

UTT/0238/05/DFO - STANSTED .....	4
UTT/0238/05/DFO - STANSTED .....	5
UTT/0239/05/DFO - STANSTED .....	9
UTT/0239/05/DFO - STANSTED .....	10
UTT/0172/05/OP – BARNSTON .....	14
UTT/0414/05/OP – NEWPORT .....	17
1) UTT/0386/05/DFO, 2) UTT/0392/05/DFO, 3)UTT/0394/05/FUL, 4) UTT/0395/05/FUL – GREAT DUNMOW .....	21
UTT/0358/05/FUL & UTT/0378/05/LB – WIMBISH.....	32
UTT/0399/05/DFO - GREAT DUNMOW.....	39
UTT/0486/05/LB - SAFFRON WALDEN.....	44
UTT/0191/05/FUL – FELSTED .....	45
UTT/0507/05/OP - LITTLE CANFIELD.....	48
UTT/0351/05/FUL - LINDSELL .....	51

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS AWAITING DECISIONS WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN INCLUDED ON A PREVIOUS SCHEDULE AS AT 18 MAY 2005**

APPL NO: **UTT/0238/05/DFO**  
PARISH: **STANSTED**  
DEVELOPMENT: Details of proposals for B1 use including buildings, parking, access, servicing and landscaping (Outline planning permission approved under reference UTT/0833/91 with period extended under approval UTT/1480/03/REN).  
APPLICANT: W R C Morton & Co Ltd.  
LOCATION: Land at Parsonage Farm.  
D.C. CTTE: 27 April 2005 (see report copy attached)  
REMARKS: Deferred for Site Visit  
**RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions**  
*Case Officer:* Mr T Morton 01799 510654  
Expiry Date: 18 April 2005

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0239/05/DFO**  
PARISH: **STANSTED**  
DEVELOPMENT: Details of proposal for B1 use including buildings, parking, access, servicing & landscaping. (Outline planning permission approved under reference UTT/0833/91 with period extended under approval UTT/1481/03/REN).  
APPLICANT: W R C Morton & Co.  
LOCATION: Parsonage Farm.  
D.C. CTTE: 27 April 2005 (see report copy attached)  
REMARKS: Deferred  
**RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions**  
*Case Officer:* Mr T Morton 01799 510654  
Expiry Date: 18 April 2005

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0172/05/OP**  
PARISH: **BARNSTON**  
DEVELOPMENT: Erection of buildings to comprise an industrial workshop/storage building (25x30m), office building (8x15m), staff welfare building (4x15m with 4x8m wing) and cart shed (9x60m); removal of 5 no. existing buildings.  
APPLICANT: Mr J Jaggard  
LOCATION: Mawkinherds Farm, Wellstye Green.  
D.C. CTTE: 27 April 2005 (see report copy attached)  
REMARKS: Deferred for Site Visit  
**RECOMMENDATION: Refusal**  
*Case Officer:* Mr M Ranner 01799 510556  
Expiry Date: 13 April 2005

---

APPL NO: **UTT/0414/05/OP**  
PARISH: **NEWPORT**  
DEVELOPMENT: Outline application for demolition of existing Nissen hut and storage building and erection of 2 no. detached dwellings with garages.

APPLICANT: JMJ Construction.  
LOCATION: Plots 4 & 5 The Spinney, London Road.  
D.C. CTTE: 27 April 2005 (see report copy attached)  
REMARKS: Deferred for Site Visit  
**RECOMMENDATION:** **Approval with conditions**  
*Case Officer:* Mr G Lyon 01799 510458  
*Expiry Date:* 5 May 2005

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT:**

**UTT/0238/05/DFO - STANSTED**

Details of proposals for B1 use including buildings, parking, access, servicing and landscaping (Outline planning permission approved under reference UTT/0833/91 with period extended under approval UTT/1480/03/REN).

Land at Parsonage Farm. GR/TL 155-229. W R C Morton & Co Ltd.

*Case Officer: Mr T Morton 01799 510654*

Expiry Date: 18/04/2005

**BACKGROUND**

This application was presented to the last meeting of this Committee on 27 April 2005 with a recommendation for approval with conditions, but a very late objection was received from the County Highways Section on the day of the Committee meeting about the effect of the proposed vehicle access on a bridleway that runs through the site.

