, but it is being considered as part of the on-going thematic listing process of aviation related buildings nationally. The building contains a number of plaques relating to its wartime service and it is proposed condition the retention and display of these within the building as part of the current application.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether:

- 1) the conversion of this property into a mixed use accords with the Development Plan given it is an isolated location (ERSP Policies H3 & C5; ADP Policies S2 & C6 and DLP Policy H5),
- 2) the character and appearance of the structure, which is of local historic interest, would be harmed by the proposals (ADP Policy DC1 and DLP Policy GEN2) and
- 3) the proposals would have a detrimental effect on the locality (ADP Policy C2 and DLP Policy GEN8).

1) The building was last used as a commercial unit with around 1,870 sq ft of office/design studio floor space. The proposal does not involve any increase in the floor area and the majority of the floor space would be used for the single dwelling, so the overall use of the property is likely to be less intensive. The site is within a rural area and the tests of ADP Policy C6 and DLP Policy H5 can be applied. The building is in a sound structural condition and is of local historic interest, even if not listed as being of National importance to justify its reuse in such a location.

The site has been the subject of a suspected arson attack in the past so the dual use would mean a presence on the site on a 24 hour basis thereby improving the security here. The proposal accommodates adequate on site parking and a private amenity area, thereby creating an acceptable form of residential development.

2) The drawing office use of part of the building retains some public access and affords an area to display the memorabilia associated with its former use. The external alterations to enlarge the windows would be carried out using metal windows to match the style on the existing building. Internally there is evidence to suggest these windows may have originally been of the size proposed. The new external doors will also be of a style to match the windows. Internally the alterations are not considered to significantly alter the building to harm its character.

3) The proposal would reuse an existing building and retain what is a local landmark structure. The mixed activity is not considered to be an over-intensive use of the site. It is proposed to secure details of any external lighting to protect the rural character of the area. It is also proposed to link the two uses to ensure the amenities of the future occupiers of the residential part are protected.

CONCLUSION: The proposal is considered to broadly accord with Development Plan policies and would not adversely affect the appearance of the building or the surrounding area.

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.
3. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
4. C.5.3. Matching materials.
5. C.5.17. Window and door details and sections to be submitted and agreed.
6. C.6.2. Excluding all rights of permitted development within the curtilage of a dwelling house without further permission.
7. Details shall be submitted in writing and agreed in writing with the local planning authority of the location of the commemorative plaques relating to the wartime use of the site. The plaques shall subsequently retained on the site and shall not be removed unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
Reason: To ensure these features are retained within the building.
8. The design studio hereby permitted as part of this consent shall remain as an ancillary use controlled by the occupiers of the dwelling unit on the site and at no time shall this form a separate or independent use from the dwelling unit unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the local planning authority. To prevent over intensive use of the site and ensure the residential amenities of the future occupiers of the residential unit are fully safeguard.
9. Details of any external lighting to the building or the adjacent compound are shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The lighting shall be implemented solely in accordance with the agreed details.
Reason: To secure the amenities of the surrounding rural area from light pollution and protecting the character of the building.
10. The use of the building hereby permitted shall be as a dwelling together with a design studio (Class B1 (a)). There shall no change to any other use within Class B1 without prior written consent of the local planning authority.
Reason: To retain control over the use of the site in the interests of protecting the amenities of the area, the integrity and character of the building and the amenities of future occupiers of the residential unit.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0750/02/DFO - STEBBING

Erection of two-storey dwelling and detached double garage. Relocation of access.
Land adj. Elmcroft, Bran End. GR/TL 656-251. Messrs Stile & Hammond.

Case Officer: *Richard Aston 01799 510464*

Expiry Date: 10/07/2002

NOTATION: ADP & DLP: Outside Development Limits and Settlement Boundaries/Within Area of Special Landscape Value (ADP only)/Special Verge (DLP only).

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is located on the north-eastern side of Pulford Place, the road between the two adjacent settlements of Bran End and Stebbing. It forms part of the garden to Elmcroft, a two-storey house at the junction with Brick Kiln Lane. The plot measures an average of 19m frontage to the Lane and a length of 57m. It has some residential outbuildings towards the road frontage, including a garage and the site is well screened.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: It is proposed to erect a two-storey four-bedroomed dwelling on the northern side of the existing property. It would be constructed of rendered walls and weatherboarding on a brick plinth with a plain tiled roof. The dwelling would be sited half way down the plot, almost clear of the dwellings on the other side of the Lane, and a double garage erected in front to replace the existing outbuildings. A new access would be created to Brick Kiln Lane to serve both properties, to replace the existing access further down the Lane. No provision is made to replace garaging for the existing property.

RELEVANT HISTORY: One dwelling allowed on appeal in outline in 1986 and renewed thereafter (still extant).

