

UTT/1513/02/FUL - LITTLE CHESTERFORD.....	2
UTT/0630/03/DFO – TAKELEY.....	33
1) UTT/0715/03/DFO & 2) UTT/0716/03/DFO - LITTLE DUNMOW.....	36
UTT/1836/02/OP - QUENDON & RICKLING.....	39
UTT/0775/03/OP – TAKELEY.....	42
1) UTT/0523/03/FUL, 2) UTT/0525/03/FUL, 3) UTT/0604/03/CA.....	45
& 4) UTT/0872/03/FUL – FELSTED.....	45
UTT/0773/03/FUL – STANSTED.....	50
1) UTT/0515/03/FUL & 2) UTT/0516/03/LB - BROXTED.....	52
1) UTT/0670/03/FUL & 2) UTT/671/03/LB - WENDENS AMBO.....	54
UTT/0129/03/FUL - HIGH EASTER.....	57

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS AWAITING DECISIONS WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN INCLUDED ON A PREVIOUS SCHEDULE AS AT 7 JULY 2003**

APPL NO: **UTT/1636/02/FUL**  
PARISH: **LEADEN RODING**  
DEVELOPMENT: Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 4 detached dwellings and 1 bungalow with associated garaging and landscaping  
APPLICANT: Chase End Developments Ltd  
LOCATION: Elms Acre, Chalks Green  
D.C. CTTE: 27 May 2003 (see copy attached on p3-8)  
REMARKS: Deferred for further negotiations regarding the number of dwellings, car parking and drainage  
**RECOMMENDATION: To be reported**  
*Case Officer:* Richard Aston 01799 510464  
Expiry Date: 9 January 2003

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0147/03/FUL**  
PARISH: **GREAT DUNMOW**  
DEVELOPMENT: Erection of 156 affordable dwellings and associated garages, parking spaces and access roads  
APPLICANT: Estuary Housing Association Ltd  
LOCATION: Sector 2, Housing Association Phase, Woodlands Park  
D.C. CTTE: 16 June (see copy attached on p9-25)  
REMARKS: Deferred for further negotiations to reduce 3-storey flats to 2 & Members' Site Visit  
**RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions & Section 106 Agreement**  
*Case Officer:* John Grayson 01799 510455  
Expiry Date: 6 May 2003

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0290/03/FUL, UTT/0292/03/LB & UTT/0294/03/CA**  
PARISH: **NEWPORT**  
DEVELOPMENT: 1) Single and two-storey rear extensions to dwelling. Replace barn with two-storey dwelling, 2) Single and two-storey rear extensions. Internal alterations to partitions and openings, 3) Demolition of outbuilding  
APPLICANT: Estate of A K Skingley  
LOCATION: Belmont, Belmont Hill  
D.C. CTTE: 16 June 2003 (see copy attached on p26-32)  
REMARKS: Deferred for Members' Site Visit  
**RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions**  
*Case Officer:* Hilary Lock 01799 510486  
Expiry Date: 29 April 2003

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0319/03/FUL**  
PARISH: **FELSTED**  
DEVELOPMENT: Change of use of poultry farm to boarding kennels  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Brown  
LOCATION: Gifford House, Stebbing Road  
D.C. CTTE: 27 May 2003 (see copy attached on p33-38)  
REMARKS: Deferred for reconsultation with Environmental Services  
**RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions**  
*Case Officer:* Katherine Benjafield 01799 510494  
Expiry Date: 16 May 2003

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0404/03/FUL**  
PARISH: **WIMBISH**  
DEVELOPMENT: Removal of condition 6.10 attached to planning permission UTT/1018/01/FUL (removing restriction on use of barn to residential annex only)

APPLICANT: L Moss  
LOCATION: Highams Farm, Thaxted Road  
D.C. CTTE: 16 June 2003 (see copy attached on p39-42)  
REMARKS: Deferred for Members' Site Visit  
**RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions**  
*Case Officer: Hilary Lock 01799 510486*  
Expiry Date: 19 May 2003

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0455/03/DFO**  
PARISH: **TAKELEY**  
DEVELOPMENT: Construction of hotel with associated parking, landscaping, servicing and ancillary works & operations.

APPLICANT: BAA Lynton  
LOCATION: South Gate Site Stansted Airport  
D.C. CTTE: 27 May 2003 (see copy attached on p43-52)  
REMARKS: Deferred for receipt of revised plans  
**RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions**  
*Case Officer: Jeremy Pine 01799 510460*  
Expiry Date: 26 May 2003

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0523/03/FUL, UTT/0525/03FUL & UTT/0604/03/CA**  
PARISH: **FELSTED**  
DEVELOPMENT: 1) Erection of 4 x three storey blocks – a total of 33 flats  
2) Erection of music block,  
3) Demolition of music school and two other structures

APPLICANT: Felsted School  
LOCATION: Land to the North of Ingrams and rear of main school  
D.C. CTTE: 16 June 2003  
REMARKS: Deferred for Members' Site Visit & receipt of revised plans  
**RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions (see revised report attached on p105-110)**  
*Case Officer: John Grayson 01799 510455*  
Expiry Date: 20 June 2003

---

## **UTT/1636/02/FUL - LEADEN RODING**

Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 4 detached dwellings and 1 bungalow with associated garaging and landscaping

Elms Acre, Chalks Green. GR/TL 597-134. Chase End Developments Ltd.

Case Officer: Richard Aston 01799 510464

Expiry Date: 09/01/2003

**NOTATION:** ADP & DLP: Within Development Limits/Settlement Boundaries

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** Elms Acre is a 0.32 ha (0.79 acre) existing residential plot, located within development limits, fronting onto Chalks Green on the eastern edge of Leaden Roding. The site is bordered by Metropolitan Greenbelt to the north and south and existing residential properties to the east and west. To the west lies a modern development of detached 4/5 bedroom houses with detached and attached double garages and to the east the development is more sporadic consisting of a number of chalet bungalows and 1 ½ storey dwellings in fairly large grounds. There is a bungalow on the site with a number of associated outbuildings; this is located in the centre with access along the eastern boundary.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The proposal details the demolition of the existing bungalow, its replacement with a new bungalow and the erection of 4 detached dwellings to the rear with associated garaging and landscaping.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** The application has been discussed and revised in line with Officers' recommendations to increase the density.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Environment Agency - A private means of foul effluent disposal is required in the form of a private sewage treatment plant. Makes advisory comments in relation to works affecting a watercourse. A percolation test should be undertaken to ensure soakaways are adequate.

ECC Transportation – No objections.

Anglian Water – No objections in principle to the application, details of foul and surface water drainage must be approved by the LPA prior to the commencement of development. Details of foul and surface water drainage for the site must be submitted and approved.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Concerns regarding overdevelopment of the site. If the application is to be granted then perhaps the developer could be encouraged to tarmac the unadopted part of this lane as a planning gain.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This applications has been advertised and 7 representations have been received. Period expired 2 January 2003.

General Summary – No objections from the neighbouring property to the proposal if the existing Leylandii hedge is retained and adequate provision is made for drainage. Bungalows rather than detached dwellings may be more appropriate. Five objections have been received to the application, with concerns about surface water drainage, the amount of car parking on the site and where the sewage treatment plant will be located. See letter from Cllr Mrs Flack attached at end of report.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues are whether the proposal is acceptable with regards to

- 1) ADP Policies S1 (Development Limits)
- 2) H10 (Backland Development) design and DC1 layout (and their DLP equivalents).

1. The site is located within development limits and Policy S1 of the ADP states that *'within development limits, development proposals that are not detrimental to any important environmental or visual characteristic of the locality and accord with other relevant policies of the plan will normally be granted'*. In conjunction with this, the proposal must be determined against this policy and policy H10 which states that *'development will normally be refused unless, there is significant underuse of the land, there is no material overlooking or overshadowing, the site is not of significant environmental value and significant road congestion would not be created'*. The proposal is limited to 5 dwellings and is designed and laid out in such a way that it would not create any material overlooking or overshadowing. The site is not of significant environmental value and the development of the rear of this plot would make good use of land within the village limits.

2. Turning to the design of the development, the proposal would appear as a transitional site between the low density ribbon development of 4 houses to the east with the Greenbelt beyond and the fairly modern housing development which borders the site to the west. The retention of a bungalow on the front of the property would maintain the existing streetscene and would also partially obscure the two storey dwellings to the rear. Concerns have been raised by residents with regards to the car parking on the site and the density of the housing. The Adopted District Plan standard for such houses is 3 spaces per dwelling; the proposal details 1 garage space per dwelling and 1 parking space. However, there is sufficient circulation space inside the site to allow for extra cars to be occasionally parked and accordingly it is considered acceptable. The design of the house types is vernacular and would be in keeping with the properties to the west, which are similar in height and appearance. Accordingly, the proposal complies with Policy DC1 of the Adopted District Plan and there are no valid reasons for refusal. Should Members wish to impose a condition requiring up to 3 extra spaces, this could be added.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** It is the intention to retain the existing boundary screen around the site; this can be secured by landscaping condition. Concerns relating to the drainage of the site can be assessed, because if Members are minded to approve the application a drainage scheme would have to be submitted prior to commencement of development. The proposed density would only be 15 dwellings per hectare, half the Government's recommended minimum, and Members are advised that any fewer dwellings would be recommended for refusal as inefficient use of land.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The proposal is in accordance with relevant District Plan policies and its design and layout would not detract from this attractive area of Leaden Roding or from the Metropolitan Greenbelt beyond. The proposal has been revised in line with Officers' recommendations and is now considered to be acceptable. Car parking and drainage are covered by conditions.

### **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 with 3 extra car parking spaces added
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping
5. C.4.4. Retention/replacement of trees
6. C.5.2. Details of materials to be submitted, agreed & implemented
7. C.6.4. Excluding extensions without further permission
8. C.7.1. Slab levels to be submitted, agreed & implemented

- 9. C.6.7. Excluding conversion of garages
- 10 Drainage details to be submitted, agreed & implemented.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## UTT/0147/03/FUL - GREAT DUNMOW

*(Revised report)*

Erection of 156 affordable dwellings and associated garages, parking spaces and access roads

Sector 2, Housing Association Phase, Woodlands Park. GR/TL 622-223. Estuary Housing Association Ltd.

Case Officer: John Grayson 01799 510455

Expiry Date: 02/04/2003

**NOTATION:** Within Town Development Limits on Adopted Plan and Settlement Boundaries on Second Deposit Local Plan/Allocated for residential development (this site approved for affordable units.)

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site is located in the south-eastern corner of the Woodlands Park estate close to existing properties in Waldgroves, Rosemary Crescent, Downs Crescent and Godfrey Way. It measures 2.7 ha (6.7 acres).

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** It is proposed to erect 156 affordable units and the revised mix of units would be 43 flats, 63 maisonettes, 36 houses and 14 bungalows. The layout has been further revised to take account of local objections and Members' comments on the original and first amended schemes. The latest changes are set out in the agent's supporting statement received on 21 May attached at end of report. Estuary Housing is a Registered Social Landlord (RSL).

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See applicant's letter dated 28 January and supporting statement dated 21 May attached at end of report. See letter dated 6 June 2003 from Wickford Development Company attached at end of report.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Part of residential development site approved for over 1300 dwellings. This site agreed for affordable housing by E&T Committee in September 2002.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Environment Agency: Advisory comments only.

Anglian Water: No objection subject to condition.

English Nature: pond close to SE boundary should be protected.

Essex Police Architectural Liaison: No objection in principle. Recommendations made to applicant regarding fences, drive ways, rear gates, etc. Suggests "Secured by Design" standard would be achieved if recommendations incorporated into scheme.

UDC Local Plan Policy Advice: Revised Master Plan approved by E&T Committee on 10 September 2002. 110 of the 156 units relate to Sectors 1 & 2 and 46 are associated with Sector 3. The provision of affordable housing in relation to Sectors 1 & 2 was seen by Officers and Members as an important aspect of the Master Plan which should be delivered as soon as possible, since development on these Sectors is already well advanced and beyond the threshold in the original Sec 106 Agreement. This proposal would enable some of the affordable housing required in association with Sector 3 to be provided earlier. *(The public consultation on the Master Plan raised concern from some residents in Downs Crescent regarding the visual impact of the development in this corner of the estate.)* See memo dated 11 April attached at end of report.

UDC Housing: There is an unfulfilled need for this type of accommodation in Great Dunmow. The proposed mix of tenure would be 90 for affordable rent, 19 for key worker market rent and 47 for shared ownership.

ECC Transportation & Operational Services: No objections subject to "inter alia" a 2m wide independent footpath should be provided where shown pink on the plan. This facility will need to be drained and may require to be lit. The section of footpath coloured yellow on the plan should be included as part of the normal checking and inspection procedures but until matters of access and land ownership are agreed, should not form part of the Section 38 Agreement.

Essex Police: In principle we have no objections to this development. I would, however, request that the large car parking areas are subject to lighting schemes appropriate for the security and safety of residences. I would suggest a white light source as high-pressure sodium as a minimum. As you are aware, there are sufficient luminaries that will not waste light and raise issues of light pollution.

RSPB: We recommend that the area is surveyed prior to commencing work on the site to determine whether there are any protected species present. Should any protected species be found, appropriate mitigation will need to be put in place. English Nature will be able to offer advice on this. We would also recommend that any removal of hedgerows of scrub is not undertaken during the breeding season, as these provide valuable breeding habitats for wildlife. It is an offence to disturb any species of bird whilst it is breeding. Finally, we hope that the developers will be making the most of the opportunity for positive wildlife enhancement during the development of this proposal. Landscaping opportunities using native species can provide new areas of habitat for wildlife, as can new areas of open space.

**TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Original plans: support.

First revised plans: recommended amendments relating to additional landscaping, rerouting of footpath, more "rural" type houses rather than "urban" flats, better design, bungalows relocated to SE corner, provision of children's play areas, reduction in loss of privacy from blocks 5, 6, 7 & 10 and affordable housing spread throughout the whole estate.

Further to the above at the meeting of the Planning Committee of Great Dunmow Town Council held on Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2003, Members passed the following resolution: -

" That the development of social housing at Woodlands Park, as proposed in the above planning application, constitutes over development of the site, and requires re-designing to make it more sympathetic to Godfrey, Downs Crescent and Buildings Farm House. Further to this it is in contravention of the revised Local Plan, dated October 2002, Policy GD5 paragraphs a, d and e in that:-

- a. "It provides for a mixed and balanced community;
- d. It provides for substantial landscaping with development boundaries to complement the layout and arrangement of buildings and may be required, by legal agreement, to provide off site landscaping;
- e. It is designed to mitigate adverse effects upon existing residential and community interests and may be required, by legal agreement, to provide or contribute towards wider and longer term planning benefits reasonably."

Second revised plans: Concerned at the close proximity of the dwelling on Plot 40 to No.72 Godfrey Way. Suggest consider rotating the dwellings on Plots 37 to 40, 90 degrees and re-locate the play space.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** *(Members are reminded that full copies of all these letters can be inspected at the Council Offices.)* This application has been advertised.

Original plans: 90 individual letters of objection were received, together with a petition containing 315 signatures. See report to meeting on 28 April for summaries.

First revised plans: 49 individual letters of objection were received, together with a petition containing 495 signatures. See letter from Jon Durbin dated 17 April attached to report to meeting on 28 April which sets out all the main points.

Second revised plans: (period expired on 19 June). 4 further letters

1. & 2. See letters dated 9 June 2003 from Jon Durbin and 10 June 2003 from a neighbour attached at end of report.

3. We have seen the revised plans, and although there has been a slight improvement from the last set of plans, we still feel that it is unacceptable to have so many dwellings in one area of the development. We feel that it would be fairer to everyone to have a mixture of private housing association houses thus reducing the density of the 156 dwellings. We



also feel that the houses which are now planned for the south-east corner boundary are still far too close to the boundary of the existing residents. As stated in our previous letter, we appreciate the fact there is a need for affordable housing in this area. We hope therefore you take on board our objections and feelings towards the revised proposals as we feel they are still unacceptable.

4. The application has caused concern because of its high density and inappropriate arrangements for amenities and access which will impact on the immediate location and town. I put forward some points for your consideration. At the previous meeting some Councillors put forward views, such as courtyard developments, for consideration that would improve the sector, but these have not been considered. In particular there is insufficient detail over the landscaping of the site boundaries. The residents with families will not have easy access to the open spaces the site management refer to for their use, as there is no direct footpath through the private housing around the edge. There will be pedestrian impact on the private roads linking the area to the town and the existing rural footpaths. There is no private housing in the sector to make it fit the category of mixed housing. The proposed houses/flats are still very close to some existing properties. I hope that you will be able to consider this application fully, in the light of its effect, visually upon the town, for those who will have to live there in the future and to ensure that the best possible options are taken to make it a good place to live.