The application was deferred for a site visit to be held to clarify the access arrangements and to pick up the highways issues.

This report has been drafted to meet the closing date for the Agenda on 2 May 2005, and the site meeting has been arranged for 6 May 2005. The results of the meeting and the response of the Highway Authority will be reported at the meeting.

**RECOMMENDATION**

If the Highway Authority withdraw their objection it is recommended that approval be granted in the terms of the report to this Committee on 27 April 2005, as attached.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **UTT/0238/05/DFO - STANSTED**

Details of proposals for B1 use including buildings, parking, access, servicing and landscaping (Outline planning permission approved under reference UTT/0833/91 with period extended under approval UTT/1480/03/REN).

Land at Parsonage Farm. GR/TL 155-229. W R C Morton & Co Ltd.

Case Officer: Mr T Morton 01799 510654

Expiry Date: 18/04/2005

**NOTATION:** Policy Area SM5 / Within MGB.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site consists of two separate pieces of land, accessed by a long private road from Foresthall Road. The site contains a collection of ageing buildings in various business uses.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The northern section is proposed to be an estate of factory units, providing 13 units. The southern site is proposed to be 9 factory units, each 7.6m high to the eaves and 9.2m to the ridge (9.9m for unit 5). Each unit is provided with its own parking forecourt. A landscape planting scheme is provided for the areas around the new buildings to provide a landscape setting, as well as amenity planting within the development areas.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** The current application provides the final details for these schemes, which have been the subject of prior negotiations and previous decisions in Outline. Surveys for Protected Species have been carried out and confirm that there are no issues that arise.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Various permissions for industrial redevelopment of site approved and renewed since original outline granted in 1991. In 1995, condition varied to amend junction details. Condition varying time for submission of reserved matters was renewed in October 2000 and February 2002 (to be submitted by 30 May 2005).

There are now two series of consents for two alternative development schemes;

UTT/833/91 – Outline approval for redevelopment of site for B1 uses incl. Condition limiting Office and Research floorspace to no more than 20% of the total in not more than 4,000 sq ft in any one unit

UTT/1392/92 – Floorspace limit increased to a minimum of 50% light industry.

UTT/0003/94 – Renewal of 833/91 (80/20 mix)

UTT/0890/95 – Renewal of 1392/92 (50% mix)

UTT/0962/95 – Renewal of 0003/94 (80/20 mix)

UTT/1122/97 – Renewal of 962/95

UTT/1123/97 – Renewal of 890/95

UTT/0888/00 – Renewal of 1122/97

UTT/0887/00 – Renewal of 1123/97

UTT/1724/01 – Renewal of 888/00

UTT/1725/01 – Renewal of 887/00

UTT/1480/03 – Renewal of 1724/01

UTT/1481/03 – Renewal of 1725/01

UTT/0238/05 – Details for 1480/03

UTT/0239/05 – Details for 1481/05

**CONSULTATIONS:** Environment Agency: No objections.

The Ramblers Association: Parsonage Lane is a bridleway (Bridleway 27) and has a particular importance in the network of highways because they connect to highways on the eastern side of the M11 and will provide a safe access for horseriders, cyclists and walkers to the new £1.5 million development of the Flitch Way by Essex County Council. Safety of non-motorised users of the bridleway should be safeguarded.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Notification period expired 24 March 2005.

Birchanger Parish Council: Strong objection, totally out of character with the residential nature of this neighbourhood, the 406 parking spaces plus lorries would have an excessive traffic impact especially during peak times on this rural road with major safety concerns close to secondary school entrance. The size and density is an overdevelopment of the area and out of proportion to the existing development. The proposal would impact on the agricultural nature of the surrounding area making it inaccessible for farming, leading to pressure to extend the development further. Visual impact on this land must be preserved, the development would be overlooked by a major proportion of residents of Birchanger. Parsonage Farm is Listed such a huge development would be inappropriate with its curtilage. Close to the secondary school possible noise and pollution impacts too great.

Stansted Parish Council: No objections – this will tidy up the site and provide much needed space for small and starter businesses.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and no representations have been received. Period expired 16 March 2005.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** None.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues are

- 1) the principle of development (ERSP Policy C2, ULP Policy SM2);
- 2) design (ULP Policy GEN2);
- 3) highways issues (ERSP Policies T1, T3, T6);
- 4) landscape and Wildlife issues (ULP Policy GEN7).