CONSULTATIONS: ECC Transportation: No objections subject to informative note.
Environment Agency: No objections subject to informative notes.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: No objections subject to retention of hedge.

REPRESENTATIONS: One. Notification period expired 16 June.
Brick Kiln Lane is, at present, relatively unspoilt. A dwelling of this appearance and size would be totally out of keeping and a blot on the landscape. The view from Bran End is both green and pleasant and would not benefit from further developments of any size. This end of the village has been developed more than enough with a variety of modern housing.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether the new dwelling would be acceptable in relation to:

- 1) **the location of the site outside Development Limits, the appearance of the village street scene and provision of amenity space (ADP Policies S1, S2 & DC1 and DLP Policies S7 & GEN2),**
- 2) **the effect on the existing and neighbouring properties (ADP Policies DC1 & DC14 and DLP Policy GEN4) and**
- 3) **the access and impact on the Special Verge (ADP Policy T1 and DLP Policies GEN1 & ENV7).**

1) The relevant Policies state that new dwellings will not normally be approved outside Development Limits. In this case outline permission for one new dwelling was allowed on appeal 17 years ago and has been kept alive by a series of renewals ever since. Therefore, the principle of developing this plot has been established. The design and scale of the new dwelling would be appropriate for this location. The rural character of the street scene would not be materially harmed as the dwelling would be set back on the plot. The double garage

would be sited in front of the dwelling, but it would replace existing outbuildings and should not be prominent if the frontage hedging is retained. There would be ample private garden to the rear to serve the needs of future residents.

2) The dwelling has been designed to avoid overlooking the existing dwelling to the south and those on the opposite side of Brick Kiln Lane to the north. However, it would be prominent from the front of the eastern-most dwelling opposite and should be set back by 5m to reduce the overbearing effect. The loss of garaging to the existing dwelling can be replaced elsewhere on its extensive plot.

3) The new access to Brick Kiln Lane would replace the existing one further down, so there would be no net loss of hedgerow (see the Parish Council's comments). The Special Verge is only to the frontage with Pulford Place which would be unaffected by this proposal. No further vehicular access to the existing property would be required.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The principle of a new house on this site has already been established on appeal. The size and design of the dwelling would be in scale with development in the area. Its siting should help to retain the outlook from existing properties. Brick Kiln Lane would benefit from relocating the access closer to Pulford Place and closing up the existing one. The proposal represents improvements on those approved.

CONCLUSION: The proposal accords with Development Plan Policies.

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.
3. C.17.2. No development shall take place until the following amendments have been incorporated into the design for the development hereby permitted and the permission shall be implemented in accordance with the amendments listed below
the dwelling hereby approved shall be set back 5m to the east.
Reason: To reduce the overbearing effect on residents in the dwelling opposite.
4. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
5. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
6. C.4.5. Retention of hedges.
7. The existing access marked E on the approved plan shall be closed within one month of the first residential occupation of the new dwelling hereby approved and filled with planting as part of the scheme required by condition 4 above.
Reason: To retain the rural character of Brick Kiln Lane.
8. The new access hereby approved shall be constructed and brought into use before the new dwelling hereby approved is first residentially occupied and it shall be taken to the southern boundary of the site to be available for access to Elmcroft.
Reason: To ensure that the existing access to Elmcroft is replaced in the interests of highway safety.
9. No new accesses shall be constructed along the frontage marked D - F on the approved plan.
Reason: To preserve the Special Verge as required by DLP Policy ENV7.
10. C.5.2. Details of materials to be submitted and agreed.
11. C.6.2. Excluding all rights of Permitted Development within the curtilage of a dwelling house without further permission.
12. C.7.1. Slab levels to be submitted and agreed.
13. C.11.5. Standard vehicle parking facilities.
14. C.12.3. Boundary screening requirements.
15. C.15.1. Superseding previous permission.
16. C.19.1. Avoidance of overlooking.

Background papers: see application file.

1) UTT/0698/02/FUL & 2) UTT/0699/02/LB - LITTLE SAMPFORD

- 1) Conversion of barns and buildings to dwelling and garage. Erection of link addition and wall.
- 2) Part demolition of modern buildings and part roof. Conversion of barns to form a dwelling. Erection of small link & walling. New roof to old piggery building and conversion to garaging. Spriggs Farm, Thaxted Road. GR/TL 624-330 A J & P A & M D Wisbey
Case Officer: Hilary Lock 01799 510486
Expiry Date: 02/07/2002

NOTATION: ADP & DLP: Outside Development Limits & Settlement Boundary; Within Area of Special Landscape Value (ADP only) and curtilage of Grade II Listed farmhouse.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is located on the north-western side of the B1051, approximately 1.5km (1 mile) northeast of Thaxted, and 2.5km (1.5 miles) southwest of Great Sampford. The site comprises a group of farm buildings and listed farmhouse.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: It is proposed to convert a timber barn into a two storey three/four bedroom house. A piggery would be converted to a treble garage, and part of the main barn would be converted to provide garaging and storage for the adjacent listed house. A walled courtyard would be created separate from the main farmyard, and a modest area of farmland to the rear of the barn would be used for turning of vehicles, and garden. The barn would be served by the existing farm access.