A petition containing 804 signatures has also been received headed Dunmow Community Deserves more than second best.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS: The main issues are whether the proposal complies with**

- 1) **ADP Policy H4 which requires Airport-related development to be carried out in accordance with a Master Plan,**
- 2) **ADP Policy GD8 regarding the five principles of residential development at BUILDINGS FARM (DLP Policy GD5 WOODLANDS PARK),**
- 3) **ADP Policies DC1 & DC14 regarding good design and neighbourliness (DLP Policies GEN2 & GEN4) and**
- 4) **ADP Policy T1 regarding highways (DLP Policy GEN1).**

1) The principle of airport-related residential development for Sectors 1, 2 & 3 was established in the Adopted District Plan. The current proposal complies with the requirements of Policy H4. Regarding the general location of development.

2) A revised Master Plan for Woodlands Park was agreed last year following public consultation (see Local Plan comments under Consultations above). The current proposal complies with the five principles of development on this site:

- a) *a mixed and balanced community* – this would be achieved by the first provision of affordable housing on this estate to help to redress the current imbalance. There will be another site of affordable housing to the north-west in Sector 3.
- b) *Primary school, community facilities and open space* – all these are allocated on other parts of the development.
- c) *NW bypass* – this is under construction.
- d) *Substantial landscaping* – this has already been agreed along the southern and eastern boundaries of the estate.
- e) *Mitigate adverse effects on existing residential and community interests* – these were all agreed last year as part of the revised Master Plan.

3) Policy GD1 requires good design with regard to the Essex Design Guide. DLP Policy GEN2 states that residential development will not be permitted unless its design meets all the 7 criteria. Policies DC14 & GEN4 require development to avoid loss of privacy or daylight and overbearing impact or overshadowing. The proposed housing would be to a density of 58 dwellings per ha (23 per acre), in line with Government targets for such

development and similar to other schemes approved recently on the Eastern Sector site in the town centre and in Thaxted Road and Radwinter Road, Saffron Walden. This would contrast with the lower densities throughout the rest of the estate and again help to redress the imbalance.

The Design Guide advocates the linking of dwellings into terraces in order to achieve a more traditional form of development characteristic of Essex. The proposed layout shows good use of terraced and linked dwellings, together with an interesting variety of forms created by the flats. The original layout showed three-storey flats on the edge of the development, where they would have caused harm to the attractive setting and amenities of adjacent residents.

Following negotiations with Officers, further revised plans have now been submitted to help overcome issues raised by local residents and Members at the meeting on 28 April. These are detailed in the agent's supporting statement attached. The main improvements relate to the relocation of the three-storey flats mostly to the centre of the site, the erection of two-storey houses in the SE corner next to Downs Crescent, the provision of an alternative footpath access to Downs Crescent, the inclusion of two children's play areas and the relocation of proposed dwellings further away from the listed Buildings Farmhouse. The only three-storey dwellings on the edge of the site would now be two small blocks part of two-storey buildings on the southern edge where the site abuts existing three-storey flats in Waldgrooms. The layout and design of the proposed dwellings would be sympathetic to the setting of this large estate development on the edge of the town. It is considered that these further amendments go a long way to meeting the concerns regarding the previous plans and are now acceptable.

4) The parking provision for the flats has been reduced to 100% to allow for more planting and amenity areas. This is in line with Government advice on sustainable developments and the need to encourage the reduction in car usage. The site is only 10 minutes walk from the town centre and 5 minutes from Tesco and the local Primary Schools. The Highways Authority raises no objections.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** Most of the objections related to the original proposal to site 3-storey flats in close proximity to existing dwellings. This situation has now been resolved. The landscaping will be significantly improved, both along the site boundaries and within the development. The footpath which runs through the site will be retained and diverted along the estate road. There would be no vehicular access via Downs Crescent. The Environment Agency is satisfied with the proposed drainage arrangements.

**CONCLUSION:** This revised proposal now meets all the Development and Master Plan Policies. The negotiated improvements to the scheme have addressed most of the issues raised previously and should ensure that the amenities of local residents are not materially harmed. A Section 106 Agreement will be required to ensure permanent control of occupancy by an RSL. Go-East are being consulted regarding whether the Council needs to refer the application to the ODPM under the Greenfield Regulations.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS and SECTION 106 AGREEMENT (SUBJECT TO CONSULTATION WITH GO-EAST if required)**

1. C.2.1. Standard time limit
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.7.1. Details of external ground and internal floor levels to be submitted and agreed
6. C.11.5. Standard vehicle parking facilities to be provided
7. C.8.27. Drainage details to be submitted, agreed and implemented
8. C.8.13 Restriction on hours of construction: - 08:30-17:30 Mon-Fri & 09:00-17:00 Sat, none on Sun or Bank/Public Holidays

9. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until revised drawings have been submitted and approved showing at least 20% of plots with chimneys, which shall thereafter be implemented.
10. Parking requirements
11. Details of lighting to be submitted and agreed.
12. C.6.4. Excluding PD Rights of extension without further permission
13. C.16.1. Archaeological watching brief
14. C.17.1. Revised plan required incorporating the following:
  - a) as set out in letter from J Durbin (p.3 points 1-6)
  - b) as set out in letter from GDTC
  - c) as set out in letter from Police
  - d) as set out in letter from Environment Agency
  - e) as set out in letter from ECC Transportation
  - f) the footpath link to the east shall not be provided if the footpath link to the southeast has been implemented &
  - g) reduce roof pitch on 3-storey blocks to 30 degrees

**Notes to accompany decision notice**

1. Energy efficiency, recycling and waste
2. Protection of wildlife
3. Surface water drainage and flood protection matters

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**1) UTT/0290/03/FUL, 2) UTT/0292/03/LB & 3) UTT/0294/03/CA – NEWPORT**  
***(Referred at Members' Request)***

1) Single and two-storey rear extensions to dwelling. Replace barn with two-storey dwelling.  
2) Single and two-storey rear extensions. Internal alterations to partitions and openings. Insertion of two first floor rear windows. Demolition of outbuilding.  
3) Demolition of outbuilding.  
Belmont, Belmont Hill. GR/TL 521-342. Exec. Estate of A K Skingley.  
*Case Officer: Hilary Lock 01799 510486*  
Expiry Date: 29/04/2003

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits, Conservation Area and Curtilage of Listed Building

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site is located in a prominent location to the north of the village centre on the western side of the main road. It comprises a listed white-rendered and slated-roofed two-storey listed building with a separate wooden barn, both on the frontage. There is a large rear garden. Access is via a shared private drive which serves five properties. The site slopes gently down to the north. The dwelling to the north is also white-rendered with a slate roof.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSALS:** It is proposed to demolish and replace the barn with a new separate 4-bed dwelling, extend the listed building to the rear with a part two and part single-storey structure with slate and clay tiles and demolish its lean-to. The dwelling would be constructed with timber-boarding with plain clay tiles. The existing access would continue to be used.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** see statement attached at end of report.

In response to objections wish to comment on design, access and pedestrian safety. The responses are made from the standpoint that our family have occupied the subject property continuously for more than one hundred years which, in our opinion, lends credibility to our comments.

Design: Objective is to restore the long time family homestead and have taken every measure possible to ensure the whole proposal should be sympathetic. The design was prepared in full consultation with the UDC Conservation Officer, who has confirmed that she has "no objections". At a loss to understand how any valid concerns, relating to the design aspect, could remain.

Access/Pedestrian Safety: Site entrance is accessed via an existing vehicular carriageway which has been used by the applicant's family for more than 100 years. It has been used not only for domestic use but also for a farm entrance, quarry entrance, and at one time for a haulage business. Whilst all of these activities were being conducted pedestrians were using the carriageway simultaneously and in living memory there have not been any incidents or injuries involving them. Professional advice was taken regarding the suitability of access. A survey confirmed that "splay views" would be met and exceeded. Visibility along the carriageway is good for drivers and pedestrians. Vehicle speeds are very low thus reducing any potential hazard. The access is also well lit. Proposed development would result in a minimal increase in traffic along the carriageway with no significant increase in hazard to pedestrians. Elderly residents of "Reynolds Court" have their own dedicated level footpath from "Graces' Acre" through to the High Street, alongside "Monte Vista". Pupils of Newport School intermittently use the carriageway. The majority use the wide pavement on the opposite (East) side of Belmont Hill that runs the whole length of the village to the railway station, which is their main destination.

**CONSULTATIONS:** ECC Transportation: no objections.

ECC Archaeology: recommend watching brief.

Environment Agency: no objections.

Specialist Design Advice: this proposal has been negotiated. No objections subject to detailed conditions.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Concerned that the frontal windows are out of keeping with the locality and would prefer a design compatible with the surrounding cottages. Access to the proposed parking is along an extended stretch of a pavement and the status of that access needs to be resolved with the Highways Authority before any application is granted. The pavement in question is a major route for schoolchildren and elderly residents from nearby Reynolds Court.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** These applications have been advertised and six representations have been received. Period expired 16 April. See letter dated 21 March attached at end of report (sent in by 3 of the objectors) which covers the points raised by all six.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues are whether the proposals would

- 1) **enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Building (ADP Policies DC2 & 5 and DLP Policies ENV1 & 2),**
- 2) **respect the amenities of neighbouring properties (ADP Policy DC14 & DLP Policy GEN4)**
- 3) **provide sufficient amenity open space and car parking facilities to meet Council standards (ADP Policies DC1 & T2 and DLP Policies GEN2 & 9) and**
- 4) **be acceptable in terms of highway safety (ADP Policy T1 and DLP Policy GEN1).**

1) The relevant Policies require that any development permitted within Conservation Areas or curtilages of Listed Buildings should protect the character, appearance and setting of the locality. The existing barn is an ordinary timber-clad building with a slate roof. It is not listed in its own right, but it contributes to the character of the street scene. Its demolition would only be acceptable if it were to be replaced with a building of architectural quality. The proposed new dwelling would occupy the identical footprint of the existing barn, with a single-storey extension to the rear. It would be 8m high at its northern end compared with 6.7m as existing. This would be 1.5m higher than the listed house and 0.7m higher than the adjacent property to the north (Thriftwood). The new dwelling would, therefore, appear as a more dominant element in the street scene than the existing barn. Its character would also change with the insertion of the proposed four windows in the front elevation.

The issue is whether these changes would protect and enhance the appearance of the area. The existing character of this part of the street scene is low-key and predominantly residential. The new house would retain the general pattern of frontage buildings and reflect the materials of the existing barn. The change from slate to clay tiles would be sympathetic with the roofing materials used on other buildings in the vicinity, notably the house immediately south of the site and would be more appropriate to the steeper pitch of the roof. The brick plinth would be harmonious with the existing barn. In all the circumstances, and following design negotiations, it is considered that the proposed house would enhance the appearance of the site. Similarly, there are no objections to the demolition of the barn or the outbuildings to the rear of the listed building, or to its extension as proposed.

2) The dwelling would be close to the common boundary with the property to the north and 1.5m higher. There would also be a single-storey extension to the rear. No windows are proposed along this side elevation, apart from two roof-lights. It is considered that there would be a marginal increase in overshadowing of the neighbour, but not materially significant to warrant refusal.

3) There would be adequate rear garden, parking and turning facilities for the new occupants of the dwelling.

4) The use of the private drive serving five dwellings would be increased by 20%, which is not considered significant. The barn could be occupied as an annexe without permission,

which could generate a similar number of additional vehicles. The Highways Authority raises no objections.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** See above.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The proposals would be appropriate and would meet all the Policy requirements.

**RECOMMENDATIONS: 1) 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.6.4. Excluding extensions without further permission.
4. C.7.1. Slab levels to be submitted, approved and implemented.
5. C.8.13. Restriction on hours of construction.  
REASON: to reduce disturbance to neighbours due to the restricted access.
6. C.16.1. Archaeological Watching Brief

**2) 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
3. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted, approved and implemented
4. C.5.4 & 5. Natural slate, hand-made clay plain tiles and feather-edged painted boarding
5. C.5.8. Painted timber window frames
6. C.5.16. No elements of historic timber frame shall be cut or removed  
Reason: to protect the fabric of the listed building

**3) UNCONDITIONAL CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT**

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## UTT/0319/03/FUL – FELSTED

Change of use of poultry farm to boarding kennels  
Gifford House, Stebbing Road. GR/TL 678-215. Mr & Mrs Brown.  
*Case Officer: Katherine Benjafield 01799 510494*  
Expiry Date: 16/05/2003

**NOTATION:** Outside Development Limits / Adjacent to the Flicht Way

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site is located approximately 1.2km to the north of Felsted village and forms a boundary with the Flichtway immediately to the south. It comprises a disused poultry farm and has four poultry sheds located on it. The building that the application relates to is the southern of the two larger sheds and has a length of approximately 63m. The maximum height of the shed is 4m excluding the roof vents. There is a grassed area to the south of the poultry sheds and a mature hedge forms the boundary to the Flichtway.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The proposal would involve the change of use of part of one of the disused poultry sheds for use as a boarding kennels. It is proposed that the exterior of the building would remain largely the same as it is in its present form. The only external alteration would be the removal of the existing ventilation boxes with glazing being inserted in their place.

It is proposed that the area of land to the south of the shed would be fenced for use as an exercise area. In addition, the area between the shed that the application relates to and the shed to the north would be fenced off for use as a holding area for dogs while their kennels are cleaned.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See letter accompanying the application and noise survey submitted by applicants attached at end of report.

With reference to our change of use concerning the recommended conditions. The main one we are concerned about, and wondered if it would be possible to change, is the one that limits one dog to a kennel. We presume the idea is to minimise noise, certainly something we would readily endorse. But if we have a customer with more than one dog and they are used to sharing accommodation at home and are then separated when boarded they will be unduly stressed. Stress usually leads to barking thus causing unnecessary noise. Under these circumstances it would obviously be beneficial to house them together, something this condition should preclude. So in order to facilitate the efficiency of the establishment we would ask for this unusual condition to be varied or even removed.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Environment Agency: Copy of letter sent to applicants making advisory comments regarding the storage and disposal of animal wastes.

Environmental Services: No adverse comments. Further comments to be reported.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No comment.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** 11 objections plus 1 petition registering objections. Notification period expired 29 April.

Main points of letters and petition are that the proposal would:

1. result in an unacceptably high level of noise as a result of dogs barking.
2. generate a level of traffic which would not be suitable for the road.
3. generate unacceptable levels of smells and animal waste.
4. be in an unsuitable location adjacent to the Flichtway.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues are whether the proposal complies with

- 1) **Policy S2 of the Adopted District Plan – Countryside beyond the Green Belt and the Stansted Airport Countryside Protection Zone (C5 – Structure Plan, S7 – Deposit Draft Local Plan)**
- 2) **Policy C5 of the Adopted District Plan – The re-use of rural buildings (RE2 – Structure Plan, E4 – Deposit Draft Local Plan) and**
- 3) **Policy DC14 of the Adopted District Plan – General Amenity (GEN4 – Deposit Draft Local Plan)**

1) Policy S2 states that development will not normally be approved in the countryside beyond Development Limits unless it relates to agriculture, forestry, appropriate outdoor recreational uses or appropriate changes of use of suitable existing buildings. It is considered that the proposal would be an appropriate change of use of the vacant poultry shed and as it does not involve any new buildings it would comply with the above policy.

2) Policy C5 relating to the re-use of rural buildings specifies that the buildings should not require substantial reconstruction and must not impair the important characteristics of the surrounding countryside. In addition, the new use should respect the rural amenities of the area and have satisfactory accessibility and adequate space for associated activities. The existing poultry shed that the change of use relates to would require very little external alterations and the works would not amount to substantial reconstruction. There is adequate space within the application site for any associated activities and the access is considered to be satisfactory. It is not considered that the level of traffic generated by people using the kennels would be so great that it would significantly increase the overall traffic movements along this road in Felsted. There are no parking standards for a boarding kennels use, however there is sufficient area available to accommodate customer parking.

3) Policy DC14 of the Adopted District Plan states that development which would adversely affect the reasonable occupation and enjoyment of a residential property will not normally be permitted. Concerns have been raised that the proposed change of use would generate excessive noise and smells. The applicants have submitted a report from a company specialising in noise surveys and assessments which states that there are a number of measures that can be undertaken by the applicants in order to reduce any noise generated from the kennels. It is considered that these measures could be achieved through the use of conditions and would minimise the potential noise created by dogs barking. In addition, conditions could also be imposed to control the storage and disposal of animal waste which would reduce the likelihood of smells being generated.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** The issues raised in the representation letters and the petition have been noted, the noise and smell issues can be controlled by condition while the traffic generated would not be of a volume that would be significantly greater than that which already uses the road. The owners of the Flitch Way have been notified of the proposal and their comments were made at the Members' Site Visit.