1) The principle of the redevelopment of this site has been established with the November 1991 approval of UTT/0833/91, and this is also reflected by an allocation in the Local Plan. The planning history of the site is protracted and complex, but the use was seen as established, and redevelopment was seen as the way to tidy up and improve the site. The Outline consent was not subject to a condition placing any limitation on the floorspace that might be developed. The 1991 case quoted an existing floorspace of 52,000 sq ft (15,850 sq m). The proposal is for a total of 14,000 sq m, in 22 units. Condition C.91B of the 1991 consent places a limit of 4,000 sq ft within any unit of any Class B1(a) or B1 (b) use. Policy SM 5 of the ULP states:

“ Within the Policy Area redevelopment of existing buildings for Class B1 purposes, primarily in small individual units, will be permitted, if all the following criteria are met.

- a) Schemes for replacement buildings form part of an agreed overall plan for the phased improvement of the whole site, which may include arrangements for the regulation of existing haulage and car breaking uses.
- b) The design of new buildings suits the rural character and appearance of the locality, and associated activities and car parking are concealed from principal public viewpoints. Permission may also be granted for a lesser proportion of Class B2 uses. No increased floorspace will be permitted in any phase until all existing buildings in that phase have been replaced. Permission will not be granted for new haulage or car breaking uses.”

2) The units are functional space frame structures with metal sheet cladding and limited areas of glazing. Externally to the site the view will essentially be of large sheds in the landscape, and these would not relate particularly well to the countryside. The proposed landscape planting would eventually offer some limited screening of the units, but they will always read as an urban feature in the countryside. This could perhaps be further mitigated if the cladding and roofing were to be executed in very dark coloured materials, natural earth colours or very dark green. The internal courtyards are dominated by parking areas, and there may be some conflict with delivery vehicle movements. This is an uninspired standardised factory estate design, and may not meet the aspirations of Policy SM5 (b).

National planning guidance contained in PPS7 would not now view this location as a sustainable one for new development, it is remote and can only be accessed by the private car. However the planning history, established nature of the uses and outline consent negate this.

3) The access currently is by a relatively narrow single-track road, which is barely adequate to serve the current site. The outline approval includes provision for a new section of road to bypass the most restricted section of the current road around the farmstead of Parsonage Farm. The applicant's agent has pointed out that the first section of the lane has been paralleled by a new track, built under Permitted development rights as a farm track in 1998 (P/A/2/14/97), and they intend to use this to 'dual' the first section of the road to provide one way working and thereby improve it. This is however not shown on any currently submitted drawing, nor any drawing already approved. A change of use is involved from farm track to road ancillary to Class B1 development. The Outline approval contained drawings for improvement of the junction with Foresthall Road, and these are secured by condition. Birchanger Parish Council has raised objections to the increased levels of traffic likely to be generated, and they are probably right in this. Increased traffic pressure is likely to be felt on Parsonage Lane, at the junction with Foresthall Road, at the ensuing junction with Church Road in the vicinity of the school, and at the junction of Foresthall Road and Stansted Road, though this junction will be reconstructed and improved as part of the nearby residential development at Rochford Nurseries.

The first section of the road from Foresthall Road is also a bridleway, and no direct provision for this appears to have been made in earlier planning stages. The Ramblers Association have made representations about this. The developer has been requested to provide a segregated route and has responded that the new parallel driveway will avoid conflict and they see no basis for providing any additional works in this respect. This is not considered adequate; the bridleway should be physically separate from the roadway, and a condition is recommended to require provision of a separate route before occupation of any of the buildings. Full drawings of the entire length of the access road should be submitted for approval before commencement of development.

4) Concern was raised at earlier stages about the use that protected species (Badger, Great Crested Newt and Bats) might make of the site. A full ecological assessment has been provided, and a further check has been made during the life of the application in respect of badgers. It is accepted that although badgers and bats may make passing use of the site, they are not apparently resident. Of course, the provisions of legislation giving legal protection is not over-riden by any planning consent, but the LPA has to consider any possible impact upon them in reaching its decision. On the basis of the available evidence it is considered that there will be no impact.