APPLICANT'S CASE: This is part of long-term scheme for diversification of number of barns on site. Proposed conversion would be served by existing farm access, separate from farmhouse, other buildings and yard. Barn is traditional and soundly constructed six bay building with projecting midstrey. Five bays would be converted and sixth retained as store for farmhouse. Two modern lean-tos to be removed to improve views of features of barn. Wall proposed to screen farmhouse from conversion. No overlooking or loss of privacy from windows. Adjacent piggery roof to be replaced with pitched roof more in keeping with barn and house. Piggery to be converted for parking. Scheme accords with Council policies.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Conversion of barns (southwest of application buildings) to Class B1 business unit and nursery school approved 2000 following a Members' Site Visit.

CONSULTATIONS: Design Advice: Barn is of 17th century origins and forms part of historic yard together with the listed Spriggs Farmhouse. It is of environmental value because of its architectural and historic merit and function it serves within farmyard. Proposal has been negotiated and its design has been intelligently resolved. The openings by and large would be accommodated between existing studs. The principle entry would be formed in the area of the now infilled great doors on the northwest elevation. The created vestibule would allow for borrowed light and ventilation, which in turn would minimise the need for additional windows on the external wall. Recommend approval subject to conditions.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: No response received (due 6 June).

REPRESENTATIONS: These applications have been advertised and no representations have been received. Period expired 2 July.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issue is whether the proposal would meet the criteria relating to the residential conversion of rural buildings (ERSP Policy RE2, ADP Policy C6 and DLP Policy H5).

The Policies require that the buildings are sound and enhance the character and appearance of the rural area through their historic, traditional or historic form. Design Advice is that this range of buildings would satisfy these criteria, and would be acceptable in terms of the impact on the listed farmhouse. The siting of the building would not give rise to any overlooking or loss of privacy of adjacent property, and would not conflict with the permitted commercial uses in adjacent buildings. The proximity to other settlements would not be regarded as remote for the purposes of Policy RE2.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposal would enhance the setting of the adjacent listed building and the rural character of the area.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) UTT/0698/02/FUL - APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

1. C.2.1. Time for commencement of development.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans except in relation to condition 8 below.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
- 4 C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
5. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted and agreed.
6. C.6.3. Excluding Permitted Development extensions and erection of freestanding buildings.
7. C.11.7. Standard Parking Requirement.
8. C.17.2. Detailed amendments to be incorporated into design.
9. C.8.27. Drainage details to be submitted and agreed.

2) UTT/0699/02/LB - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

1. C.2.2. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans except in relation to condition 6 below.
3. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted and agreed.
4. The area of the removed weatherboarding at the new entrance shall be no greater than the size of the great doors on southeast elevation.
5. Prior to the occupation of the conversion hereby permitted, the missing vertically boarded great doors to the northwest elevation shall be reinstated and pinned back on the adjoining walls.
6. C.17.2. Detailed amendments to be incorporated into design.
7. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted and agreed.
8. C.5.8. Joinery details.
9. C.5.9. Stained wood.

Reason 3 - 9: In the interests of ensuring the development does not adversely affect the historic character, appearance and setting of the main listed building.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0606/02/FUL - BERDEN

Removal of condition C.22 on Planning Permission UTT/0606/89 relating to Agricultural Occupancy.

Southfields, Brick End. GR/TL 468-284. M Watson.

Case Officer: *Jeremy Pine 01799 510460*

Expiry Date: 14/06/2002

NOTATION: ADP & DLP: Outside Development Limits and Settlement Boundaries.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is located in open countryside about one mile south of Berden at Brick House End. The property is one of 5 surrounded by farmland.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: This application proposes the removal of an agricultural occupancy condition imposed on Southfields in 1989. Southfields is a detached 3-bedroom house set in approximately 0.4ha (1 acre).

APPLICANT'S CASE: See statement of case dated 4 March 2002 attached at end of report.

RELEVANT HISTORY: New dwelling approved in 1989 for occupation by Mr & Mrs Watson, who farmed the adjacent land and wanted to retire and move out of the nearby farmhouse, but continue to give consultancy advice re the running of the farm. The application was recommended for refusal by officers, since there were 3 existing dwellings on the holding at that time. Members approved the application on the personal grounds put forward, subject to an agricultural occupancy condition. Refusal for removal of agricultural occupancy condition in 2001 for reason of prematurity likely to lead to a further application for an agricultural dwelling in the future.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: None received (due 22 May).