**CONCLUSION:** It is considered that the building is suitable for re-use and that the change to boarding kennels would be appropriate subject to conditions being imposed to control noise issues and the storage and disposal of waste.

**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. There shall be no more than 20 dogs housed in the building at any one time and there shall be only one dog housed in each unit comprised of one kennel and one run area, except if two dogs are from the same family and need to be boarded together.  
REASON: To prevent implementation in the interests of residential amenity.
4. Dogs shall only be collected or left at the kennels between the hours 10.00 and 12.30 Mondays to Saturday and 16.00 and 18.00 Monday to Saturday. There shall be no collections or deliveries of dogs on Sundays or Bank and Public Holidays.  
REASON: To protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.



5. Prior to the first use of the building for kennels, details of the boundary fencing for the exercise area to the south of the shed shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, the exercise area shall be implemented in accordance with these details and shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To protect the amenity of neighbouring properties and users of the Flich Way.
6. Prior to the first use of the building for kennels, details of the construction of the pen located immediately to the north of the shed and the solid barrier to the west for use while cleaning individual kennels, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, the pen shall be implemented in accordance with these details and shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. No more than one dog shall be held in this pen at any one time.
7. Prior to the first use of the building for kennels, details of how the dogs will be visually impeded from each other when in the kennels and runs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, the kennels and runs shall be implemented in accordance with these details and shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
8. Prior to the first use of the building for kennels, details of the storage and disposal of waste materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, the storage and disposal of waste shall be implemented in accordance with these details and shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
9. Prior to the first use of the building for kennels, details of the noise attenuation measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, the noise attenuation measures shall be implemented in accordance with these details and shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
10. Prior to the first use of the building for kennels, details of the removal of the side air vents and their replacement with glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, the replacement of the air vents with glazing shall be implemented in accordance with these details and shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON 6-10: In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.
11. No lighting shall be erected within the application site unless details have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To protect the character of the open countryside.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0404/03/FUL – WIMBISH**

Change of use of barn from approved annex to full separate residential occupation).  
Highams Farm, Thaxted Road. GR/TL 607-335. L Moss.  
*Case Officer: Hilary Lock 01799 510486*  
Expiry Date: 19/05/2003

**NOTATION:** Curtilage listed buildings outside Development Limits/Within Area of Special Landscape Value

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** Highams Farm is located 600m along an access lane, off Thaxted Road approximately 2km (1.5m) north of Thaxted village. The application relates to a former stable building, located in a courtyard with a second formerly agricultural building. The buildings are curtilage listed because of their age and historical relationship with the main farmhouse, a Grade II listed building. Its construction is that of timber, brick and render under a corrugated roof. To the north and east lie the farmhouse and its associated outbuildings, and west and south agricultural farmland. Access is via an existing vehicular access to the south of the application site, shared with the farmhouse.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** Permission was granted to convert the larger of the two buildings to a dwelling in 2001, and the building subject of this application to an annex only. The proposal is now to remove the condition which restricts this building to an annex, to enable its conversion as a separate one-bedroom dwelling. The conversion works have already been approved. Two parking spaces would be provided, and ample garden area would be retained to serve both new dwellings.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See agent's letter dated 3 February 2003 attached.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Permission granted for conversion to residential annex in 2001.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Design Advice: no objections in design terms. Merits of building would meet requirements of Policy C6, but concerned that barn is too small to be converted to separate dwelling, and further extension would be unacceptable in terms of impact on the historic character and appearance. Use as separate dwelling would increase domestic paraphernalia to the detriment of the rural character of the area.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** object to removal of condition which restricts use of barn to annex only. Original condition should remain. It is important that Highams Farm remains as one unit, especially as the barns are in the grounds of a listed building.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and no representations have been received. Period expired 18 May 2003.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** the main issues are whether the proposal

- 2) **Would meet the criteria relating to the residential conversion of rural buildings (ADP Policy C6 and DLP Policy H5, and ERSP Policy RE2) and**
- 3) **to use the barn as a separate dwelling rather than an annex would materially harm the setting of the listed building or the amenities of the countryside (ADP Policy DC5 and DLP Policy ENV2).**

1) The Council's Policies require that the buildings to be considered for separate residential conversion are sound and enhance the character and appearance of the rural area through their historic, traditional or historic form. Design Advice is that this structure satisfies these criteria, but there is concern that due to the small size of the barn it would be unable to offer an acceptable range of accommodation. Planning permission in the future

would be unlikely to be forthcoming for further extensions to the building, as this would destroy its historic character. Such advice was given to the applicant by officers prior to the submission of this application.

However, although re-use of the building could be achieved by conversion to an annex, it is not considered reasonable to refuse the application solely on the size of the resultant dwelling. Other District Plan policies encourage the provision of smaller units of accommodation in the countryside, and the Council would need to consider any future proposals for extension on their merits.

2) The access arrangements and external layout around the building would be unaltered from the previously approved scheme, and it is not considered the additional activity resulting from independent occupation of this unit would be sufficiently harmful to the setting of the listed building or the countryside to warrant refusal. The conversion could be undertaken without any adverse impact on residential amenity.

It is recommended that a note be added to the decision notice advising that planning permission would be unlikely to be forthcoming for any extension or outbuildings to serve the new dwelling because of their effect on its character.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** The comments of the Parish Council are addressed above.

**CONCLUSION:** The removal of the condition restricting use to an annex is considered acceptable, as the harm which would result from independent use would not be sufficient to warrant refusal. Further any future extensions or outbuildings would need to be considered on their merits, but could be resisted if detrimental to the historic character, appearance and setting of the curtilage listed building.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.3. To be implemented in accordance with original and 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 within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse without further permission.
6. C.11.7. Standard vehicle parking facilities.
7. C.19.1. Avoidance of overlooking –1.

**Note to accompany decision notice:** re no extensions likely to be granted

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**1) UTT/0453/03/DFO, 2) UTT/0455/03/DFO & 3) UTT/0456/03/DFO – TAKELEY**

**(Only no. 2) remains undermined)**

- 1) Construction of a petrol filling station inc. forecourts (including canopies, pumps and underground tanks), shop (class A1), ATM, car and jet washes, other car care facilities, parking, landscaping and associated access.
  - 2) Construction of hotel with associated parking, landscaping, servicing and ancillary works & operations.
  - 3) Construction of access road plus landscaping, lighting and ancillary works & operations South Gate Site, Stansted Airport. GR/TL 547-221. BAA Lynton.
- Case Officer: Jeremy Pine 01799 510460*  
Expiry Date: 26/05/2003

**NOTATION:** Within Southern Ancillary Area in both ADP and DLP (Policy AIR3 relates).

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The South Gate site is located to the south of Bassingbourn roundabout, immediately southwest of the mid stay car park. Thremhall Avenue lies to the northwest and the line of the new A120 (currently under construction) is to the south. To the east, feeding off the Bassingbourn roundabout is a local distributor roundabout which currently serves the mid stay car park, further spurs having already been constructed when the roundabout was built to serve the South Gate site and to provide a link (Trinity Bridge) into the airport road system from the new A120 for motorists coming from and going to the east. This link also serves the balancing pond.

The South Gate site is roughly triangular in shape, measuring approximately 470m along the boundary with the new A120 and 200m in depth from the same boundary towards Bassingbourn roundabout. The total site area is 5.6 hectares (13.85 acres). The site rises gently from south to north and is at a lower level than Thremhall Avenue, from which it is separated by a planted embankment established in 1990. The link road running to the east of the site between the two roundabouts is also set at a higher level. The new A120 is at the same level as the site, but there will be a bund and planting to the south of the road alignment approved as part of the A120 road improvements.

An ancient hedgerow runs SE-NW across the western part of the South Gate site and there is a major underground service corridor across part of the eastern side. Neither would be affected by any of these current proposals.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSALS: 1) UTT/0453/03/DFO (Petrol Filling Station**

A petrol filling station would be erected on a 110m x 60m (0.66 ha) plot (known as Plot 2) roughly in the centre of the southern part of the South Gate site immediately north of the new A120 and behind a mixed native hedgerow approved as part of the A120 road improvements. The proposals would include separate car and HGV fuel forecourts (including curved 6m high canopies, underground tanks and pump islands), a single storey sales building measuring 24 x 15 x 4.2m, ATM machine, ancillary car parking, car and jet washes, other car care facilities and border planting. Access would be taken from the internal site road (see UTT/0456/03/DFO). The submitted drawings show indicative corporate signs for a BP franchise – these will be subject to a separate application for express advertisement consent.

The sales building would be located close to the northern boundary of the plot, as would the car fuel forecourt. The HGV fuel forecourt would be to the south, served by a dedicated entry lane and exit in the interests of safety.

The main finish of the structures would be grey with corporate green and yellow to the sales building and car wash fascias and the canopy edges. Amongst measures to achieve energy efficiency, recycling and waste management, the canopies would incorporate solar technology, and use of recycled water would be made for the car wash and toilet flushing.

## 2) UTT/0455/03/DFO (Hotel)

A budget hotel would be erected on an irregularly shaped 1.2 ha plot (known as Plot 1) roughly in the centre of the northern part of the South Gate site immediately south of Bassingbourn roundabout and opposite Plot 2 (proposed petrol filling station). The hotel would contain 256 bedrooms (to be developed in two phases, but all applied for now) with 175 car parking spaces, cycle storage and landscaping. All access would be via the internal site road (see UTT/0456/03/DFO) with a barriered entrance/exit for staff and resident guests at the eastern end of the plot and a separate entrance to a service yard/turning head at the western end.

The hotel would be located at the western end of the plot and would consist of two wings extending in a “v” shape from a central atrium area, giving a broken appearance in distant views from the south and east. The building would be of 4 storeys, with the finished floor level cut into the ground by 1.5m, and with a roof of swept delta wing appearance with a monopitch over each wing. All mechanical and electrical plant would be contained within the roofspace. The height of the building would be 16m, all but the top 5m of which would currently be screened from Thremhall Avenue by the established bank and planting. External materials would match those on other airport buildings, consisting of masonry, glazing, render, cladding and louvres in shades of grey.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of 80 bedrooms would be constructed as an extension to the northernmost wing of the hotel, giving an asymmetric appearance.

The proposed lighting to the car park would match that in the mid stay car park, consisting of 5m columns with a horizontal cut-off. All lighting would contain low energy fittings, controlled by time clocks and photocells. Other measures to achieve energy efficiency, recycling and waste management would include key card/central switching (to ensure bedroom lights and heating are turned off when the room is not in use) and a linen re-use programme.

## 3) UTT/0456/03/DFO (Infrastructure Works)

This application is for the infrastructure works that are required to service the individual plots. An internal site road from the roundabout spur would be constructed running E-W across the South Gate site, off which the hotel and petrol filling station (and other future plots) would be accessed. The road would be capable of future extension to the west to service the rest of the South Gate site as/when required. Perimeter planting would also be undertaken around both Plots 1 and 2, consisting of Hornbeam hedges and Ash and Field Maple to minimise the risk of bird strike. This perimeter planting would be in addition to the planting proposed within the individual plots. Finally, the established woodland planting along the northern boundary of the site adjacent to Thremhall Avenue would be extended around the northeastern side of the South Gate site to provide more screening of the hotel from the east.

The application drawing also shows Plots 3 and 4, these being located to the east of Plots 1 and 2 respectively. No proposals for Plots 3 and 4, through which the major underground service corridor runs, have currently been put forward.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** 4 statements in A3 format have been submitted, copies of which can be inspected at the District Council's Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow offices. These are entitled *Development Overview and Strategic Guidance, Infrastructure Works Supporting Statement, Filling Station Supporting Statement and Hotel Supporting Statement*.

The main points relating to each of the applications are:

### 1) UTT/0453/03/DFO (Petrol Filling Station)

- Will negate the need for on-airport operators, such as taxi drivers and freight forwarders, to make unnecessary off-airport trips for fuel
- Will allow airport bound and returning passengers to meet their fuel and related needs without making dedicated off-line trips to seek alternative provision

- The provision of complementary on-site services, between the forecourt and sales building, maximises the opportunity for linked trips
- The provision of LPG, partial use of solar power, incorporation of the latest vapour recovery techniques and the use of grey water and passive heating/cooling will contribute to the principles of sustainable development

## 2) UTT/0455/03/DFO (Hotel)

- The provision of 175 car park spaces for a 256 bed hotel constrains car use and therefore contributes to the general BAA policy of encouraging journeys to the airport by modes other than the private car
- A comprehensive staff travel plan to encourage use of public transport
- The design of the building seeks to maintain the “airport in the countryside” and subsequent mitigation is proposed so that the development is in harmony with the visual setting
- 4 storeys provides an efficient plan for hotel operation, reducing circulation, the building footprint and mass to minimise construction and operation costs
- The location within the site reduces on site vehicular movements and emissions while maximising the area available for landscaping
- Additional on-airport provision, and the specific provision of a budget hotel will reduce the need for additional car journeys to hotels in the surrounding countryside
- Provision of employment opportunities during construction and operation
- Incorporation of “green” initiatives such as use of passive heat, low energy lighting and thermal insulation

## 3) UTT/0456/03/DFO (Infrastructure works)

- Proposals accord with the guidelines for development within the airport, particularly in respect of landscaping
- Proposals represent part of a co-ordinated lighting package for the whole site

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Outline planning permission granted subject to conditions in 1985 by the Secretaries of State for the Environment and Transport for the expansion of Stansted Airport to about 15 million passengers per annum (mppa). The permission included a new passenger terminal, cargo handling and general aviation facilities, hotel accommodation, taxiways (including the widening of a proposed taxiway to be used as an emergency runway), associated facilities (including infrastructure for aircraft maintenance and other tenants’ developments) and related road access. A condition of the outline permission requires that the reserved matters be submitted within 20 years (i.e. by 5/6/05).

Further conditions of the outline planning permission require, *inter alia*, that the main internal road layout and the location of hotels within the site be agreed via general layout plans for 8 & about 15mppa phases (approved 9/4/86) and that the height of any hotels not within the terminal area not exceed 3 storeys in height except with the written agreement of the local planning authority.

Reserved matters submissions relating to phase 1 expansion to 8mppa were made and approved during the late 1980’s and early 1990’s. Phase 2 expansion from 8-about 15mppa was approved in April 1999.

Members resolved to grant outline planning permission for expansion of Stansted Airport from about 15mppa – 25mppa in September 2002 subject to conditions and a legal agreement (completion pending). In the Environmental Statement that accompanied that application, the development of the South Gate site was taken as being part of the Phase 2 expansion to about 15mppa and was, therefore, part of the cumulative impact at about 15mppa against which further expansion to 25mppa was assessed.

**CONSULTATIONS:** 1) UTT/0453/03/DFO (Petrol Filling Station)  
ECC Transportation: No objections subject to conditions.

Thames Water: Drainage, pollution control and trade effluent discharge details (from car wash) require to be agreed.

Environment Agency: To be reported (due 23/4)

BAA Safeguarding: To be reported (due 23/4)

ECC Archaeology: No objections subject to investigative works.

### 2) UTT/0455/03/DFO (Hotel)

ECC Transportation: No objections subject to conditions.

Thames Water: Drainage and pollution control details require to be agreed.

Environment Agency: To be reported (due 23/4)

BAA Safeguarding: To be reported (due 23/4)

Essex Police Community Safety: No objections, but do have concerns regarding car park security. Request a condition requiring hotel and car park to be subject to “Secured by Design” and “Secured Car Park” certification respectively.

ECC Archaeology: No objections subject to investigative works.

### 3) UTT/0456/03/DFO (Infrastructure Works)

ECC Transportation: No objections.

Environment Agency: No comments

BAA Safeguarding: To be reported (due 23/4)

Essex Police Community Safety: No comments.

ECC Archaeology: No objections subject to investigative works.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** 1) UTT/0453/03/DFO (Petrol Filling Station): No

objections subject to suitable low-level lighting to prevent an increase in light pollution.

UTT/0455/03/DFO (Hotel): Object. Only 175 car parking spaces shown for 256 bedroom hotel (risk of increased fly parking). Increase in light pollution. Concern re poor design.

UTT/0456/03/DFO (Infrastructure Works): No objections subject to lighting levels being kept as low as possible.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** These applications have been advertised and no representations have been received. Period expired 30/4/03.