The landscape planting proposals are for planting around the two sites, but also for the creation of 'shelter belt' planting along field edges to the east. This will eventually offer some screening from the M11 motorway, but the scale of these buildings means that they will always be highly visible in the landscape. The Birchanger Parish Council have raised an

objection to the development being visible from houses in Birchanger. The existing Digby Wood offers some screening on that side of the development, and there are changes in the topography of the surface too. This makes it difficult to predict exactly how far the buildings will be visible from, but it is likely that there will be distant views. Planning case law says that merely being able to see a development is not necessarily a reason to refuse it, on the other hand countryside policy seeks to protect the countryside for its own sake, particularly its landscapes, and the development is within a defined policy area, it will intrude into the landscape.

**CONCLUSIONS:** As a site for a large new commercial estate, this is far from ideal. It would not meet tests for sustainable location, being remote and only accessible by car. The development will be visible in the landscape, and probably intrusive. However, the history of the site places constraints upon current courses of action. Any replacement employment floorspace here is likely to suffer from the same problems. If the colour of the buildings can be toned into the landscape, this will mitigate the impact. Improvement of the bridleway is considered essential.

There are concerns about the access road and full drawings are required for consideration before commencement of development. There remain other conditions of the Outline consent to be discharged; an investigation into site contamination, and pollution prevention; and for on-site and off-site drainage works. Materials also need approval and as discussed above these need to be chosen to blend the buildings into the landscape.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. Full engineering drawings of the proposed access road from the junction of Foresthall Road to the new development, including details of a segregated route for Bridleway 27, shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be constructed and completed before commencement of development.  
REASON: In the interests of traffic safety and the safety of users of the Bridleway.
2. Samples of all external materials of the buildings and paving and surfacing materials shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before commencement of development, and those approved materials shall thereafter be used and no alterations made to them subsequently without the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority has a preference for dark and natural earth coloured external materials to be used.  
REASON: To blend the development into the landscape in the interest of protecting the character and appearance of the countryside in this Metropolitan Green Belt location.
3. C.20.3. If Protected Species discovered get Licence from DEFRA.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*



## **SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**

### **UTT/0239/05/DFO - STANSTED**

Details of proposal for B1 use including buildings, parking, access, servicing & landscaping. (Outline planning permission approved under reference UTT/0833/91 with period extended under approval UTT/1481/03/REN).

Parsonage Farm. GR/TL 155-229. W R C Morton & Co.

*Case Officer: Mr T Morton 01799 510654*

Expiry Date: 18 April 2005

#### **BACKGROUND**

This application was presented to the last meeting of this Committee on 27 April 2005 with a recommendation for approval with conditions, but a very late objection was received from the County Highways Section on the day of the Committee meeting about the effect of the proposed vehicle access on a bridleway that runs through the site.

The application was deferred for a site visit to be held to clarify the access arrangements and to pick up the highways issues.

This report has been drafted to meet the closing date for the Agenda on 2 May 2005, and the site meeting has been arranged for 6 May 2005. The results of the meeting and the response of the Highway Authority will be reported at the meeting.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

If the Highway Authority withdraw their objection it is recommended that approval be granted in the terms of the report to this Committee on 27 April 2005, as attached.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **UTT/0239/05/DFO - STANSTED**

Details of proposal for B1 use including buildings, parking, access, servicing & landscaping. (Outline planning permission approved under reference UTT/0833/91 with period extended under approval UTT/1481/03/REN).

Parsonage Farm. GR/TL 155-229. W R C Morton & Co.

Case Officer: Mr T Morton 01799 510654

Expiry Date: 18 April 2005

**NOTATION:** Policy Area SM5 / Within MGB.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site consists of two separate pieces of land, accessed by a long private road from Foresthall Road. The site contains a collection of ageing buildings in various business uses.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The northern section is proposed to be an estate of factory units, providing 13 units. The southern site is proposed to be 11 two-storey small office units (9.85m high), with unit sizes ranging from 270 sq m to 440 sq m. Each unit is provided with its own parking forecourt. A landscape planting scheme is provided for the areas around the new buildings to provide a landscape setting, as well as amenity planting within the development areas.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** The current application provides the final details for these schemes, which have been the subject of prior negotiations and previous decisions in Outline. Surveys for Protected Species have been carried out and confirm that there are no issues that arise.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Various permissions for industrial redevelopment of site approved and renewed since original outline granted in 1991. In 1995, condition varied to amend junction details. Condition varying time for submission of reserved matters was renewed in October 2000 and February 2002 (to be submitted by 30 May 2005).