REPRESENTATIONS: None. Notification period expired 13 May.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether:

- 1) **the proposal complies with UDP Policies S2 (Development in the Countryside) & C9 (Removal of Agricultural Occupancy Conditions) and DLP Policies S7 & H12 and**
 - 2) **any further information has been supplied since the previous refusal which could now justify approval.**
- 1) Policy C9 requires that the dwelling:
 - a) is genuinely surplus to current and foreseen future agricultural needs of the holding, neighbouring locality and local farmers, and
 - b) has been widely advertised for at least 6 months at a price reflecting its restriction.
 - a) None of the local farmers notified about the sale have expressed an interest in the property. Due to the current trends in agriculture, it is considered that the foreseeable future agricultural needs of this and nearby holdings are unlikely to exceed current requirements.
 - b) Over 15 months have passed since attempts were first made to advertise and sell the property. During this time, it has been advertised in 3 local papers, 1 national journal, at estate agents, on the Internet and by writing to local farmers. The dwelling is only 12 years

old and apparently worth about £450K. The asking price was £295K, about 30% below expected open market value. This course of action has not resulted in the sale of the property.

2) Since the previous refusal, Southfields has become vacant, as Mr & Mrs Watson have moved into an annex at nearby Farm Croft, an agricultural worker's dwelling on the farm for which planning permission was granted by East Herts DC in 1984. Farm Croft is occupied by Mr & Mrs Watsons' son, whilst another son occupies a third dwelling on the farm, Greens Farmhouse, which is a Grade II Listed Building.

Officers have considered the further information submitted with the application and are now satisfied that there is no reasonable case to retain the occupancy condition. Southfields is the dwelling that is furthest from the operational buildings of the farm, and one dwelling would remain agriculturally tied to meet the needs of the farm in addition to the original farmhouse. The applicant has considered whether it would be viable to transfer the condition to another dwelling, but has concluded that it would not be so as there is no proven need for a second tied dwelling. In any case, the location of that dwelling might not be suitable were a need to exist.

CONCLUSION: Officers are now satisfied that the agricultural occupancy condition no longer fulfils its original purpose.

RECOMMENDATION: UNCONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0618/02/FUL - GREAT CANFIELD

Use of agricultural building as dwelling for period of 2 years (previously expired temporary permission granted under ref: UTT/0493/98/FUL) and conversion of part of existing building to dwelling.

Ashfields Polo Centre. GR/TL 587-190. Mr & Mrs Mathies.

Case Officer: *Richard Aston 01799 510464*

Expiry Date: 27/06/2002

NOTATION: ADP & DLP: Outside Development Limits and Settlement Boundaries.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is located in open countryside, 1km (0.6 mile) northwest of the village. It comprises a complex of barn buildings, forming part of a larger area of about 15ha (38 acres) mainly used as a polo and equestrian centre. The building has a floor area of about 1,300 sqm.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: This revised proposal involves the conversion of part of the barn used for equestrian activities to a 3-bedroomed 2-storey dwelling in association with the commercial facilities. It has been submitted following the refusal of permission last February for an 8-bedroomed 2-storey dwelling totalling 270 sqm. The smaller dwelling would cover 166 sqm. It is also proposed to extend the temporary permission for the existing residential use for 2 years until the barn conversion has been implemented.

APPLICANT'S CASE: See agent's letters dated 15 April and 28 June attached at end of report.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Changes of use of farm buildings to stabling, light industry, equestrian centre, stabling for polo ponies, storage and distribution and vehicle maintenance approved in 1990, 1991, 1998 and 2001 (following a Members' site visit). Use of farmland for polo and change of use of farm building to polo club approved in 1993. Retrospective temporary permission for change of use of farm building to dwelling granted in 1998 for 3 years (expired October 2001). Change of use of building to dwelling refused in February 2002 for reasons of size, reconstruction and design. Retention of use of building for indoor riding arena approved in April 2002.

CONSULTATIONS: ECC Transportation: no objections.

Environment Agency: no objections subject to informative notes.

Environmental Services: no objections subject to condition requiring small scale sewage treatment plant rather than a septic tank.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: None (due 6 June).

REPRESENTATIONS: None. Notification period expired 31 May.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are is whether the need for permanent residential accommodation on the site is sufficient to over-ride the normal presumption against new dwellings in the countryside and whether the reasons for refusing the previous application have now been overcome (ERSP Policy C5, ADP Policies S2, C6 & REC6 and DLP Policies S7 & H5).

The relevant Policies require new development outside Development Limits to be exceptionally justified. They also allow certain development in the countryside compatible with a rural area if it relates to an appropriate outdoor use. National guidance requires that proposals for additional dwellings should be considered very carefully, with particular

consideration being given to the need to give care to animals at short notice, and to protect them from theft. Where justified, any such dwellings should be of modest size.