### **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** 1) UTT/0453/03/DFO (Petrol Filling Station)

The main issues are whether:

- 1) the provision of a petrol filling station would be an appropriate facility within the Southern Ancillary Area (ERSP Policy T14, ADP Policies AIR3 & T3 (b), and DLP Policies AIR3 & T2),
- 2) the design and lighting would be appropriate and neighbourly (ADP Policies DC1 & 14 and DLP Policies GEN2, 4 & 5) and
- 3) the access would be convenient and safe (ERSP Policy T3, ADP Policies T1 & 2 and DLP Policy GEN1).

1) In BAA's supporting letter of 25/7/80 which accompanied the outline application for expansion to about 15mppa, a petrol filling station was included within the list of associated facilities for the purposes of the application description. Evidence presented by BAA during the 1980's Airport Inquiry put forward a site for the petrol filling station between the M11 slip roads and the airport access road running from the Birchanger Interchange to Priory Wood roundabouts (now part of the Strategic Landscape Area following the approval of the 8-about 15mppa layout plans in 1986). It was intended that this facility would be complementary to the motorway service area to the southwest of the Birchanger Interchange. In his report following the Inquiry the Inspector additionally commented, "*The on-airport facility might, at some future date, operate as a second motorway service area to cater for the needs of the southbound motorist*".

The relocation of the petrol filling station to the South Gate site would help retain the integrity of the Strategic Landscape Area as proposed in the 8 & about 15mppa layout plans, and would be consistent with both Policies AIR3. The wordings of both AIR3 Policies do not

specifically refer to petrol filling stations within the Southern Ancillary Area, but the uses referred to in the policies are not exclusive and the principle of a petrol filling station was established during the Inquiry. Being within an area allocated for development, Officers do not consider that the petrol filling station would contravene either ADP Policy T3 (b) or DLP Policy T2, the principal aims of which are to prevent development in the countryside unrelated to essential motoring need. A petrol filling station on the South Gate Site would be well positioned to meet airport-related needs and also to cater for any need that would exist on behalf of motorists travelling along the new A120 between Bishops Stortford and Braintree. Approval here would help to resist other similar greenfield proposals along the line of the new A120.

2) The design of the petrol filling station would be appropriate to the location and, in addition to the border planting proposed as part of the application, the perimeter planting proposed under UTT/0456/03/DFO and the proposed planting in association with the new A120 should assist in reducing its visual impact, including any spill of lighting. Details of forecourt lighting will be the subject of a condition.

3) There are no objections to the proposed access points off the estate road, which forms part of UTT/0456/03/DFO. Adequate on site parking and waiting facilities would be provided.

## **2) UTT/0455/03/DFO (Hotel)**

**The main issues are whether:**

- 1) the provision of a hotel would be an appropriate facility within the Southern Ancillary Area (ERSP Policy LRT10, ADP Policies AIR3 & REC5, and DLP Policies AIR3 & LC6),**
- 2) the design and lighting would be appropriate and neighbourly (ADP Policies DC1 & 14 and DLP Policies GEN2, 4 & 5) and**
- 3) the access and parking would be convenient and safe (ERSP Policy T3, ADP Policies T1, 2 & 4 and DLP Policies GEN1 & 9).**

1) On the general layout plan for about 15mppa, which was approved in 1986 as a reserved matter, 3 sites for hotels within the airport development boundary were shown. The first was the Hilton adjacent to the long-term car park (now built), the second was to the northeast of the terminal (under construction for Radisson SAS) and the third was immediately to the east of Bassingbourn roundabout. The construction of the mid-stay car park on the land to the east of Bassingbourn roundabout has resulted in some revisions to the about 15mppa layout plan, one of which has been the relocation of the third hotel site to immediately to the south of the roundabout. The wordings of both AIR3 Policies do not specifically refer to hotels within the Southern Ancillary Area, but the uses referred to in the policies are not exclusive and the principle of a third hotel remains established via the about 15mppa layout plan, notwithstanding the revised location, which is of no material consequence in land use terms. The provision of airport related hotels within the airport development boundary is, in any case, encouraged by the other ERSP, ADP and DLP policies referred to under main issue 1.

Evidence presented by BAA during the 1980's Airport Inquiry, and subsequently noted in the Inspector's report, indicated that some 850 bedrooms might be required within the airport development boundary to serve about 15mppa. If these reserved matters were granted, total provision would be 994 bedrooms within the boundary once all phases of all 3 hotels are completed. The increase in bedroom numbers is justified by changes in passenger traffic forecasting which has occurred since 1981, in particular:

- the catchment area being slightly larger than originally estimated, resulting in some passengers travelling further distances and requiring overnight accommodation,
- a higher proportion of scheduled traffic than originally estimated with relatively high business usage seeking overnight accommodation to maximise the business day, and



- the extensive growth of low cost carriers where passengers seek matching cost accommodation to utilise early/late flights.

Officers are of the view that it is in the public interest and is also more sustainable for extra bedrooms to be provided within the airport boundary on the allocated sites when this is possible, rather than in locations beyond the airport.

2) It is considered that the design of the hotel would be appropriate to this location, and its positioning within the South Gate site would enable the maximum screening benefit to be gained from the existing structural planting to the north as well as from the perimeter planting proposed under UTT/0456/03/DFO. Although the hotel would be of 4 storeys opposed to the 3 anticipated when outline planning permission was granted, the ground level would be lowered to minimise its impact and the additional storey would reduce the ground coverage of the building. Officers are satisfied that the “v” shaped plan form of the hotel would assist in reducing the visual impact of the building from the south. The detail of car park lighting will be the subject of a condition.

3) There are no objections to the proposed access points off the estate road, which forms part of UTT/0456/03/DFO. Adequate on site car parking for staff and resident guests would be provided, taking into account the applicant’s commitment to reduce journeys by private car. Longer term parking for air passengers would be prohibited.

### **3) UTT/0456/03/DFO (Infrastructure Works)**

**The main issue is whether the layout of the site road and the proposed perimeter planting would be appropriate within the Southern Ancillary Area (ADP & DLP Policies AIR3).**

As anticipated on the about 15mppa layout plan, the site road would feed into the link within the airport road system southeast of Bassingbourn roundabout, and would serve all the individual plots. The perimeter hedge planting around Plots 1 and 2 would be appropriate in terms of location and mix. The extension to the woodland edge planting around the northeastern edge of the South Gate site would also be appropriate and is welcomed in reducing the visual impact from the east.

**CONCLUSIONS:** These proposals begin the development of the South Gate site as an integral part of the Southern Ancillary Area. Officers are satisfied that the provision of a petrol filling station and a budget hotel are reasonably required, even if their timing has been delayed relative to the throughput of passengers at the airport.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS: APPROVALS WITH CONDITIONS**

### **1) UTT/0453/03/DFO (Petrol Filling Station)**

1. Except where Condition 2 is varied by Condition 3, the development hereby permitted shall be implemented in all respects strictly in accordance with the submitted plans contained in the application, unless agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure the development will be carried out as approved.

2. The landscaping works shown on drawing ref STANSTED.F.S.PLANTING Rev C, and any variation to them required by Condition 3, shall be carried out during the first planting season following the opening to the public of the petrol filling station hereby permitted. Any part of the landscaping works which within a period of 5 years following the opening to the public die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.

REASON: The landscaping of this site is required to minimise the visual impact of the development hereby permitted.

3. No development shall commence until measures to prevent dazzle to motorists using the new A120 from vehicle headlights within the site have been submitted to and agreed in

writing with the local planning authority. The agreed measures shall be in place prior to the opening to the public of the petrol filling station hereby permitted and thereafter retained, including any temporary measures required pending the carrying out and establishment of the landscaping works under Condition 2.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

4. The external materials to be used in the construction of the building and structures hereby permitted shall be those specified in the Filling Station Supporting Statement submitted as part of the application.

REASON: In the interests of the appearance of the site.

5. C.7.1. Details of external ground and internal floor levels to be submitted and agreed.

REASON: To reduce the visual impact of the development hereby permitted.

6. No development shall commence until details of the means of disposal of surface water and foul drainage (including trade effluent) have been submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The development shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To prevent pollution.

7. Details of the positioning of all forecourt lighting (which shall be in accordance with the Filling Station Supporting Statement submitted as part of the application) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to installation. Subsequently, the approved lighting shall not be altered without the written approval of the local planning authority.

REASON: To reduce glare and in the interests of aviation safety.

8. All the parking and waiting areas shown on drawing ref STANSTED/PLAN Rev C shall be provided and made available for use prior to the opening to the public of the petrol filling station hereby permitted, and subsequently retained in perpetuity.

REASON: To reduce off-site parking.

9. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented and subsequently managed in accordance with the measures to achieve energy efficiency, recycling and waste management and a reduction in the use of harmful chemicals set out in the Filling Station Supporting Statement submitted as part of the application.

10. No development shall commence until details of measures to encourage staff to travel to and from work by means other than the motor car have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority

REASON for 9 & 10: To promote sustainable development.

11. The detailing and positioning of any new signs facing the A120, and of any subsequent alterations to them shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the local planning authority prior to their erection or alteration.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

## **2) UTT/0455/03/DFO (Hotel)**

1. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans

2. The landscaping works shown on drawing number 419/2/1 B shall be carried out during the first planting season following the opening to the public of the hotel hereby permitted. Any part of the landscaping works which within a period of 5 years following the opening to the public die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.

REASON: The landscaping of this site is required to minimise the visual impact of the development hereby permitted.

3. The external materials to be used in the construction of the hotel hereby permitted shall be those specified in the Hotel Development Supporting Statement submitted as part of the application.

REASON: In the interests of the appearance of the site.

4. C.7.1. Details of external ground and internal floor levels to be submitted and agreed.

REASON: To reduce the visual impact of the development hereby permitted.

5. No development shall commence until details of the means of disposal of surface water and foul drainage have been submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning

authority. The development shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To prevent pollution.

6. Details of the positioning of all car park lighting (which shall be in accordance with the Hotel Development Supporting Statement submitted as part of the application) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to installation. Subsequently, the approved lighting shall not be altered without the written approval of the local planning authority.

REASON: To reduce glare and in the interests of aviation safety.

7. Unless otherwise agreed as part of a phased programme, all the car parking spaces and waiting areas shown on drawing number 01 R shall be provided and made available for use prior to the opening to the public of the hotel hereby permitted, and subsequently retained in perpetuity.

REASON: To reduce off-site parking.

8. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented and subsequently managed in accordance with the measures to achieve energy efficiency, recycling and waste management and a reduction in the use of harmful chemicals set out in the Hotel Development Supporting Statement submitted as part of the application.

9. No development shall commence until details of measures to encourage staff to travel to and from work by means other than the motor car have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority

REASON for 8 & 9: To promote sustainable development.

10. C.25.1. No airport related car parking other than for resident guests.

11. The footways shown on drawing 419/2/1/B shall be provided prior to the opening to the public of the hotel hereby permitted and thereafter retained in perpetuity.

REASON: In the interests of pedestrian safety.

12. The detailing and positioning of any new signs facing the A120, and of any subsequent alterations to them shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the local planning authority prior to their erection or alteration.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

13. No development shall commence until details of measures to improve public and staff safety and security on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved measures shall be implemented prior to the opening to the public of the hotel hereby permitted and thereafter retained in perpetuity.

REASON: In the interests of public and staff safety and security.

### **3) UTT/0456/03/DFO (Infrastructure works)**

1. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans

2. The structural and perimeter landscaping works shown on drawing number 419/1 D shall be carried out during the first planting season following the opening to the public of the hotel or petrol filling station, to whichever they relate. Any part of the landscaping works which within a period of 5 years following the opening to the public die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.

REASON: The structural and perimeter landscaping is required to minimise the visual impact of development on the South Gate site.

*Background papers: see application files.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## UTT/1513/02/FUL - LITTLE CHESTERFORD

New central facilities building, new research building, new start up research units, realignment of internal road, balancing pond, water storage tank, landscape works. Chesterford Research Park. GR/TL 535-420. Norwich Union Life & Pensions.

Case Officer: John Mitchell 01799 510450

Expiry Date: 13/12/2002

**NOTATION:** Within area covered by Local Policy 1, Chesterford Research Park in ADP and DLP.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The Chesterford Research Park is located to the east of Little Chesterford and to the north of Saffron Walden. It is a well established research site that has undergone a considerable period of change recently as the previous single occupier, Aventis, has withdrawn from the site and different research companies have moved in. The new owner (Norwich Union) is undertaking a programme of improvements including upgrading existing buildings and planting. Access is taken from the B184 via a new roundabout which has recently been completed. The research park is based around a Victorian country house standing in grounds of approximately 100 hectares. There are approximately 70 buildings distributed around the site with a total floor area of approximately 32,500 sq m.

The site comprises a group of some 18 outdated research buildings in the south west corner of the research park with a total floor area of 3,370 sq m. They are currently vacant but were used for a variety of research and ancillary activities including agricultural trials. There are also areas of concrete hardstanding which will be broken up.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** It is proposed to demolish the 18 outdated research buildings and erect:

1. **A new central facilities building** of 2,719 sq m, replacing the old small staff restaurant and providing a modern restaurant for all those employed on the site, including a gym and meeting rooms available for use by businesses on the site. It would not be open to the general public. It would be of flat-roofed modern design, approximately 10m high with a central feature of 11.5m, a maximum width of 55m and a maximum depth of 30m.
2. **New start up and research units.** The building would be designed to provide a series of modern small research units for small companies and new businesses. It would have a floor area of 1,444 sq m, have a barrel roof rising to a height of 12m, with a width of 38m and a depth of 25m. Materials would be brick with an aluminium roof
3. **New Research building.** This would be an L-shaped building and have two stories of laboratories in the southern wing, with a plant area above, and a smaller administrative wing to the north, linked by a central entrance and core. The floor area would be 3,968m, the maximum height being 14m. The laboratory area would be 57m long and 20m wide, and the office wing 36m long and 16m wide. Materials and design features, including the use of flat and barrel roofs, would be common to the other two buildings.

The net increase in floor area, allowing for demolitions, would be 4,221 sq m. The total new floor area would be 7,591 sq m.

In addition, an underground water reservoir for fire-fighting is proposed, a balancing pond to the south where the land falls away from the development area, a realignment of the loop road in the vicinity of the site, and new pedestrian routes through the inner park and a new water feature wrapping round the eastern side of the arboretum.

A total of 204 parking spaces would be provided distributed as follows: 113 to serve the research building, 42 to serve the start up units and 59 to serve the central facilities unit. A travel plan is also in place and it is proposed to augment this with the running of a minibus service to and from local railway stations.

A Traffic Impact Assessment accompanies the application which concludes that the junctions will accommodate all the traffic generated by the additional development and, in order to reduce the potential effects on the highway network it is proposed to introduce a bus service to and from local railway stations. Finally a comprehensive landscaping scheme accompanies the application. This concludes:

*“The design of the exterior environment of Chesterford Research Park aims to take a holistic approach working carefully and sensitively with the genius loci to create a landscape which responds to the inherent riches of both the historic and rural landscape. The proposals recognise that features outside the application site such as the Mansion, the Estate Cottages, the arboretum and the nearby ancient woodland are vital in contributing to the sense of place and crucially provide the constraints and opportunities on which the concept of the design is founded.*

*Essentially the landscape treatment is a tapestry of interpretations from the past, present and proposed landscapes, deriving particular inspiration from the surviving historic landscape and manifest reinterpretation of parkland. The landscape will also provide a thoroughly modern threshold appropriate to a modern research establishment and a robust response to the site’s character – this is particularly evident in the outer park area of new woodland planting proposed for the western boundary.*

*Ultimately the aim is to site the new building s sensitively within the landscape, minimising impact on the outside environs while at the same time making a positive contribution to the existing, rather neglected, Chesterford Park landscape. These proposals will undoubtedly deliver an attractive landscape setting, a pleasant working environment, and a framework for conservation and enhancement”*

**APPLICANT’S CASE:** See supporting statement attached at the end of this report.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** The history is long and varied. In June 2000 most of the planning uses were rationalised to permit B1 (b) uses (research and development). Several new research buildings have been constructed. Planning permission has been granted for a new access road and roundabout to the B184, subject to a Section 106 Agreement requiring, inter alia, a Travel Plan. This Plan includes provision for a travel co-ordinator to be designated for the site, with responsibility for arranging a car sharing scheme.

This application, submitted on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2002, has been placed “on hold” pending the approval of a Master Plan for the whole site. Officers considered that the Master Plan submitted with the application was inadequate and sought a comprehensive Plan. This was approved by the Environment and Transport Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2003, after being modified following public consultation.

**CONSULTATIONS:** ECC Transportation: No objection.

ECC Archaeology: Field evaluation by trial trenching.