There are now two series of consents for two alternative development schemes:

UTT/833/91 – Outline approval for redevelopment of site for B1 uses incl. Condition limiting Office and Research floorspace to no more than 20% of the total in not more than 4,000 sq ft in any one unit

UTT/1392/92 – Floorspace limit increased to a minimum of 50% light industry and with a maximum unit size of 500 sq m for the offices.

UTT/0003/94 – Renewal of 833/91 (80/20 mix)

UTT/0890/95 – Renewal of 1392/92 (50% mix)

UTT/0962/95 – Renewal of 0003/94 (80/20 mix)

UTT/1122/97 – Renewal of 962/95

UTT/1123/97 – Renewal of 890/95

UTT/0888/00 - Renewal of 1122/97

UTT/0887/00 – Renewal of 1123/97

UTT/1724/01 – Renewal of 888/00

UTT/1725/01 – Renewal of 887/00

UTT/1480/03 – Renewal of 1724/01

UTT/1481/03 – Renewal of 1725/01

UTT/0238/05 - Details for 1480/03

UTT/0239/05 - Details for 1481/05

**CONSULTATIONS:** Environment Agency No objections.

The Ramblers Association: Parsonage Lane is a bridleway (Bridleway 27) and has a particular importance in the network of highways because they connect to highways on the

eastern side of the M11 and will provide a safe access for horseriders, cyclists and walkers to the new £1.5 million development of the Flitch Way by Essex County Council. Safety of non-motorised users of the bridleway should be safeguarded.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Notification period expired 24 March 2005.

Birchanger Parish Council: Strong objection, totally out of character with the residential nature of this neighbourhood, the 406 parking spaces plus lorries would have an excessive traffic impact especially during peak times on this rural road with major safety concerns close to secondary school entrance. The size and density is an overdevelopment of the area and out of proportion to the existing development. The proposal would impact on the agricultural nature of the surrounding area making it inaccessible for farming, leading to pressure to extend the development further. Visual impact on this land must be preserved, the development would be overlooked by a major proportion of residents of Birchanger.

Parsonage Farm is Listed such a huge development would be inappropriate with its curtilage. Close to the secondary school possible noise and pollution impacts too great.

Stansted Parish Council: No objections – this will tidy up the site and provide much needed space for small and starter businesses.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and no representations have been received. Period expired 16 March 2005.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS: The main issues are**

- 1) the principle of development (ERSP Policy C2, ULP Policy SM2),
- 2) design (ULP Policy GEN2),
- 3) highways issues (ERSP Policies T1, T3, T6),
- 4) landscape and Wildlife issues (ULP Policy GEN7).

1) The principle of the redevelopment of this site has been established with the November 1991 approval of UTT/0833/91, and this is also reflected by an allocation in the Local Plan. The planning history of the site is protracted and complex, but the use was seen as established, and redevelopment was seen as the way to tidy up and improve the site. The Outline consent was not subject to a condition placing any limitation on the floorspace that might be developed. The 1991 case quoted an existing floorspace of 52,000sq ft (15,850sqm).

The proposal is for a total of 6855 sqm of industrial space in 18 units, and 7732 sqm of office space in 22 suites. Condition C.91B of the 1991 consent places a limit of 4,000 sq ft within any unit of any Class B1(a) or B1 (b) use.

Policy SM 5 of the ULP states;

“ Within the Policy Area redevelopment of existing buildings for Class B1 purposes, primarily in small individual units, will be permitted, if all the following criteria are met.

a) Schemes for replacement buildings form part of an agreed overall plan for the phased improvement of the whole site, which may include arrangements for the regulation of existing haulage and car breaking uses.

b) The design of new buildings suits the rural character and appearance of the locality, and associated activities and car parking are concealed from principal public viewpoints. Permission may also be granted for a lesser proportion of Class B2 uses. No increased floorspace will be permitted in any phase until all existing buildings in that phase have been replaced. Permission will not be granted for new haulage or car breaking uses.”