The owners have now had 4 years since their first residential occupation on the site to establish the need for a permanent dwelling. Their case is based on the supervision, treatment and security of 60 horses and their equipment. It is considered that the functional and financial tests have now been established. The dwelling has been considerably reduced in size, there would now be no reconstruction and the design has been improved.

CONCLUSION: The essential need has now been proven sufficient to warrant an exception to normal Policies and the previous reasons for refusal have been overcome.

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.
3. C.6.2. Excluding all rights of Permitted Development within the curtilage of a dwelling house without further permission.
4. C.6.11. One dwelling unit only.
5. C.6.14. Restriction on rebuilding.
6. C.8.27. Drainage details to be submitted and approved.
7. All access shall be gained from the south.
Reason: To avoid disturbance to local residents.
8. C.14.1. Permission linked to equestrian facilities on site.
9. C.14.3. Staff accommodation only.
10. C.15.1. Superseding previous permission.
11. C.25.1. Prevention of Airport-related parking.
12. The residential occupation of the existing buildings shall cease on 22 July 2004 or upon first occupation of the new dwelling hereby approved, whichever is the sooner.
Reason: To prevent a second dwelling in the countryside.

Background papers: See application file.

UTT/0265/02/FUL - GREAT EASTON

Construction of new garage premises with workshop, showroom, offices and basement car parking.

G S Brown's Garage. GR/TL 610-254. P & A Wood.

Case Officer: Michael Ovenden 01799 510476

Expiry Date: 03/05/2002

NOTATION: ADP & DLP: Outside Development Limit and Settlement Boundary/Within Area of Special Landscape Value (ADP only).

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: This sloping site is prominently situated on the south-western corner of the junction of the B184 Dunmow-Thaxted Road with the road through the village to the northern side of the road is the P & A Wood's showroom and garage; to the east is The Moat House Nursing Home and to the south and west are private dwellings. Currently on the site is a petrol filling station, including canopy, a low single-storey shop with a workshop behind (about 6 m high). Some cars are also sold from the site. In front of the buildings is a large area of hardstanding, with a grass bank sloping down to the highway. There is a vehicular access to the B184 and two to the village road. There is a patchy hedge along the north and south boundaries and a Beech hedge along the west boundary.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: The proposal is to demolish all existing buildings on the site and the canopy and retain the three vehicular accesses. The site would be used by P & A Wood as part of their business. The original submission has been revised following negotiations to include the erection of a barn type building, with a reverse L-shaped plan form facing the two highways, sited slightly to the rear of the existing canopy, behind which would be a more conventional rectangular plan form workshop building, with basement below and a mezzanine and first floor above parts of the ground floor. The building would contain reception, waiting rooms, clean build area, paint shop, workshop, machine room, trim shop, canteen and changing rooms. At the southern end of the site would be a vehicle ramp down to the basement.

APPLICANT'S CASE: See agent's letters dated 14 February and 21 May 2002 attached at end of report.

CONSULTATIONS: ECC Transportation: No objections subject to turning facilities.

Environmental Services: No comments.

Design Advice: Great improvement over original scheme. Recommend conditional approval.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: Original Plans: None (due 8 April).

Revised Plans: To be reported (due 18 June).

REPRESENTATIONS: Two on Original Plans: Notification period expired 18 June.

1. Concern over height of the original proposal.
2. CPREssex: Do not object in principle. Is there room for all operations and manoeuvring? Scale of buildings may affect neighbours.

Revised Plan: Any received will be reported (due 2 July).

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether:

- 1) the design of the development of this prominent site would be acceptable (ADP Policy DC1 and DLP Policy GEN2) and
- 2) the proposal protects the amenity of neighbours (ADP Plan policy DC14 and DLP Policy GEN4).

1) The site currently has a collection of run-down buildings, unsightly petrol canopy and large area of hardstanding. None of these utilitarian buildings are worthy of retention. The site is on a prominent elevated corner and is not an attractive approach to the nearby Conservation Area. The removal of these buildings would enhance the appearance of the site and character of the locality. The development has been designed to allow modern facilities to be provided, but these would be screened from the public roads by traditional agricultural-style elements, e.g. the barn-type building along the front and the cartshed-type building along the village road. The use of traditional features to mask more conventional modern buildings is similar to the approach taken by the applicants on their site opposite. The revised building would be 9.2 m high and 6.5 – 7.5m from the nearby dwelling. The original proposal would have been 11.2 m tall and about 8 m from the adjacent chalet dwelling, which is approximately 6.8 m high. On balance this relationship between the two dwellings is considered to be acceptable, subject to a minimum gap of 8m as originally proposed.

2) Although motor-related work-shops are not normally considered appropriate to a residential area, as they can give rise to noise, fumes etc, no objections have been received from neighbours concerned about the activities and no adverse comments have been raised by Environmental Services. The site is an established vehicle garage and petrol station with car sales, although current activities are probably only at a low intensity. The applicant has stated that working hours will be restricted to Mon-Fri 8.30-18.00 and Saturday 8.30-13.00 in order to protect neighbour's amenity and these can be controlled by condition.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The proposal has been revised to address the concerns of the neighbour and the CPREssex.