Environment Agency: No objections subject to conditions

Anglian Water: No objections

Environmental Services: Remediation measures will be required should any contamination be found.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Object: Increase in size of developed area.  
Master Plan is inadequate.

The Central Services Building should not be allowed, as it is not a facility for research and development.

The balancing pond is outside the Development Zone.

The TIA is incorrect and its conclusions invalid.

There will be increased potential for accidents along the B184, especially at Springwell.

The bus routes may pass through Little Chesterford.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and 4 representations have been received.

1. CPREssex: Object. The Master Plan is inadequate in a number of aspects. (*Officer Comment – the Master Plan has been revised since the comment was made and subsequently approved by the E&T Committee on 10 June*).

The development cannot be properly assessed without the context of an approved Master Plan in line with Chesterford Research Park Local Policy 1;

The TIA and Travel Plan need to be reassessed in the light of new figures for square footage and employee numbers; the nature and hours of use of the central facilities building must be defined.

2 – 4. The development represents an increase in the size of the developed area some 4221 sq m above that of the 32,516 sq m for which there is permission – a 13% increase. It is disingenuous for the applicants to put forward the argument that the central facilities building is a common facilities building and does not need to be taken into account in the assessment of the effect of the overall increase in size of the development; the Central Service Building should be assessed as if were a leisure facility: there is no provision for this in the District Plan; the balancing pond is outside the development area; the master plan does not fulfil the requirements of the Local Plan policy; the TIA is flawed, as are the assumptions on which it is based; the use of buses will not significantly decrease traffic; there may be more accidents along the B184.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues are whether the proposal complies with

- 1) the Chesterford Park Local Policy 1 in the ADP and DLP and
- 2) the approved Master Plan.

1) Chesterford Local Park Policy 1 in the ADP presumes in favour of development ancillary to the main use of the site as a research station, provided that such development is appropriate to a parkland setting. Chesterford Local Park Policy in the DLP permits the development of facilities for research and development in the development zone of 15.59ha subject to 5 criteria. These are:

**a) They are compatible with its parkland setting**

The proposed buildings are low-rise in scale and would be seen in the context of the parkland setting of The Mansion. They would not be visible from outside the estate. It is considered that the proposal complies with (a).

**b) The proposals include a comprehensive landscaping scheme to help assimilate development into the parkland setting**

A comprehensive landscaping scheme accompanies the proposal, which is considered acceptable.

**c) The Mansion, Garden House and Emanuel Cottage are preserved**

The proposal is neutral in regard to these properties.

**d) A comprehensive traffic impact assessment that the movement likely to be generated can be properly accommodated on the surrounding transport network and that measures are proposed to ensure that as high a proportion of**

***journeys as is reasonably feasible in the context of the site will be by modes other than the private car.***

The application is accompanied by a traffic impact assessment (TIA) and the County Highways Authority has no objections. There is already a Travel Plan in place and recent surveys suggest that 22% of single occupancy drivers are willing to travel by train if a bus service were available. The proposal to start a bus service to local railway stations as part of the Travel Plan is therefore welcomed. Cycle parks will be provided. The Council's standard for car parking for developments of this type is one space per 35 sq m. The total parking provision is 204 spaces for 7491 sq m of development, which complies with the Council's standards. Given that these standards are derived with a view to reducing dependence on the private car when compared with previous standards, this level of provision is considered acceptable. It is considered that the proposed development complies with criterion (d).

***e) The transport needs of the development can be accommodated whilst maintaining or improving road safety and the surrounding environmental conditions for the local community without the need for engineering measures that would detract from the countryside character of the area.***

There are no additional physical infrastructure requirements arising from the proposal. The provision of a bus service will help to improve road safety in the wider area. The proposal complies with criterion (e).

2) There is also a requirement for a comprehensive Master Plan. This Plan was approved by the Environment and Transport Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> June. Norwich Union's vision for the site is to preserve the best elements of the site, to improve the environment, provide additional facilities for occupiers and to construct new buildings to meet modern research requirements. Its strengths lie in the landscaped environment and historic elements of the site. A weakness is the quality of some of the buildings. This overall vision will be achieved by the following means:

- Provision to be made for business start ups requiring smaller laboratory space and flexible terms, as well as providing for more established companies. There are advantages for high technology companies forming part of a cluster of research activities.
- Improved central facilities to produce a better café/restaurant for staff on site and a gym. This will encourage contact between occupiers and meet needs to reduce journeys elsewhere.
- Older and unsightly buildings will be removed over time and the distribution of buildings across the site changed to enhance the parkland setting. New floorspace will be initially located on the southern part of the site with some buildings in the northern part being removed.
- The amount of space will depend on a number of factors including market demand but it is anticipated that approximately 24,000 sq m of additional floorspace will be provided. A phasing plan shows how this will be achieved, as new buildings are constructed and older ones removed.
- This is a long-term strategy and one that can respond to changes in market demand. Details have to respond to needs as they arise but the Master Plan sets out the overall context.

The Master Plan is not prescriptive, and one of the requirements of the E&T Committee is that each phase of development is accompanied by a TIA. This will enable this Committee to take into account the cumulative impacts of this and other developments in the vicinity on the road network, and to require appropriate remedial measures. It will further enable the Committee to test the assumptions on which the previous phase has been assessed and to put into place remedial measures before further development occurs, if the assumptions prove to be incorrect.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** These are covered in the report. It is stressed that the flexibility of the Master Plan enables consideration of the cumulative effect of development at all phases of the development.

**CONCLUSION:** The proposed development complies with the Chesterford Local Policies in the ADP and the DLP, and further complies with the requirements of the Master Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS SUBJECT TO A SECTION 106 AGREEMENT REQUIRING IMPROVEMENTS TO THE TRAVEL PLAN:**

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.
5. C.4.8 Landscape management and maintenance plan.
6. C.8.22 Control of lighting.
7. C.9.1 No outdoor storage.
8. C.11.7 Standard vehicles parking faculties.
9. C.16.1 Watching archaeological brief.
10. C.25.1 Airport related parking conditions.
11. The buildings hereby permitted shall only be used for uses falling within Class B1b of the Town and Country Planning Use Classes Order 1987, as amended and as may be amended or superseded.  
Reason: in the interests of ensuring development complies with the Council's policies for the Chesterford Research Park.
12. Demolition of buildings.
13. The Central Facilities Building hereby approved shall not be used for purposes other than related to the use of the Research Park, nor available for hire or use by any outside organisation or individual.  
Reason: In the interests of the amenity of residents of nearby settlements.
14. Drainage requirements.
15. Environment Agency requirements.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*



## UTT/0630/03/DFO – TAKELEY

Details following outline permission for erection of 28 dwellings, garages and parking areas and access road (phase 1)

Land south of A120 and west of Hawthorn Close. GR/TL 556-210. David Wilson Homes.

Case Officer: Michael Ovenden 01799 510476

Expiry Date: 28/07/2003

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits/ADP Policy TAK1: Allocated for residential redevelopment for 100 dwellings.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site is located some 160m west of the Four Ashes crossroads on the southern side of the A120. It covers about 3.9ha (9.6 acres) and slopes gently down to the southwest. A public footpath runs along the western boundary between the road and the Flitch Way.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** This is a revised detailed scheme for approval of reserved matters relating to the first phase of the residential redevelopment granted outline permission. 28 dwellings are now proposed by the new owners, on land where 27 were previously approved on the eastern side of the site. The proposed changes are set out in the applicant's letter attached. This scheme is for a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced two-storey houses with 12 x 3-bedroomed, 13 x 4 bedroomed and 3 x 5 bedroomed. The four dwellings fronting the main road, the layout and the open space would be similar to those previously approved.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See letter dated 26 March attached at end of report.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** The site was allocated for residential redevelopment in 1991 and adopted as part of the ADP in 1995. The Master Plan was agreed in 2001. 100 dwellings were approved in 2002, subject to conditions and Section 106 Agreement re financial contributions to and provision of infrastructure, 20 affordable units and no more than 80 dwellings to be occupied before new A120 opens.

The **Master Plan** covered the following principles:

1. areas of public open space providing opportunities to create small village greens,
2. a strong traditional identity to the scheme,
3. a sense of enclosure and integration,
4. a traffic-calmed environment and
5. appropriate relationships with adjoining land and property.

The detailed points covered were:

1. replacement access with frontage housing,
2. junction with A120 to be controlled by traffic lights,
3. an internal loop road layout off a single access point with traffic calming and a variety of road surface treatments,
4. a village scale of development, a closely-knit layout based around cottage styles,
5. creation of attractive and safe areas to live,
6. some houses fronting the Flitch Way and direct footpath access onto it,
7. integration with existing adjoining footpaths,
8. provision of affordable housing integrated into the overall design in smaller groups,
9. provision of two open spaces totalling about 0.4ha (1 acre), incorporating a balancing pond and
10. retention of as much existing vegetation as possible and adding new planting,

The **outline planning permission** (UTT/0786/00/OP) dated 20 December 2001 was subject to 20 conditions (see copy attached at end of report.) The accompanying **Section 106 Agreement** requires the developer to:

1. transfer amenity open space land to the Council before the 50<sup>th</sup> dwelling is occupied, then laid out and completed before the 80<sup>th</sup> dwelling is occupied, with a payment of £25K to the Council for future maintenance,
2. lay out and equip the Local Area for Play (LAP) in the SW corner in accordance with an agreed timetable,
3. make a payment of £45K to the Council towards infrastructure provision and community facilities and
4. replace or add to changing room facilities at the Gordon Austin Memorial Playing Field opposite the site or any other community facilities to be agreed.

The **detailed planning permission** for 100 dwellings dated 17 October 2002 was granted subject to 18 conditions (see attached at end of report with the relevant Minute DCL63 ii).

**CONSULTATIONS:** ECC Transportation: to be reported (due 16 May).

Environment Agency: To be reported (due 29 May).

Thames Water: No objections subject to conditions.

English Nature: No objections subject to conditions.

Police Architectural Liaison: No objections subject to conditions.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objections subject to all properties having chimneys and there being some 2-bedroomed dwellings in subsequent phases.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** 74 local residents have been notified and one representation has been received. Period expired 21 May.

Summary: No mention of traffic calming to allow access onto and off A120, no mention of materials or colours of the houses, concerned about possible overlooking from dwellings backing on to eastern boundary, need to plant trees along this boundary, need to protect residents of Sarah's Walk to the east of the site from surface water flooding, need for restrictions on hours of construction.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** **The main issue is whether this revised proposal is still in accordance with the approved Master Plan and outline permission.**

All the detailed requirements of the Master Plan and outline permission, with its accompanying legal agreement, continue to apply to this revised reserved matters application, even though it is only for the first phase at this time. The overall form of the layout, design and mix of units would be very similar to that already granted. The first open space would be in the same place. One improvement would be the replacement of three parking courts with rear gardens, along both the boundary with Sarah's Walk to the east and close to the open space, which would give more usable private amenity space and reduce disturbance to neighbours from vehicle movements. There have been some house-type changes, with overall beneficial results.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** The Parish Council's comments about chimneys were the subject of a condition on the detailed permission, which would be repeated in this case. The provision of smaller units will be shown in phase 2. The neighbour's comments have been taken on board in that traffic calming will be incorporated, details of materials will be the subject of a condition for later approval, the benefits of reduced disturbance from the omission of the previously approved parking courts would outweigh any minor overlooking from bedroom windows in new dwellings which are no closer to the common boundary than before, trees will be planted along the eastern boundary as part of the agreed Master Plan, drainage will be dealt with by the Environment Agency in the usual way and the hours of construction as set out in condition C.90C on the outline permission would be repeated in this case.

**CONCLUSION:** This revised detailed scheme for approval of reserved matters is very similar to the one previously approved, which followed lengthy negotiations with Officers to

ensure compliance with the high standards set by the Master Plan. The requirements of the s106 agreement apply to the outline planning permission and would continue apply to this proposal, but would be revised to allow flexibility for the Parish Council to decide which sporting items it should purchase.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS AND REVISED SECTION 106 AGREEMENT**

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans, Master Plan & outline permission conditions.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
5. C.4.5. Retention of hedges.
6. C.4.6. Retention and protection of trees and shrubs during development.
7. C.4.8. Landscape management and maintenance plan to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
8. C.5.2. Details of materials to be submitted agreed and implemented.
9. C.6.4. Excluding Permitted Development Extensions without further permission on units 1, 2, 55 – 61 & 71 – 80.
10. C.7.1. Slab levels to be submitted, agreed and implemented re units 1 – 11 & 75 - 80 with reference to existing adjoining properties.
11. C.8.13 Restriction on hours of construction: Mondays – Fridays: 0730 – 1800; Saturdays: 0800 – 1300 and not at all on Sundays or Bank/Public Holidays.
12. C.8.27. Drainage details to be submitted agreed and implemented.
13. C.11.6. Car parking to be provided.
- 14,&15. C.12.1 & 4. Boundary screening requirements.
16. C.15.1. Superseding previous permission UTT/0614/02/DFO.
17. C.16.2. Archaeological investigation to be carried out.
18. C.17.1. Design amendments re provision of chimneys on at least 20% of units including plots 1,2, 79 & 80.
19. Nature conservation & management survey to be carried out, agreed and implemented.
20. Contaminated land survey to be carried out, agreed and implemented.
21. Provision of traffic light controlled junction with A120 and internal traffic calming measures to be implemented.
22. A120 road cleaning measures to be carried out during construction.
23. Scheme for protecting neighbours from noise during construction to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
24. Scheme for suppressing dust during construction to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
25. Details of footpath link to Fritch Way to be submitted agreed and implemented.
- 26 – 30. Detailed highway requirements to be implemented.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **1) UTT/0715/03/DFO & 2) UTT/0716/03/DFO - LITTLE DUNMOW**

### ***(Joint report on duplicate applications)***

Erection of 120 x three to five bedroom dwellings with garages and associated ground works (Reserved matters for outline planning permission UTT/0302/96/OP)

Phase 4, Oakwood Park, Little Dunmow GR/TL 662-207 Enodis Property Developments

Case Officer: Mr R Aston 01799 510464

Expiry Date: 09/07/2003

**NOTATION:** ADP & DLP: Within Development Limits/Part of Oakwood Park Residential site.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The subject of these applications form Phase 4 of the overall development of the site for 650 dwellings, in accordance with the latest Masterplan for the estate revised in July 2002. This Phase 4 site measures 4.05ha (16.4 acres) along the northwestern edge of the development, abutting agricultural land. A section of the principal estate road of the site runs north to south through the phase and into adjoining phases. The site abuts Phases 2a and 2b to the east where construction is currently under way for 130 dwellings. To the south lies land in Phase 3, which has yet to be sold.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** This revised proposal seeks approval under reserved matters for the erection of 120 3-5 bedroom dwellings with garages and associated ground works, pursuant to outline planning permission ref: UTT/0302/96/OP. There would be 24 three-bedroomed houses, 20 three/four-bed, 63 four-bed and 13 five-bed. Officer-level negotiations have resulted in this amended scheme.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Outline application for reclamation of despoiled land and demolition of redundant structures approved 1996. Temporary storage of soil reclaimed from settlement lagoons, allowed on appeal 1999. Amendment to condition to allow 250 dwellings to be constructed prior to completion of A120 approved 2000. Erection of 80m dwellings and associated garaging approved 2000. Erection of 85 dwellings and associated roads approved 2000. Reserved matters for 69 dwellings approved 2000. Variation of Condition 12 of UTT/0302/96/OP to allow occupation of not more than 305 dwellings prior to opening of A120. Variation to allow construction of up to 350 dwellings, prior to opening of A120. Redevelopment up to 655 dwellings, being a net addition of 170. Reserved matters for 120 dwellings withdrawn in March 2003 following Officers' recommendations for refusal.

**CONSULTATIONS:** ECC Transportation: To be reported (due 7 July).

Environment Agency: To be reported (due 7 July).

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Little Dunmow: No objections.

Felsted: No comments.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** These applications have been advertised and no representations have been received regarding the Original Plans.

Revised advertisement period following receipt of revised plans expires 10 July.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** **The main issue is whether the proposed layout and design are in accordance with the current Masterplan for the site, the Oakwood Park Design Guide and Policy DC1 of the ADP.**

For the purposes of determining this current proposal, the development of the site is in accordance with the approved Masterplan for the site, however the Masterplan does not contain specific design and layout guidance. Accordingly the proposal has been judged against the criteria of the Policy DC1 of the ADP which states that amongst other factors, '*Residential development should have regard to operative published standards of layout and design guidance*', with this theme continued in Oakwood Park Local Policy of the Emerging

District Plan. In determining this current proposal, the operative standards of guidance are the Essex Design Guide for Residential and Mixed Use Areas and the Oakwood Park Design Guide November 2002. In the pre text to the above Policy, Paragraphs 10.5 and 10.6 set out the argument as to why a good standard of Urban Design is a priority when dealing with large residential and mixed-use sites. It states that *'in the past, a few development have been built which are not satisfactory and whose design and siting were not sensitive to their location'* Current Central Government Planning Policy guidance is that weight should be attached to the appearance of the proposed development and its relationship to its surroundings and that detailed design should not be controlled unless the sensitive nature of the setting justifies it.