2) The industrial units are functional space frame structures with metal sheet cladding and limited areas of glazing. Externally to the site the view of this section of the development will essentially be of large sheds in the landscape, and these would not relate particularly

well to the countryside. The office units have some areas of brown brick artificial slate to the roofs, but some walls are clad in metal sheet. Because the office units are more separated than the industrial units the mass will be broken up, and this will help to reduce the visual impact in the landscape.

The proposed landscape planting would eventually offer some limited screening of the units, but they will always read as an urban feature in the countryside. This could perhaps be further mitigated if the cladding and roofing were to be executed in very dark coloured materials, natural earth colours or very dark green. The internal courtyards are dominated by parking areas, and there may be some conflict with delivery vehicle movements. This is an uninspired standardised factory estate design, and a fairly random placing of the office buildings with no real attempt to create a sense of place, and may not meet the aspirations of Policy SM5 (b).

National planning guidance contained in PPS7 would not now view this location as a sustainable one for new development; it is remote and can only be accessed by the private car. However the planning history, established nature of the uses and outline consent negate this.

3) The access currently is by a relatively narrow single-track road which is barely adequate to serve the current site. The outline approval includes provision for a new section of road to bypass the most restricted section of the current road around the farmstead of Parsonage Farm. The applicant's agent has pointed out that the first section of the lane has been paralleled by a new track, built under Permitted Development rights as a farm track in 1998 (P/A/2/14/97), and they intend to use this to 'dual' the first section of the road to provide one way working and thereby improve it. This is however not shown on any currently submitted drawing, nor any drawing already approved. A change of use is involved from farm track to road ancillary to Class B1 development. The Outline approval contained drawings for improvement of the junction with Foresthall Road, and these are secured by condition. Birchanger Parish Council has raised objections to the increased levels of traffic likely to be generated, and they are probably right in this. Increased traffic pressure is likely to be felt on Parsonage Lane, at the junction with Foresthall Road, at the ensuing junction with Church Road in the vicinity of the school, and at the junction of Foresthall Road and Stansted Road, though this junction will be reconstructed and improved as part of the nearby residential development at Rochford Nurseries.

The first section of the road from Foresthall Road is also a bridleway, and no direct provision for this appears to have been made in earlier planning stages. The Ramblers Association have made representations about this. The developer has been requested to provide a segregated route and has responded that the new parallel driveway will avoid conflict and they see no basis for providing any additional works in this respect. This is not considered adequate; the bridleway should be physically separate from the roadway, and a condition is recommended to require provision of a separate route before occupation of any of the buildings. Full drawings of the entire length of the access road should be submitted for approval before commencement of development.

4) Concern was raised at earlier stages about the use that protected species (Badger, Great Crested Newt and Bats) might make of the site. A full ecological assessment has been provided, and a further check has been made during the life of the application in respect of badgers. It is accepted that although badgers and bats may make passing use of the site, they are not apparently resident. Of course, the provisions of legislation giving legal protection is not over-riden by any planning consent, but the LPA has to consider any possible impact upon them in reaching its decision. On the basis of the available evidence it is considered that there will be no impact.

The landscape planting proposals are for planting around the two sites, but also for the creation of 'shelter belt' planting along field edges to the east. This will eventually offer some screening from the M11 motorway, but the scale of these buildings means that they will always be highly visible in the landscape. The Birchanger Parish Council have raised an objection to the development being visible from houses in Birchanger. The existing Digby Wood offers some screening on that side of the development, and there are changes in the topography of the surface too. This makes it difficult to predict exactly how far the buildings will be visible from, but it is likely that there will be distant views. Planning case law says that merely being able to see a development is not necessarily a reason to refuse it, on the other hand countryside policy seeks to protect the countryside for its own sake, particularly its landscapes, and the development is within a defined policy area, it will intrude into the landscape.

**CONCLUSIONS:** As a site for a large new commercial estate, this is far from ideal. It would not meet tests for sustainable location, being remote and only accessible by car. The development will be visible in the landscape, and probably intrusive. However, the history of the site places constraints upon current courses of action. Any replacement employment floorspace here is likely to suffer from the same problems. If the colour of the buildings can be toned into the landscape, this will mitigate the impact. Improvement of the bridleway is considered essential.