CONCLUSION: The revised proposal negotiated by Officers is considered to be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

1. C.2.1. Time Limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.2. To be implemented in accordance with revised plans except re condition no. 10 below.
3. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of colour of feather-edged weather-boarding and window frames/doors have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
4. The roof to the front and side barn/cart shed elements shall be clad in clay plain tiles.
5. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the colour of profiled sheeting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason 3-5: To protect the approach to the Conservation Area.
6. C.7.1. Details of external ground and internal floor levels to be submitted and agreed.
7. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
8. Hours of deliveries and use: Monday - Friday 8.30 - 18.00 and Saturday 8.30 - 13.00.
Reason: In order to protect neighbour's amenity.

9. To be used only in conjunction with commercial premises opposite.
Reason: To avoid overdevelopment.
10. Gap between building and neighbour to be retained at 8m.
Reason: In order to protect neighbour's amenity.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0885/02/FUL – FELSTED

Erection of two-storey extension, relocation of staff parking area and provision of drop-off point.

Felsted Preparatory School, Braintree Road. GR/TL 678-203 Felsted School Trustees Ltd

Case Officer: John Grayson 01799 510455

Expiry Date: 02/08/2002

NOTATION: ADP & DLP: Mainly Within Development Limit, Settlement Boundary and Conservation Area/Opposite Listed Building.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site lies close to the centre of the village on the southern side of Braintree Road, about 200m east of its junction with Chelmsford Road, opposite the listed Almshouses. The proposed site for the building currently comprises two grass tennis courts. The land proposed for the staff car park at the rear forms part of the playing fields, near the site for the recently approved sports hall. To the west is the main 3-storey school building, to the east open land part of Follyfield (also in the school's ownership) and to the south playing fields.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: This revised proposal is for the erection of a new building comprising an 11+ centre associated with the school. It would have two-storeys and comprise two elements linked by a glazed passageway, one set back from the other. The buildings would be 25m wide and 38m long in total. The one to the east would be 28m from the road, roughly in line with the existing building, and the other set back a further 11m. The materials would be clay bricks and tiles. There would be a separate drop-off point at the front with in and out access, a new staff car park at the rear using an existing access and the existing staff car park in front of the main block would become the drop-off and parking for the Preparatory School using the existing accesses.

APPLICANT'S CASE: See applicant's and agent's letters dated 28 May and 5 June attached at end of report. Unilateral obligation to be submitted by applicants to avoid any future development between site and Follyfield.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Permission for sports hall to southwest granted November 2001. New 11+ centre withdrawn April 2002.

CONSULTATIONS: Design Advice: No objections.
ECC Transportation: To be reported (due 27 June).

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: Appreciate rearrangement of parking facilities to enable even flow of traffic to both buildings.

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised and any representations will be reported. Period expires 11 July.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether the proposal would:

- 1) preserve or enhance the existing character of the street scene and Conservation Area (ERSP Policy HC2, ADP Policies S2 & DC8 and DLP Policies S3 & ENV3),
- 2) be of an appropriate design in this location (ERSP Policy HC2, ADP Policy DC2 and DLP Policy ENV1),
- 3) affect highway safety (ARSP Policy T3, ADP Policy T1 and DLP Policy GEN1) and
- 4) result in the loss of playing field facilities (PPG 17).

1) The site forms the western part of a 85m gap between the Headmaster's House and Follyfield to the east. This is the only major open space on the southern side of Braintree Road, giving views over the playing fields towards the countryside. The reverse view from a public footpath is also of value. The site has a low hedge (1.5m) and chain-link tennis court fencing which still allows views through. The erection of the proposed building would reduce this gap to 50m. The previous scheme showed a building 19m wide across its whole frontage, only 20m back from the road. The revised siting would be 8m further back and, although wider than before, the structures would be split into two separate elements, thereby cumulatively reducing the impact on the street scene. It is considered that the revised layout has largely overcome previous concerns about harm to the open character of this part of the village, especially as the applicant has confirmed that the remaining 50m gap to the east will not be built upon.

2) The design of the building has been improved considerably and would be sympathetic to the existing building whilst adopting a modern architectural theme. It would remain subservient to the existing block, but an interesting structure in its own right.

3) The previous concerns about congestion caused by parents dropping pupils off have been addressed with two separate points and a dedicated staff car park to the rear.

4) The two tennis courts could be relocated elsewhere in the School's extensive grounds if there is a need for them to be retained.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The previous concerns from the Parish Council and local residents about access and parking have been overcome.