This thread is continued in the Essex Design Guide of which the criteria for the layout of development at densities over 20 dwellings per hectare are applicable.

Furthermore, because of the sensitive nature and prominent location of the site the Council has for the past 6-7 months been involved in the formulation of site specific design guidance for Oakwood Park, however the final version has yet to be officially adopted. However the design guide is relevant to this application, as all pre-application discussions with developers have been based on the principles of the guide. The purpose of the guide is to set the layout and design objectives against which detailed planning applications for the subsequent phases of development will be reviewed. Furthermore, the guide seeks to create a development which is sympathetic to its setting and the environmental characteristics of the area whilst encouraging a scheme which follows the established principles of good urban design.

The proposal has been designed in accordance with a density which was agreed in October 2002, for a total of 120 dwellings on 4.05 hectares, ie 29.7 dwellings per hectare. Although this is slightly below the required 30 per hectare as advocated in Circular 01/02, the overall density of the site will be above 30. Within this context the site was separated into three areas, for high, medium and low density housing in accordance with the Masterplan. The three areas were to be developed in accordance with the Urban Design Strategy of the Design Guide, which allowed an area of low density housing, with buildings set within a heavily landscaped area to the edge of the site, a medium density area acting as a transition between the low density and the higher density areas with built form frontages along the principal estate road and the area immediately adjacent to Phase 2.

The proposal includes a mix of 3 and 5 bedroom properties in a range of different styles from 5 bedroom detached properties sited in large spacious plots with landscaped frontages to relatively small 3 bedroom townhouses set within a Mews style court to the south. Other specific features include the provision of a Circus feature to the north west of the site, which encloses the roundabout and creates a focal feature for the area whilst also providing a gateway between the different character areas of the scheme. Furthermore, the scheme has also been revised to include substantial landscaping and 'green wedges' of open space along the main pedestrian and vehicular routes through the site helping to create more attractive and responsive streetscenes and different character areas. Concerns over the height of some of the dwellings within this rural context have been overcome and following the previous refusal of this scheme, the scheme is now considered to be satisfactory having regard to the provisions of the Masterplan and the Design Guide.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The scheme has been substantially revised following the refusal of the previous application (UTT/1841/02/DFO & UTT/1842/02/DFO) in line with Officer recommendations. The overall design of the scheme has greatly improved as a result and is in accordance with the provisions of the Masterplan and the Oakwood Park Residential Design Guide.

**RECOMMENDATIONS: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS (SUBJECT TO Director's Authority to issue notice after 10 July)** Page 37

1. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans

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.4.6. Retention and protection of trees and shrubs for the duration of development
6. C.6.4. Excluding extensions without further permission
7. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted, agreed and implemented
8. C.6.5. Excluding fences and walls without further permission
9. Details of foul and Surface water drainage to be submitted, agreed and implemented
10. Construction hours and deliveries to be 0800-1800 Mon-Fri, 0830-1300 Sat and not at all on Sun or Bank/Public Holidays
11. C.7.1. Slab Levels to be submitted agreed and implemented
12. Cycleways and footpath details to be submitted agreed and implemented
13. No gates to open over highway
14. C.10.15. Standard Highway Requirements
15. C.10.23. Standard Highway Requirements
16. C.10.24. Standard Highway Requirements
17. C.10.19. Standard Highway Requirements
18. C.10.26. Standard Highway Requirements
19. C.16.1. Archaeological Watching Brief

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **UTT/1836/02/OP - QUENDON & RICKLING**

Outline application for erection of a minimum of nine dwellings  
Red Star Garage Site, London Road, Quendon. GR/TL 512-300. Clayden Contractors Ltd.  
*Case Officer: Karen Hollitt 01799 510495*  
Expiry Date: 18/02/2003

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

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** This site is located on the western side of the B1383, at the southern end of Quendon. It currently forms a petrol filling station, tyre and exhaust fitters, a garage workshop and a large concrete hardstanding, which is fenced off at the western end of the site. The petrol filling station ceased petrol sales in the past year and currently only offers diesel.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The application seeks approval for outline planning permission for residential redevelopment, for a minimum of 9 units. The revised indicative plan shows 2 x 2 bedroom, 3 x 3 bedroom and 4 x 4 bedroom properties. All matters other than the number of dwellings are to be reserved.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Erection of four light industrial units (Class B1) approved 1996. Change of use of restaurant to industrial and erection of two industrial units approved 1996.

**CONSULTATIONS:** English Nature: Site adjacent Quendon Wood SSSI. Suggest condition be attached to prevent or reduce the risk of any accidental impact upon the SSSI during construction.

Policy: No policy objections. Calculate density to be 30 dwellings per hectare.

Archaeology: No archaeological recommendations.

ECC Transportation: No objections in principle subject to conditions.

Environment Agency: Site overlies major aquifer and is therefore vulnerable to pollution. Suggest site is subject to detailed scheme for the investigation and recording of contamination.

Anglian Water: No objections subject to conditions.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Original Plans: Would seem to be insufficient provision for vehicles in terms of garaging and/or parking. The adjacent Village Hall car park is not an option for residents of this proposal. Proposed dormer windows on plots 6 & 7 overlook property to west. Will result in overloading of sewage system. Present mains sewer already at critical capacity. Updating of sewage arrangements would need to be addressed prior to occupation of this site. Above concerns indicate too high density on this site, especially plots 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Revised Plans: Objections remain the same as before.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** Original Plans: This application has been advertised and 12 representations have been received. Period expired 29 January 2003.

The main concerns relate to drainage, flooding, over development, height, overlooking, adequate car parking facilities, loss of local services, decontamination and the need for affordable housing.

**Councillor Wilcock** raised the issue of low cost/affordable housing being provided on the site. (Officers' response: There can be no truly affordable units because the total number proposed does not meet the current threshold of 35. Whilst social housing provision cannot be required to be provided, the need for smaller, affordable market units, as required by ULP

Policy H9, can be secured by condition and further negotiations may continue at detailed application stage if required.)

Revised Plans: One. Notification period expired 20 June 2003.

Firmly believe that additional sewage and water usage on this site will cause unnecessary stress and damage to existing properties in the area. It would be more acceptable if the remedial works to the drainage system were carried out beforehand or at least some attempt to rectify the flooding in the area during heavy rainfall periods.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS: The main issues are whether**

- 1) **the use would be appropriate within the development limits and the density and mix of development would be appropriate (ADP Policy S1 and DLP Policies S1 & H9),**
- 2) **the loss of employment land would be acceptable (ERSP Policy BIW4 & DLP Policy E2) and**
- 3) **the design and layout would be appropriate and residential amenity would be protected (ADP Policies DC1 & DC14, DLP Policies GEN2 & GEN4 and PPG3 / Circular 1/02).**

1) This proposal relates to residential development within the village development limits and is considered an appropriate use of the land in principle. The density of the proposed development has been calculated to be 30 units per hectare. PPG3 and Circular 1/02 require the efficient use of previously developed land and encourage developments which make more efficient use of land (30-50 dwellings per hectare). Whilst the upper end of the recommended density range would be inappropriate in this rural village location, it is considered that better use could be made of the land. The mix of dwellings still shows 4 x 4 bedroom properties, and it is not considered that this meets the requirement of DLP Policy H9 which states that a significant proportion of the development will be for smaller properties (2 and 3 bedroom). These issues can be resolved by condition, particularly as the applicant has agreed to revising the description of the proposed development to relate to a minimum of 9 units.

2) The existing employment uses on the site are non-conforming in this rural and residential location. The petrol service station has been allowed to decline in recent months and now only sells diesel. The tyre and exhaust centre and the vehicle workshop at the rear of the service station are uses which, due to their nature, subject the adjoining residential properties to noise and fumes. It is considered that the replacement of these uses with residential development would meet the requirements of DLP Policy E2.

3) The draft layout of the site has been negotiated in order to confirm that the proposed number of dwellings can be satisfactorily accommodated on this site and to protect the residential amenity of the bungalow to the west. However, the revised indicative layout still fails to meet the requirements as laid out in the Essex Design Guide (25m rear elevation to rear elevation). The indicative layout shows a rear elevation to rear boundary distance of only 15m and 2 x 2-storey dwellings on plots 6 & 7 would be unacceptable. It is also considered that there would be potential areas of conflict within the site in relation to parking and turning areas. However, the submitted plan is indicative as all matters are reserved and these issues can be resolved by conditions which can be incorporated into the subsequent detailed planning application.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** The comments made regarding the problems in relation to sewage within the village are noted, however, these are issues for the applicant to resolve with the Environment Agency and Water Authority prior to development commencing. A condition should be included requiring this. The comments regarding overlooking issues for the bungalow on the western boundary are noted and these can be resolved at detailed application stage as the submitted drawing is indicative only. The density would be appropriate. All the other issues are covered above.



**CONCLUSION:** The use of the site for residential development is considered appropriate in principle, despite the loss of employment land, because the current activities cause harm to this environment. The density and mix of the proposed development could be improved, but this application relates to outline planning permission only and such details can be covered by conditions and resolved at the detailed application stage.

**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. C.4.1. Landscaping scheme to be submitted and agreed.
6. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
7. C.5.2. Details of materials to be submitted agreed and implemented.
8. C.8.27. Details of foul and surface water drainage to be submitted, approved and implemented
9. No development shall commence on site until a detailed scheme of investigation and recording of contamination and a report submitted together with detailed proposals in line with current best practice for the removal, containment or otherwise rendering harmless any contamination that may be found, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Subsequently the decontamination works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme prior to development commencing on site.  
Reason: Decontamination of the site is required prior to residential development of the site.
10. No vehicles, materials, or waste are to be stored, assembled, or deposited inside or on the boundary of Quendon Wood SSSI.  
Reason: To prevent and reduce the risk of any accidental impact on the SSSI during construction.
11. Highway requirements.
12. The details required by condition C.1.1. above shall show single-storey dwellings on the western boundary, with a minimum 15m distance between the rear elevation and the rear boundary.  
Reason: To protect the residential amenity of the property to the west of the site.
13. The details required by condition C.1.1. above shall show a minimum of 9 dwellings, at least 75% of which shall be 2 or 3 bedroom properties.  
Reason: To ensure the provision of affordable market housing to meet local needs

*Background papers: see application file*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **UTT/0775/03/OP – TAKELEY**

Outline application for erection of dwelling and alteration of existing access  
Westview Cottage, Dunmow Road. GR/TL 570-211. Mr & Mrs G Pretious.  
Case Officer: *Katherine Benjafield 01799 510494*  
Expiry Date: 17/07/2003

**NOTATION:** Within Takeley Local Policy 1 Area in Adopted District Plan (ADP) and within Takeley/Little Canfield Local Policy 3 – Prior’s Green Site in the Deposit Draft Local Plan (DLP). The site is also within the area subject to Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) for existing small areas within Prior’s Green, Takeley/Little Canfield approved by the Environment and Transport Committee on 11 March 2003 (known as “island” sites).

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** This 42m long and 11m wide site is located approximately 0.9km east of the Four Ashes junction in Takeley, on the northern side of the A120 opposite the “Little Chef”. The site forms the side garden to Westview Cottage, a two-storey detached house to the east. A garage and shed are located on the site, which would be demolished. The site is one of several “island sites” within the Prior’s Green site which lie outside the outline planning application site for 650 dwellings but within the Takeley/Little Canfield policy area.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** This outline application is for the erection of two detached dwellings. The means of access is to be determined at this outline stage while siting, design, landscaping and external appearance would all be determined at the reserved matters stage. There is an existing access onto the A120 at this point and the proposal would involve widening this to enable it to be used for both the proposed and existing dwellings.

**APPLICANT’S CASE:** See agent’s letter dated 12 May attached at end of report.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Change of use from residential to office conditionally approved 1988 and 1991. Removal of condition C.90B imposed on UTT/0538/91 restricting occupancy to no more than 6 persons conditionally approved 1996.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Thames Water: No objection.  
ECC Transportation: To be reported.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objections but have concerns over the shared access and turning area and possible ownership friction.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** None. Notification period expired 18 June.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues are whether

- 1) the development would be compatible with the Master Plan and the Council’s SPG (PPG3, ADP Takeley Local Policy 1 and DLP Takeley Local Policy 3) and
- 2) social, amenity and infrastructure contributions are required (DLP Policy GEN6).

1) The Development Plan policies do not permit development of this site in isolation. However, comprehensive development is acceptable in principle provided it is contiguous with the proposals for the Prior’s Green site overall.

- SPG emphasises that the principle of development of this and the other “island sites” is acceptable; that new development should gain access from the approved internal road network; that financial contributions should be made towards education, transport, sports, community and landscaping facilities; that affordable housing should be provided; and that no permissions should be granted on these “island”

sites until UTT/0816/00/OP has outline planning permission. Given the location of this site, which is adjacent to other dwellings that would retain access onto the A120, it is considered that access to the site should, exceptionally, be from the A120 in this case.

- Affordable housing would not be appropriate in this case.
- The outline permission for the overall site has now been granted.

2) SPG requires that all the island sites other than the land adjacent to Takeley Nurseries should make appropriate and proportionate contributions to social, amenity and infrastructure requirements. These are based on an assessment of the costs of primary and secondary education, a contribution to transport enhancement and a contribution to the enhancement of local sports and/or community facilities, a contribution to fitting out, equipping and furnishing the on-site community centre and a financial contribution to structural landscaping and a 15-year landscape sum for its proper maintenance. The total basic financial contribution for wider and longer-term benefits excluding affordable housing and any associated additional educational payments and landscape contributions totals £5,969 per dwelling at current prices. Because this site is outside the Master Plan area, these contributions will need to be made in full.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** The only matter that is to be determined as part of this application is the means of access. Therefore, although the comments of the Parish Council have been noted, it is considered that the access would be acceptable and the issue of possible future ownership friction is not a material consideration when determining this application.

**CONCLUSION:** The development of this site is acceptable in principle provided it is developed contiguously with planning permission UTT/0816/00/OP and not in isolation. A Section 106 agreement will be necessary to ensure contributions to social, amenity and infrastructure requirements as set out above and to link this site with the larger development, preventing its development in isolation.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS SUBJECT TO A SECTION 106 OBLIGATION REQUIRING CONTRIBUTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TAKELEY/LITTLE CANFIELD SPG AND ALSO COVERING THE ISSUES DETAILED ABOVE.**

1. C.1.1. Submission of reserved matters: 1.
2. C.1.2. Submission of reserved matters: 2..
3. C.1.3. Time limit for submission of reserved matters.
4. C.1.4. Time limit for commencement of development.
5. The land the subject of this planning permission shall not be developed other than contiguous with planning permission UTT/0816/00/OP. The site shall be included within the approval of phasing and development densities set out in condition 7 of planning permission UTT/0816/00/OP.  
Reason: To secure appropriate phasing and densities in a comprehensive manner.
6. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Master Plan, drawing no. 1071/MP/6 Rev A dated 10.08.00 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.  
Reason: To ensure development proceeds in broad accordance with the principles set out in the approved Master Plan.
7. C.5.2. Details of materials to be submitted agreed and implemented.
8. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
9. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
10. C.4.6. Retention of trees and shrubs
11. C.16.2. Full archaeological excavation and evaluation.
12. Noise construction levels / hours to be submitted, agreed and implemented.

13. No development shall take place until the new A120 has been completed and open to traffic between the M11 and Great Dunmow.
14. No development shall take place until a programme of works for the provision of foul and surface water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, following consultation with Thames Water. Subsequently the works shall be implemented as approved, including any phasing in relation to the occupation of buildings.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**1) UTT/0523/03/FUL, 2) UTT/0525/03/FUL, 3) UTT/0604/03/CA**

**& 4) UTT/0872/03/FUL – FELSTED**

***(Revised Joint Report)***

- 1) Erection of 3 x three-storey & one two-storey residential blocks – total of 29 flats
- 2) Erection of replacement music block
- 3) Demolition of music school and two other structures
- 4) Change of use of part of sports field to form car park

Land to the North of Ingrams and rear of main school. GR/TL 677-204. Felsted School.