There are concerns about the access road and full drawings are required for consideration before commencement of development. There remain other conditions of the Outline consent to be discharged; on an investigation into site contamination, and pollution prevention; and for on-site and off-site drainage works. Materials also need approval and as discussed above these need to be chosen to blend the buildings into the landscape.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. Full engineering drawings of the proposed access road from the junction of Foresthall Road to the new development, including details of a segregated route for Bridleway 27, shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be constructed and completed before commencement of development.  
REASON: In the interests of traffic safety and the safety of users of the Bridleway.
2. Sample of all external materials of the buildings and paving and surfacing materials shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before commencement of development, and those approved materials shall thereafter be used and no alterations made to them subsequently without the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority has a preference for dark and natural earth coloured external materials to be used.  
REASON: To blend the development into the landscape in the interest of protecting the character and appearance of the countryside in this Metropolitan Green Belt location.
3. C.20.3. If Protected Species discovered get License from DEFRA.
4. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in all respects strictly in accordance with the submitted plans contained in the application, as listed in Appendix One of this decision, unless agreed in writing by the local planning authority.  
REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to clarify the scope of approval.  
See attached list of drawings attached at end of report.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **UTT/0172/05/OP – BARNSTON**

Erection of buildings to comprise an industrial workshop/storage building (25x30m), office building (8x15m), staff welfare building (4x15m with 4x8m wing) and cart shed (9x60m); removal of 5 no. existing buildings.

Mawkinherds Farm, Wellstye Green. GR/TL 639-187. Mr H Jaggard.

Case Officer: Mr M Ranner 01799 510556

Expiry Date: 13 April 2005

**NOTATION:** Outside of Development Limits.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The application site is located adjacent to the hamlet of Wellstyle Green and forms part of Mawkinherds Farm, which comprises extensive agricultural land with associated buildings. These are sited in a group immediately to the south of the site and comprise a grade II listed farmhouse in addition to a number of buildings of varying types including substantial farm buildings of modern construction, a couple of portable cabins and some older timber framed farm buildings. The area subject to this application in addition to the land immediately to the north is free of buildings and is used for the external storage of farming equipment/vehicles and materials e.g. topsoil, hardcore timber etc in association with the commercial uses operating from the Farm.

A mature belt of trees borders the western boundary of the site beyond which lays an open green and High Easter Road. Three properties surround the green, a bungalow known as 'Greenview', 'Wellstyle Farm' and 'Tye Green Farm'. The eastern boundary of the site is formed by an open raised bank beyond which is an area of 'set aside grassland' and open countryside. The site can be accessed from the south via a vehicular entrance adjacent to the Mawkinherds Farmhouse or by a smaller unmade access track, which accesses the northern part of the site.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of buildings to comprise an industrial workshop/storage building (25mx30m), office building (8mx15m), staff welfare building (4mx15m with 4x8m wing) and cart shed (9m x 60m) comprising a gross floor area of 1500m<sup>2</sup>. The submitted layout drawing also indicates two formal parking areas. The first of these comprises 17 spaces sited between the proposed staff welfare building and workshop/storage building adjacent to the sites eastern boundary. The second is an HGV parking area comprising 4 spaces located adjacent to the proposed cart shed abutting the southern boundary of the site. Outline planning permission is sought in respect of siting and access with matters of design, landscaping and external appearance reserved.

As part of the project the applicant also intends to demolish 5 buildings totaling 425.5m<sup>2</sup>, which are located within the main group of buildings to the south of the application site. They comprise an open timber cart shed currently used to accommodate gritting lorries, a workshop building of modern construction currently used to repair farm machinery, a storage shed and two portable cabins, one used as an office and the other as staff welfare accommodation.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** For a full supporting case please refer to the letter dated 14 February 2005 from the applicant's professional advisors, which can be viewed on the case file at the Council Offices, Saffron Walden.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Of relevance to this case was the issue of a certificate of lawfulness on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2001 (LPA Ref: UTT/1764/00/CL) by this authority in respect to the

application site and the area accommodating the group of buildings associated with Mawkinherds Farm directly to the south. This related to the use of the aforementioned land and buildings for the purposes of agricultural storage, agricultural contracts, forestry (sale of logs), amenity landscaping, land drainage works and road gritting.

**CONSULTATIONS:** English Nature: State proposal is not likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest, although offers advice on protected species.