CONCLUSION: The revised scheme follows negotiations with Officers and would enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

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.
- 3-6. C.4.1-6. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
9. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
10. C.5.5. Clay plain tile.
11. The bricks to be used in the construction of this building shall be high quality Essex Reds.
Reason: To preserve the character of the Conservation Area.
12. C.8.27. Drainage details to be submitted and agreed.
13. All the access works and parking facilities shown on the plan hereby approved shall be completed and brought into use before the first occupation of this building.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety.
14. C.16.1. Watching archaeological brief.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0408/02/OP - GREAT HALLINGBURY

Outline application for erection of buildings for Early Years and Day Nursery.
Land at Howe Green House School. GR/TL509-187. The Howe Green Educational
Case Officer: Michael Ovenden 01799 510476
Expiry Date: 16/05/2002

NOTATION: ADP & DLP: Outside Development Limits and Boundary Settlements/Within Area of Special Landscape Value (ADP only), Curtilage of Listed Building and Area affected by Noise from aircraft using Stansted Airport/Tree Preservation Orders.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site at Howe Green is located between Great and Little Hallingbury to the east of the M11, on the back lane from Anvil Cross to Woodside Green. It is opposite the residentially converted barns Members visited on last year's tour. The school comprises a listed building, with newer structures to the east also including a hall. A temporary portakabin structure is sited closer to the road. There are 14 dwellings in this loosely-knit hamlet at Howe Green and the school is located on the north-eastern edge of the group.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: It is proposed to replace the temporary Kindergarten portakabin classroom with two new buildings, one for the new Day Nursery (6 months to 3 years) and the other for Early Years classes. Both would be located to the south-east of the main building to form three sides of a square, with the open side facing the road. The accompanying indicative plans show pitched-roofed structures in keeping with the adjacent school hall. Access would continue to be gained from the east. Only the principle and siting are to be considered at this outline stage.

APPLICANT'S CASE: See agent's letters dated 11 March and 21 June attached at end of report.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Several permissions for educational facilities granted since 1987.

CONSULTATIONS: Design Advice: No objections in principle, but prefer to see detailed plans.

Environment Agency: No objections subject to informative notes.

Environmental Services: No objections.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: No objections.

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised and 2 representations have been received. Period expired 17 April.

1. Object. Roads are less than adequate and are fast becoming a regular route for traffic heading for Hertfordshire, NW Essex, Cambridge, etc. Close to aircraft accident site. Development seems to be far larger than its proposed name suggests.
2. Strongly object. Traffic generated by existing school already far too high. Pupils suffer from aircraft noise. Safety concern re over-flying. School already grown more than originally envisaged – how much more?

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether the proposed expansion of the school would adversely affect:

- 1) its countryside character (ADP Policies S2 & C2 and DLP Policies S7 & LC3),
- 2) the setting of the listed building (ADP Policy DC5(a) and DLP Policy ENV2),
- 3) access and traffic (ADP Policy T1 and DLP Policy GEN1) and

4) exposure to aircraft noise (ADP Policy N2(a) and DLP Policy ENV9).

1) The Policies state that new development beyond Development Limits will normally be refused if it does not relate to agriculture. Any new development in Areas of Special Landscape Value will be particularly well designed and in scale to accord with the special characteristics of the area. Extensions or additional facilities at existing school sites with potential for dual school and community use will be permitted outside settlements.

In this case the educational use of this site has been well established over the last 15 years. It is considered that the replacement and new building would round off the existing facilities to create an attractive grouping facing the highway. The removal of the temporary portakabin would enhance the countryside character. The extension of educational facilities would increase the potential for dual school and community use. All the preserved and other important trees and hedges on the site would be retained.

2) The layout shows that the new buildings would be at least 40m from the Listed Building, in a grouping which would complement the existing buildings. The indicative sketches indicate that the design of the new buildings would be sympathetic to the setting of the Listed Building. Detailed design matters can be considered at the reserved matters stage.

3) The current numbers of pupils and staff (about 150 in total) generate a certain number of vehicle movements twice per day and it is estimated that the proposed additional 25 (net) pupils would not add materially to those trips so as to justify refusal on grounds of highway safety or neighbours' amenity.

4) The Policies indicate that noise sensitive development will be refused in this zone affected by aircraft noise, unless it is a replacement building or an extension to a building and it will be adequately soundproofed. The school is a noise sensitive use, but both of the new buildings fall within the exempt categories. One is a replacement for the temporary portakabin, where the exposure to noise would be significantly reduced. The other can be classed as an extension in view of its relationship with existing buildings, and could be linked if necessary. Soundproofing would be required by condition.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The only issues not covered above relate to –

- (a) the recent aircraft crash : this site lies well outside the Public Safety Zone for Stansted Airport,
- (b) noise affecting pupils: this would be reduced by requiring soundproofing and
- (c) future expansion: a note will be attached to any permission indicating that the site would not be able to satisfactorily accommodate any further buildings from an environmental point of view.