*Case Officer: John Grayson 01799 510455*

Expiry Dates: 1 – 3) 20/06/2003. 4) 1/08/03

**NOTATION:** Within Village Development Limits, Conservation Area and curtilage of listed School and Ingrams buildings/Tree Preservation Orders (Application 4: Outside Conservation Area).

**DESCRIPTION OF SITES:** The sites are located within the grounds of Felsted School. The existing Music School building is situated to the north of Ingrams and faces School Road. On the opposite side of the road to the east are two dwellings and a small church. To the north is the School Chapel and to the west landscaped open space. The proposed replacement Music School would be located to the rear of the main listed building opposite the modern Lord Riche Hall and the new car park.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSALS:** 1) The revised plans show that it is now proposed to demolish the existing Music School building and replace it with three blocks of 3-storey flats and one of two storeys, totalling 29 units. Block D has been reduced in height to two-storeys, relocated further away from the neighbours to the east and the trees to the north. Block C has also been relocated further away from The Chapel. Seven of the flats would be for members of staff at the school as affordable units for key workers. These four separate blocks would replace the 3-storey building approved in 2002 for 18 apartments, which would not now be implemented.

2) It is proposed to erect a replacement two-storey Music School on the site of two existing single-storey outbuildings opposite the Lord Riche Hall.

3) The buildings proposed to be demolished are the Music School and two structures at the rear of the main School.

4) The car park would be opposite the new music school alongside the Lord Riche Hall and would replace spaces lost by the proposal, as well as serving visitors to the new building. The car park would accommodate 45 cars and 4 mini-buses. It would be landscaped along its north-eastern and south-eastern edges.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** I confirm that we have discussed that a provision of seven flats, in the first courtyard immediately behind Ingrams, will be dedicated to housing members of staff. There is a particular need for these facilities at Felsted School. I understand that you will wish to apply a condition to our planning consent and I confirm that we are happy to deal with this matter on the basis of such a condition.

The proposals involve the removal of the flat-roofed Music School, which no longer satisfies the requirements for the School, together with some brick outbuildings. The proposed development would arrange the flats in a series of four separate blocks. The two smaller blocks (A) and (B) would form a courtyard to enhance the setting of the existing listed building, Ingrams and are both set back from the proposed brick boundary wall facing on to the churchyard grounds.

The other two blocks would be arranged to provide views in and out of the site and to be set back from the existing School Chapel, carefully avoiding the destruction of trees that exist on the site. A detailed landscaping scheme will be prepared and we assume that this would form a condition on any planning approval. Similarly, details of all materials would be the subject of a condition.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Change of use of Ingrams (to south) from educational to sheltered housing, conversion of listed building to six 2-bed apartments and warden's accommodation, erection of 3-storey building for 18 apartments, single-storey rear extension, glazed link and sun room with car parking approved in 2002 following a Members' site visit.

**CONSULTATIONS:** ECC Transportation: No objections subject to conditions.

ECC Archaeology: No recommendation on this disturbed land.

ECC Learning Services: Request contribution of £89,968 towards educational infrastructure.

Environment Agency: No objections subject to conditions.

Anglian Water Authority: No objections subject to conditions.

Specialist Design Advice: See attached at end of report.

Specialist Landscape Advice: No objections to felling of three trees subject to a group order, providing that replacement planting is agreed.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Original Plans 1 & 2. Gross over-development. The view of the Chapel from School Road would be ruined. Design appears out of keeping with the area, especially adjacent to a listed building

3. Concerned about car parking provision.

4. To be reported (due 7 July).

Revised Plans 1-3: To be reported (due 7 July).

**REPRESENTATIONS:** These applications have been advertised and 12 representations have been received regarding the Original Plans to applications 1-3. Period expired 29 May.

1. See letter dated 10 May attached at end of report to last meeting.

2. Object. I travel down Stebbing Road each day to and from my place of employment, at school times the road becomes extremely treacherous with cars parked either side of the road, sometimes making it practically impossible to pass, or pull out onto the Braintree Road. To add to this, the pupils at the school seem to have forgotten any road rules at all, and more often than not walk straight out from between parked cars into the road, they also walk out from the music school and main building onto the road. This surely must be Health and Safety issue. Secondly, I think the erection of buildings of this magnitude are totally unacceptable for the surrounding area, and quaintness of the village as a whole, I cannot understand why, with the enormous amount of land the school has within its contained land there is a need for this sort of development for the detriment of the whole village. I fear it will be a "Blot on the Landscape", and a decline for the village as a whole, as it becomes concrete jungle.

2. Object. The provision of urban style development in the Conservation Area is totally inappropriate. The proposals are incompatible with the village environment and setting which despite recent developments has been maintained. Current traffic congestion is becoming an increasing problem and the introduction of more cars, which at a minimum is likely to be 66, can only exacerbate the problem. The proposals are a departure from the District Development Plan for Felsted.

3. Appalled. Firstly because I feel it not appropriate use of this conservation area space, filling in a relatively open area with accommodation especially with the inevitable increase in cars, parking areas and the subsequent congestion. Secondly, there is already something of a problem with access through this road area when there are functions at the school Chapel and or the UR Church Hall. A large influx of additional vehicles and traffic to the flats will make this problem worse. Expansion of the accommodation needs at the

school are understandable and need to be met but perhaps a more appropriate site could be found that would have less impact on the local amenities.

4. Opposition. Not only is such a development wholly out of keeping with the village, but the implications regarding traffic flow, safety and parking, particularly during the times when the senior and prep schools open and close for the day, are horrendous for both the residents and the pupils. We appreciate the need for affordable small dwellings. However, development at Oakwood Park is ongoing and would seem a suitable venue. We also appreciate that Felsted School needs to update its Music School but why not construct a new building on the site of the existing one? It would be inconvenient for the School no doubt to house its Music School in temporary accommodation during demolition and construction, but surely if the Primary School could do it for its new School Hall, is it not beyond the wit of Felsted School to follow its example? We hope that you will give serious consideration to our arguments and reject this ill-conceived application.

5. As longstanding members of the village, as parents of past students and as continuing contributors to both Prep and Senior School activity, we are surprised and concerned that such a drastic and gross proposal should be contemplated within such an important and pleasing area of school grounds which, in passing, are part of a formal conservation area. The School has had a deserved reputation for its gracious and open campus. Where the development is planned is a greensward of considerable beauty; it has mature trees and provides an attractive setting for the Chapel in conjunction with the Bury pond and garden – and it preserves open space between them and the row of housing on Stebbing Road. It is clear that the proposed blocks would engulf and ruin the environs. (The present Music School is not very attractive but at least it is of low aspect, and has never dominated the spot).

We imagine that traffic implications will be carefully considered by the Council. With the current plethora of schools and restaurants in Felsted we would be concerned about the impact of additional vehicles owned by new occupants and their friends visiting and parking at the 33 new apartments in the middle of the village – in particular the danger that that might pose for students and local residents alike. There has been considerable infill development in Felsted and doubtless, there will be more in future. We believe that the proposal of the School for Stebbing Road is misplaced. If it needs funds for general purposes or new Music School then, surely, there are other possibilities for development on the margin of its extensive property (e.g. further along Stebbing Road at the back of Pristie's Fields) without violating the area contemplated in the middle of the village. We strongly object to the application on grounds of:

- Unnecessary amenity/environmental disturbance to Felsted
- Traffic risks to students/villagers
- Existing availability of other development options for the applicant.

6. Space is so important and the area under threat will be completely spoiled, further adding to the already bad traffic congestion in the centre of the village. Any building on this scale would push Felsted towards being a town like Dunmow instead of a village.

7. Opposed. The site is one of great natural beauty and restfulness and also within the village conservation area. The proposed buildings are quite inappropriate for this site, being too tall, too large and too close together and one of them only 14 yards from the Chapel. The view to The Bury would be lost, as would the relatively peaceful ambience of the open, semi-rural area at present enjoyed by both school and village. Greatly increasing the noise pollution and disturbance levels. Traffic congestion.

8 - 11. Contains similar comments as above.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS: The main issues are whether the revised proposals would**

- 1) affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed school building (ADP Policies DC2 & 5 and DLP Policies ENV1 & 2)**
- 2) retain sufficient space around the preserved trees to ensure their retention and to ensure that the open character of the area is not adversely affected (ADP Policy DC8 and DLP Policy ENV8),**
- 3) affect the residential amenities of neighbouring residents (ADP Policy DC14 and DLP Policy GEN4),**
- 4) create sufficient amenity open space and car parking facilities to meet the needs of their occupants and users (ADP Policies DC1 & T2 and DLP Policies GEN2 & 9) and**
- 5) leave sufficient sports facilities to meet the needs of the School (ADP Policy REC7 & DLP Policy LC1).**

1) The relevant Policies require that the appearance and character of Conservation Areas and the setting of listed buildings should be protected by any new development which may be approved. In relation to the site north of Ingrams, it is important to bear in mind what has already been granted, i.e. a large 3-storey block of apartments running from the rear of Ingrams to the back of the existing music school. This would now be replaced by three separate buildings (A, B & C), which would have less impact on the attractive open character of this area. The fourth building (D) would replace the music school structure, which is of a modern flat-roofed construction out of keeping with the area. The design of the new buildings would be more sympathetic to those adjacent than the apartment block already approved. It is considered that these proposals would protect the appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposed relocation of the music school to the rear of the listed school would replace two modern classroom structures with a well-designed building in keeping with the main structure and complementary to the modern Lord Riche Hall opposite. It is also considered that these proposals would be sympathetic to the setting of the listed building.

2) The open character of the area north of Ingrams with its group of preserved trees is particularly attractive and forms an important part of the setting of the school complex. The relevant Policies require that this character is protected. The plans show all the preserved trees to be retained, now that blocks C and D have been relocated to ensure that none of the trees to the north are affected. As stated above, the splitting up of the approved block into three separate buildings would help to retain this open character.

3) There are two dwellings on the opposite side of School Road, the occupants of which would be affected by the proposed replacement of the music school with block D. This was originally designed as a three-storey building over 11m high, located just 2m back from the road, with living room windows on the elevation facing towards the dwellings opposite only about 14m away across the road. The loss of one floor, the setting back of the block and the internal alterations to avoid living rooms facing east have now largely overcome the defects associated with the original scheme and it is considered that the adverse effects on the neighbours would be reduced to an acceptable degree.

4) The residential part of the proposal indicates 36 spaces to serve 29 flats, sufficient to meet Council and Government standards for this type of accommodation.

The plans for the proposed new music school were not originally accompanied by replacement and new parking provision to cater for events which would attract vehicle-borne visitors from outside the school. These have now been submitted and it is considered that the proposed 45 car spaces and 4 minibus spaces would be sufficient to meet this need. The proposed location on the opposite side of School Road next to Lord Riche Hall would be convenient, but some form of crossing or traffic calming would be necessary.



- 5) The loss of recreational open space for the School's use would be negligible.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The revised proposals overcome Officers' concerns regarding the original plans and now meet Development Plan Policies.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**1) UTT/0523/03/FUL - APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS and SECTION 106 AGREEMENT (re educational infrastructure contribution)**

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.3. To be implemented in accordance with original and revised plans.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
5. C.4.4. Retention/replacement of trees.
6. C.4.6. Retention and protection of trees during development.
7. C.4.7. Detailed landscaping survey to be carried out.
8. C.4.8. Landscape management and maintenance plan to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
9. C.5.2. Details of materials to be submitted agreed and implemented.
10. C.5.5. Clay plain tiles.
11. C.7.1. Slab levels to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
12. C.8.26. Internal sound insulation to flats.
13. C.8.27. Drainage details to be submitted agreed and implemented.
14. C.11.6. Provision of car parking facilities.
15. C.15.1. Superseding previous permission UTT/0203/01/FUL.
16. C.25.3 No airport-related parking.
17. C.26.1&2. Provision of 7 units for key workers.

**2) UTT/0525/03/FUL - APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
5. C.7.1. Slab levels to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
6. C.8.27, Drainage details to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
7. C.11.3. Provision of car parking under UTT/0872/03/FUL.

**3) UTT/0604/03/CA - UNCONDITIONAL CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT**

**4) UTT/0872/03/FUL - APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
5. C.25.3. No airport-related car parking.
6. Scheme of traffic calming/pedestrian crossing to be submitted agreed and implemented and retained thereafter.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **UTT/0773/03/FUL – STANSTED**

Construction of block of five flats with creation of parking area.  
R/O 48 Silver Street. GR/TL 509-249. Mr D Mason.  
*Case Officer: Michael Guppy 01799 510477*  
Expiry Date: 18/07/2003

**NOTATION:** ADP: Within Development Limits & Conservation Area. DLP: Within Settlement Boundary and Conservation Area.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site is located to the rear of No. 48 Silver Street, which is on the western side of the road. To the west are the rear gardens of the properties in Blythwood Gardens. To the north of the site is the parking area for Bakery Court. To the east are the properties fronting Silver Street.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The application proposes the erection of a block of 2 one bedroomed flats and 3 two bedroomed flat with 5 parking spaces, amenity space and landscaping. The site would be accessed from the north, with a one-way system which would pass through the car parking area for Bakery Court and under that development before exiting onto Silver Street.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** These proposals have been informed by the Inspector's comments, in allowing the appeal for 4 one bedroomed flats, particularly with regard to the same car parking provision and highway safety.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Erection of 1 block of 4 No. one bedroomed flats allowed on appeal with conditions February 2003.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Specialist Landscaping Advice: No objections subject to retention of existing trees.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** To be reported (due 27/6/03).

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and 1 representation has been received. Period expired 26/6/03.

The pressures on the site and surroundings will be enough without the addition of more vehicles and access movements caused by even one more dwelling. This development has not returned the access road to its original condition from the earlier developments, surely until some assurance that the access roads will be made up to their original state development should be delayed.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues are whether the proposal would be:

- 1) **appropriate in terms of location (ADP Policies S1 & H10 and DLP Policies S3 & H3)**
- 2) **acceptable in terms of design and effect on amenity (ERSP Policy HC2, ADP Policies DC2 & DC14 and DLP Policies ENV1 & GEN4) and**
- 3) **safe in terms of access arrangements (ADP Policy T1 & DLP Policy GEN1).**

1) The proposal would involve the erection of 5 flats on land where 4 flats were allowed on appeal earlier this year. The parking arrangement for existing properties would be the same as that allowed for the block of four flats. Any additional development on this site above what has already been approved would constitute overdevelopment. The site is not capable of accommodating any additional flats without detriment to the area. The four flats already approved for the site would not constitute significant use of land in this location and the proposal would not improve the appearance of the area.

2) The level of activity and noise generated by 5 flats, three of which would be 2 bedroom as opposed to 4 one bedroomed flats would be unreasonably detrimental to residential amenity. The proposed building would be of a much larger scale and bulk than that allowed on appeal and would be capable of accommodating a higher number of people. The proximity of the development to the boundary of the site with the rear gardens of the properties in Blythwood Gardens would result in a loss of residential amenity to their occupiers. The design and form of the proposal lacks traditional features and has little respect for the buildings of architectural merit within the conservation area. The scale and bulk of the proposal would be out of keeping with the size of the site and its location. As such the design and form of the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. There seems to be continual pressure for extra flats here and Officers consider that the maximum amount of development which could be satisfactorily accommodated on this site has already been permitted.

3) The potential additional volume of traffic using the restricted access could give rise to highway dangers. The site would be accessed from Silver Street through the northern part of Bakery Court with a one-way system through the rear parking area then back out through the south part of Bakery Court and onto Silver Street. The access and egress roads are very narrow and the traffic generated by the proposal would have to pass very close to and under several flats associated with a separate development. Additional dangers to highway users would result. The Inspector in the recent appeal did not concur with this view with regard to 4 one bedroomed flats, because the number of parking spaces accessed as proposed would be unchanged from current arrangements. The key issue is the level of traffic likely to be generated and not the number of parking spaces available. It has been noted on site visits that currently all available spaces are not occupied. The revised proposal would only increase the number of parking spaces accessed in the way proposed by one, It is Officer opinion that the volume of traffic likely to result from the proposal, coupled with the volume of traffic already permitted at the site, would be unacceptable for the reasons given above.

**CONCLUSION:** The revised proposal continues to constitute over-development, which would be detrimental to the amenity of the area, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, residential amenity and highway safety.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS**

1. The proposal would be contrary to ADP Policy DC14 and DLP Policy GEN4 because the increase in the number and size of units as proposed would adversely affect the enjoyment of neighbouring residential properties as a result of excessive noise and disturbance from the additional volume of traffic passing in close proximity.
2. The proposal would be contrary to ADP Policy DC2 and DLP Policy ENV1 because the form and design of the building would not respect the buildings of architectural merit within the Conservation Area and the scale and bulk of the building and its relationship with the open space would not be characteristic of this part of the Conservation Area.
3. The proposal would be contrary ADP Policy T1 and DLP Policy GEN1 because the level of extra traffic generated by the additional number and size of the dwellings would cause dangers to road users both within the access way and at the junction with Silver Street.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **1) UTT/0515/03/FUL & 2) UTT/0516/03/LB - BROXTED**

1) & 2) Conversion of barn to dwelling

Barn at Moor End Farm, Brick End. GR/582-260. Messrs W & P Burton.

Case Officer: Mr A Betros 01799 510471

Expiry Date: 20/06/2003

**NOTATION:** Outside Development Limits/Grade 2 Listed Building/Area of Special Landscape Value (ADP only).

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The application relates to a 17<sup>th</sup> Century Grade 2 listed barn among a group of buildings at Moor End Farm, which is approximately 1 mile south-east of Brick End. The barn has been redundant from its original agricultural purpose for over 25 years.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The proposal involves conversion of the barn to a single residential dwelling. The ground floor would be used as an open plan living area with kitchen, bathroom and utility room while a new first floor would contain 3 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms. Limited openings within the external elevations are proposed. A garage nearby to the barn will be retained, thereby avoiding the need for a new garage. The existing weatherboard exterior is to be retained where possible while the asbestos corrugated roofing is to be replaced with clay tiles.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Approval of change of use of nearby former agricultural buildings to 6 units of holiday accommodation, ancillary office, storage and recreational areas granted in 1999

**CONSULTATIONS:** ECC Transportation: No objections.

Environment Agency: Advisory letter.

Ramblers Association: No objections subject to Footpath 13 not being obstructed.

Specialist Design Advice: The subject barn is a timber-framed aisled structure of early 17<sup>th</sup> century origins. The building is listed Grade 2 and redundant for farming. The proposed conversion scheme sensitively aims at the retention of the principle characteristics of this listed structure. Conditional approval is recommended.

English Nature: Consideration should be given to the possibility of bats or barn owls using the barn. A relevant condition should be imposed.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objection.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** None. Notification period expired 19 May 2003.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues are whether the proposal complies with policies

- 1) C6 of the ADP – Conversion of Rural Buildings to Residential Use (RE2 of the Structure Plan and H05 of the Draft DLP)
- 2) DC5 of the UDP- Development Affecting Listed Buildings (HC3 of the Structure Plan and ENV02 of the Draft DLP) and
- 3) DC14 of the UDP- General Amenity (GEN of the Draft DLP).

1) The proposal complies with the relevant policy for the conversion of rural buildings as the barn is in sound structural condition while its historic form enhances the character and appearance of the rural area. The proposed works would respect and conserve the characteristics of the barn through the restriction of new openings and retention of internal void space. The setting would be enhanced as no additions or adjacent structures are proposed.

2) The proposed design has been endorsed by Council's Conservation Officer due to a respectful conversion and appropriate use of materials. The setting and integrity of the barn would be maintained by the proposal.

3) The barn is significantly separated from other farm buildings on the site and no additions are proposed. Therefore, no adverse amenity impacts are associated with the proposal to convert the barn to a single residence. Adequate parking and open space are available for future occupants of the dwelling.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The proposal conforms with Council's Policies for Listed Buildings and barn conversions in an appropriate manner which will preserve the integrity and setting of the built forms on the site. There would be no adverse amenity impacts and the additional traffic generated by the dwelling would be acceptable.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**1) UTT/0515/03/FUL – APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1. Time Limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
5. All boundary treatments shall be post and rail in association with an indigenous hedge
6. C.20.1. Protection of bat roosts

**2) UTT/0516/03/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.
3. No elements of the historic timber frame to be cut or removed without inspection and consent.
4. The roof to the building hereby permitted shall be clad with hand-made clay plain tiles agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
5. All weatherboarding to be feather-edged and painted black.
6. All external timber joinery to be timber painted black.  
REASON 3-6: To protect the heritage quality of the listed building.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **1) UTT/0670/03/FUL & 2) UTT/671/03/LB - WENDENS AMBO**

1 & 2) Change of use and conversion of barns to dwelling. Alterations to vehicular access. Construction of walls and fencing.

Westbury Barn, Royston Road. GR/TL 508-363. Rt Honourable Lord Braybrooke.

Case Officer: Geoff Lyon 01799 510458

Expiry Date: 08/07/2003

**NOTATION:** ADP and DLP: Outside Development Limits/Listed Building (Grade II), located adjacent to flood plain and within 50 metres of M11 re disturbance from traffic noise and pollution.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site is located approximately 200 metres due west of the edge of Wendens Ambo and immediately adjacent the raised bank of the M11. Access to the site is gained from the west of the barn, adjacent to M11, via an open frontage. The barn is a detached structure with additional outbuildings and forms part of the Audley End Estate. It dates from around 1600 AD and is a single aisle timber framed and plastered structure with external weatherboarding. The roof is made of corrugated iron and there have been several 19<sup>th</sup> century gabled and lean to access points inserted. Internally the frame is virtually complete. The barn is currently used as a riding school and is beginning to show signs of general deterioration with some sheeting added to the rear and side elevations to prevent further damage by weather etc. Surrounding land is used as a paddock in connection with the riding school at the barn.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** These applications seek to convert the main barn and additional linked outbuildings into residential use with an attached garage, stable and private amenity space. There is no significant new build proposed on the site and therefore most work is related to the renovation of the existing structure, which is generally in sound structural condition. The walls would be made good with new weatherboarding and brick and flint where necessary and the roof would be clad with clay tiles. New fully glazed two storey gables would be inserted in the front and rear elevations and additional windows between the timber studs.

The property would have three bedrooms with a further linked bedroom and bathroom at ground floor level for visitors. There would be four covered parking spaces with room for turning. The new access would sweep into the rear of the site and join Royston Road adjacent to the M11 underpass. Visibility is good to the west, but there is a bend looking towards Wendens Ambo, which is obscured by the existing barn. The speed limit is 30 mph, which commences the other side of the M11 underpass. A new post and wire fence would be erected at the front of the site next to the entrance and the current wide gravelled entrance would be grassed with additional trees planted. Private amenity space is available in the walled garden to the east of the site and there is also a courtyard.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** The traffic and access appraisal states that the traffic movements of the proposed dwelling would be less than the existing riding school and, with the movement of the access closer towards the M11 underpass, there would be an improvement in visibility to the east. The applicants have contacted Essex County Council Highways, who have agreed with the proposed highway improvements.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Conversion and change of use of agricultural barn to B1 Business use and associated internal and external works to building withdrawn by applicant prior to committee decision due to recommendation of refusal on highway dangers to Committee meeting in July 2001.

**CONSULTATIONS:** ECC Transportation: No objections. Adequate car parking and turning facilities to be provided within the curtilage of the site.

Environment Agency: Advisory comments relating to private means of foul effluent disposal.

UDC Specialist Design Advice The barn has lost its original roof but in this instance its reinstatement could be worthwhile and serve a greater good. In principle and subject to a satisfactory structural report, I find the proposal in accord with the aims of the local policies and the advice contain in PPG7. I recommend approval subject to the detailed conditions:  
Highways Agency: The London to South Midlands Multi Modal Study recommended that this length of the M11 be widened to three lanes.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objection.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised with both press and site notices and three neighbour notifications. Period expired 19 June 2003. No representations have been received.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues are whether the proposed conversion of the existing barn would meet with the requirements of the current local plan and would also be an appropriate form of development to be taking place in the countryside, outside defined settlement limits. (ADP Policies C6 & C1 and DLP Policies H5 & ENV4).

The proposed buildings to be converted would generally conform to the requirements of both the adopted and revised deposit draft of the local plan. The barns appear to be in sound structural condition, their traditional appearance enhances the character and appearance of the area and the conversion works would respect and conserve the characteristics of the building, especially as the amount of new build has been kept to a minimum. The setting of this listed building would be enhanced by the proposal.

The only issue that has not been demonstrated by the applicants is whether there is any significant demand for business use, small-scale retail outlets, tourist accommodation or community uses. The site accesses directly onto the busy B1039 and a business or retail use would increase the number of vehicle movements into and out of the site. Visibility is generally good to the west when entering or leaving the site, but easterly visibility is obscured by a bend in the road and the existing barn. A highways report may be required to determine whether such use would have any safety implications. This argument could also be applied with reference to a community use of the site, and there would be additional issues of accessibility to people without a car or bicycle. Tourist accommodation does exist in the area but it may be difficult to prove a general need for such facilities, especially within such a large structure as this.

**CONCLUSION:** It would seem that the proposed conversion of the barn and outbuildings into residential accommodation would generally meet with the policies and criteria of the adopted and emerging local plans. The proposal should help to secure the long-term future of an historic and prominent building, which forms part of an attractive grouping on the approach to Wendens Ambo, and contributes positively to the historic record of the District.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**1) UTT/0670/03/FUL - APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans.
3. C.6.4. Excluding extensions without further permission.
4. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
5. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
6. The new boundary treatment adjacent to the B1039 shall be post and rail and planted with indigenous species on the field side of the fence.  
Reason: To ensure that the fencing is appropriate in relation to the open countryside.
7. C.8.26. Details of internal sound insulation to dwelling to be submitted, agreed and implemented.

**2) UTT/0671/03/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.*
3. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted agreed and implemented.
4. The new roof sections indicated on the approved plans hereby permitted shall be clad using second-hand hand-made clay plain tiles, samples of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development.  
Reason: To ensure that appropriate materials are used for the approved works.
5. C.5.16. No historic timbers to be cut.
6. The necessary repairs to the building shall be carried out in timber of matching type and cross sections.  
Reason: To ensure the appropriate materials are used for the approved works.
7. C.5.8. Joinery details.
8. C.5.9. Stained wood.
9. C.5.14. Black rainwater goods.
10. C.5.17. Window & door details and sections to be submitted, agreed and implemented.
11. Retention of Brick and Flint walls.
12. All existing brick and flint walls within the application site shall be retained in perpetuity, unless first agreed in writing with the local planning authority.  
Reason 11+12: To ensure that the historic fabric of the site is retained.
13. The courtyard between the barn and the field to be converted shall be left open and finished in gravel or similar material.  
Reason: To ensure that the historical relationship between the building and the field is retained.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*



## **UTT/0129/03/FUL - HIGH EASTER**

***(Referred at ex-Member's Request)***

First-floor and ground-floor rear extensions  
2 Parsonage Cottages, Pleshey Road. GR/TL 620-147. Mr P Oates.  
Case Officer: *Richard Aston 01799 510464*  
Expiry Date: 01/04/2003

**NOTATION:** ADP & DLP: Within Development Limits, Settlement Boundaries and Conservation Area/Public Footpath to rear.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** Parsonage Cottages are a row of three two-storey dwellings situated in the centre of the village on the corner of School Road and the High Street. No 2 is the middle property and has two bedrooms upstairs, the bathroom being on the ground floor. It is flanked on both sides by first-floor rear extensions. The properties are the subject of a flying freehold because the layout of the cottages overlaps, i.e. the first floor rear bedroom of No 1 overlaps the ground floor single-storey rear extension of No 2. The window of the rear bedroom of No 1 looks over the ground floor extension of No 2. The gardens of the properties are south facing.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** This revised proposal details the erection of a first-floor extension, 4m wide and to an eaves height of 2.3m with a hipped roof, so that the existing rear bedroom can be converted into a bathroom. The ground-floor extension would enlarge the existing kitchen. The proposal has been amended following a refusal and negotiations in an attempt to minimise the potential impact on the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers to an acceptable level. The main change is that the first-floor extension would now be angled away from the neighbour after 0.9m (3'). The refused scheme was for the proposed side wall to be at right-angles. A gap of 1.5m would remain between the flank wall of the first floor extension and the flank wall of the adjoining property, with a gap of 700mm between the flank wall of the extension and the neighbour's window. The proposal also details the erection of a single storey rear extension running the length of the rear elevation and 1.9m in depth.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** The application has been revised following a previous refusal for a rear extension, and follows some discussions with officers. The previous "tunnel" effect has been removed and the revised position of the wall would ensure a much smaller reduction in the times when sunlight to the neighbours' bedroom would be affected. This bedroom window at No 1 was reduced by 50% when the new first-floor extension wall was erected. The Council approved a similar extension on the neighbouring property (No3) 600mm from my rear wall at No 2.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Erection of two-storey rear extension and single-storey rear extension refused 2002 for reasons of loss of light to the neighbour at no 1 by creating a poorly designed tunnel effect which would have had an overbearing effect, detrimental to their outlook.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Specialist Design Advice: Although the adjoining properties have been provided with additional living accommodation at the rear and side, in this instance it is not possible to do the same for this middle unit due to the site constraints. The need to provide sufficient light to the neighbouring property results in an uncomfortable architectural style. It is considered on balance that this which would not enhance or protect the character of the Conservation Area when viewed from the public footway. Recommends refusal.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Concerned that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the light of the neighbouring cottage as the extension does not meet 45-degree criteria.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and one representation has been received. Period expired 27 February 2003.

We consider that application to be worse than the previous application as it would bring the wall closer to our window and has sheer vertical walls, reducing light and creating more of a tunnel effect. The proposal does not meet the 45-degree angle as laid down by the BRE.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues are whether

- 1) the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity adjoining occupiers (ADP Policies H7, DC1 & DC14 and DLP Policies H7, GEN2 & GEN4) and
- 2) the design of the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (ADP Policy DC7 & DLP Policy ENV1).

1) The revised extension would leave a gap of 1.5m where the neighbours' rear bedroom window is located, run back at right-angles for 900mm before being diagonally angled off at 34 degrees. The neighbouring window is currently located 700mm from the flank wall of the proposed extension. It is considered that, although the extension has now been designed with an angled rear and side flank wall, this element would not meet established BRE standards when applied from the eaves height of the extension. This is because a 45 degree line drawn from the eaves height would cover more than half of the window. However the 45 degree standard would be met if a 45 degree line is drawn from the depth of the extension (i.e. from 900mm). The window in question to the neighbouring property is however to a secondary bedroom, which is given less importance than if, it was a living room. On balance it is considered that the amount of skylight that would be lost into this window is not material enough to warrant a refusal. Furthermore, as the applicant suggests in the supporting information to the application, the 45-degree criteria was not considered to be an appropriate reason for refusal when the two storey rear extensions were approved at No 1 and No 3. The erection of these extensions has had a far greater impact on the amount of sky/daylight and sunlight into the rear bedroom window of No 2 and the affected window than the proposed extension would have on its own. The fact that the wall has been angled to allow more sunlight and daylight in also means that the 'tunnel' effect, which was a main reason for refusal of the previous application, is also reduced to an acceptable level.

The case however is finely balanced; the properties surrounding the application site have been considerably extended, with No 1 having almost doubled in size, on balance it is considered that although there would be a minimal impact, this would not be material enough to warrant a refusal on amenity grounds, especially as the large two storey extension to the rear of No 1 already reduces significantly sunlight during the morning. Turning to the impact of the single storey extension, it is considered that because of its depth the extension would not have a material impact on residential amenity.

2) Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 states that a planning authority shall pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Because the applicant has shown a desire to reduce the impact on the neighbouring property, this has resulted in a somewhat awkward architectural form. The council's Conservation and Listed Buildings Officer advises that because this style is needed to reduce the impact on neighbours to an acceptable level, it would have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area. However, the property can only be seen from the footpath and would be mainly obscured between the two large rear extension on both sides, so that the existing streetscene in High Easter would not be materially affected. It is therefore considered that the extension would have no more of an impact on the Conservation Area than the existing large two-storey extensions that surround the materially site.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** See above.

**CONCLUSION:** This is a finely balanced case as the neighbouring properties have been considerably extended, with No 1 being doubled in size and No 3 having a large first floor rear extension. The revised proposal would have a minimal impact on the amount of daylight and sunlight into the bedroom window of No 1, but it is considered that this is not sufficient enough to warrant a refusal. Furthermore the angle of the flank wall would significantly reduce the ‘tunnel’ effect that the previous application created. Although objections have been received from the Council’s Conservation Officer with regard to the awkward architectural form, it is considered that the extension would have no more an impact on the Conservation Area than the existing large extensions that surround the site.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1. Standard time limit for commencement
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans
3. C.5.2. Details of materials to be submitted and agreed
4. No demolition or construction relating to this permission shall be carried out on any Sunday, Public or Bank Holiday nor at any other time, except between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 on Mondays to Fridays and between the hours of 08:30 and 13:00 on Saturdays  
Reason: To safeguard the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*