CONCLUSION: The proposal satisfies the relevant Development Plan Policies.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

1. C.1.1. Submission of reserved matters.
2. C.1.2. Submission of reserved matters.
3. C.1.3. Time limit for submission of reserved matters.
4. C.2.1. Time Limit for commencement of development.
5. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
6. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
7. C.4.3. Details of earthworks to be submitted and agreed.
8. C.4.4. Retention of trees.
9. C.4.5. Retention of hedges.
10. C.4.6. Retention and protection of trees and shrubs for the duration of development.
11. C.4.7. Detailed landscaping survey to be submitted.

12. C.4.8. Landscape management and maintenance plan to be submitted and agreed.
13. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted and agreed.
14. C.8.25.Sound insulation requirements close to Stansted Airport to be submitted and agreed.
15. C.8.27.Drainage details to be submitted and agreed.
16. The buildings hereby permitted shall only be used for educational purposes in conjunction with the rest of the site known as Howe Green House School, and not occupied separately.
Reason: The site lies in an area where new buildings are not normally permitted.
17. The existing temporary portakabin shall be completely removed from the whole site before the Early Years building hereby approved has been first occupied.
Reason: In order to improve the setting of the Listed Building.
18. C.25.1.Prevention of airport-related parking.

Note: No further development.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0704/02/FUL – NEWPORT
(Member's Interest)

Two storey side extension
45 Cherry Garden Lane. GR/TL 518-338 Mr & Mrs W Bowker.
Case Officer: Charmain Harbour 01799 510458
Expiry Date: 31/07/2002

NOTATION: ADP: Within Development Limits and Area of Special Landscape Value.
DLP: Within Settlement Boundary.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is on the northern side of Cherry Garden Lane in the middle of a residential estate. It is occupied by a two-storey three-bedroomed end-of-terrace dwelling which has its southern side elevation facing onto the road. To the front (western elevation) the dwelling fronts onto an open landscaped area and a pedestrian footway. To the rear there is vehicular access with a garage and parking spaces and there is also a dedicated parking space to the south-west adjacent to the open space area. The garden area is located to the rear and side enclosed by a hedge.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: The proposal seeks to create a two-storey side extension to the property, doubling the floor area. It would create two additional bedrooms, making a five-bedroom house and allow the kitchen to be enlarged to the ground floor, with a new living room area formed to the ground floor. The design would be similar to the existing dwelling with the same ridge height to the roof. Three windows would be formed to the side elevation but the main window would be to the front and rear elevations following a similar style of windows to the existing house. Two trees would be removed.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: None (due 5 July 2002).

REPRESENTATIONS: One. Notification period expired.

Concerned that the land the subject of the application is believed not to be in the applicants' ownership and the proposal would result in the loss of two trees which would have an adverse impact on the locality.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether:

- 1) **the form of the extension would be acceptable in design and appearance (ADP Policy H7 and DLP Policy H7),**
- 2) **the proposal would have an adverse impact on the street scene and trees (ADP Policies DC1 & DC8, DLP Policies GEN2 & ENV3) and**
- 3) **adequate on-site parking provision can be achieved (ADP Policy T2 and DLP Policy GEN 9).**

1) The proposed extension would follow the form of the existing terrace. It is proposed to secure some articulation to the front elevation by setting back the front elevation of the extension, thereby overcoming the difficulty in colour matching exactly the join line with the existing brickwork which has weathered since the units were first built.

2) The proposal would retain the majority of the existing hedge, including the complete run fronting the roadway. An area of garden/verge way between the side of the extension and the back edge of pavement of at least 4.5m would be retained. In respect of the two trees, one is within the side garden and the second is in front of the hedge to the front and in close proximity to the existing property. The trees are not subject of a Preservation Order and do enhance the area in conjunction with the hedge. However, it is considered that

replacement planting on the basis of 2:1 replacements should be sought to compensate for the loss. The amenities of the surrounding properties are not considered to be adversely affected by the proposals.

3) The applicants have identified three parking spaces which are on land within their control and therefore the proposal meets the required on site parking provision.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The applicants have completed the land ownership certificate to show that the land is in their ownership. The loss of trees is not considered to be reason alone to refuse the scheme as replacement planting can be secured better position and of different species which would enhance the locality.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposal is considered to accord with the Development Plan Policies and would not adversely affect the amenities of either the neighbouring properties or the surrounding area.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.2. To be implemented in accordance with revised plans.
3. Prior to the development commencing a replacement planting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the local planning authority, which shall provide four replacement trees for the two trees to be removed. The size, location and species of the replacement trees shall be submitted as part of these details.
Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping
5. C.4.5. Retention of hedges.
6. C.5.3. Matching materials.
7. C.6.10. Residential annexe ancillary to rest of site.
8. C.11. Retention of three parking spaces.

Background papers: see application file.