Highway Authority: No objections.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objections to the application provided that all the trees in the surrounding area remain.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** None. Notification period expired 11 March 2005.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues for consideration in this case are: -

- 1) **whether the proposed development is appropriate to the rural area (ERSP Policy C5 & ULP Policy S7.),**
- 2) **the likely effect that the development would have on the character and appearance of the countryside (ERSP Policy C5 & ULP Policy S7) and**
- 3) **other material planning considerations (ULP Policy GEN1, GEN4).**

1) The application site is situated outside of development limits within the countryside where policies C5 of the ERSP and S7 of the ULP apply. Policy S7 states that planning permission will only be given for development that protects or enhances the particular character of the part of the countryside within which it is set, or there are special reasons why the development in the form proposed needs to be there. Furthermore the countryside will be protected for its own sake and there will be a strict control on new building. Policy C5 of the ERSP stipulates that new building within the countryside will be restricted to that required to support agriculture, forestry and other uses appropriate to the rural area.

Agricultural crop growing still takes place on up to 128 acres (5.2ha) of the 133 acres (53.8ha) of the farm and the existing buildings currently provide storage for equipment in association with the agricultural use of the farm. This is however the applicant states that it is not a full time viable agricultural unit and the general purpose for the proposed buildings is to improve the existing facilities at the farm for the other uses that lawfully take place at the site. These include agricultural contracting for third parties; forestry, including the sale and storage of timber at the site generated by forestry clearance and coppicing work undertaken outside of the agricultural holding; amenity landscaping and land drainage works ranging from grass cutting to the implementation of complete landscaping schemes associated with developments and road gritting for the likes of Essex County Council and the British Airports Authority. It is clear therefore that the development is not required for agricultural or forestry purposes and so the provision of commercial buildings within the countryside which will be of considerable size totaling 1500m<sup>2</sup> of floor space, will constitute inappropriate development in light of the policy presumption against the construction of such buildings in rural areas as expressed in policies C5 (ERSP) and S7 (ULP).

The applicant in support of the application state that the proposal is important for the continued success of the business and represents a logical way of restoring an appropriate setting for the listed buildings located in close proximity to the site. Whilst the proposal may well be important to the success of the business, it is the view of officers that this does not justify a departure from policy in this case. The site is situated in an unsustainable location that is unsuitable for further expansion in terms of the introduction of considerable additional built form in this rural location. This would be contrary not only to the aforementioned Development Plan policies but also to recent Government advice contained in PPS7 entitled

'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas', which as the title suggests, seeks to promote more sustainable patterns of development. With regard to the other issues, the removal of the portable cabins from the adjacent site would be desirable however their removal does not justify the provision of 1500m<sup>2</sup> of new buildings and it is considered that the harm to the character /appearance of the countryside caused by the proposed buildings would far outweigh the benefits afforded by the removal of far smaller buildings (including two small portable cabins) located within the existing nucleus of farm buildings.

2) In respect of the possible implications of the development on the character/appearance of the countryside, the applicants also seek to justify the development with their assessment that the proposal would result in an improvement to the visual amenities of the area. The applicant states that this would be by virtue of the benefits to visual amenity afforded by the removal of existing external storage from the site and the provision of soft landscaping. Officers consider however that the proposed buildings by virtue of their considerable footprints, are likely to be of a height that would be in excess of the current materials and equipment stored on the site at present. As such the buildings are likely to be of greater prominence within the rural landscape and to a degree where they would appear visually intrusive, particularly from the east where views of the proposed buildings are likely to be obtained from the A130 to the south of Barnston. The impact of the development on the countryside will be emphasised as the proposed development will extend and enlarge the existing nucleus of buildings on the farm and consolidate the already considerable amount of built form within this rural location. The development of the site will also only remove some of the external storage from the farm as the land immediately to the north of the site is intended to remain for use of storing materials externally. Landscaping is also unlikely to be effective taking into account the probable height of the buildings (particularly the proposed workshop building) and any landscaping is likely to take a considerable time to establish and mature. In any event the use of soft landscaping should not be accepted as a measure to enable inappropriate development to be accommodated within the countryside, which is contrary to the Development Plan and Government guidance.

3) Turning to other matters of material importance, with regard to highway safety the proposal does not involve the alteration or construction of a new access. Also the Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposal and state that it is not contrary to relevant transportation policies contained within the ECC Structure Plan.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The proposal constitutes inappropriate development within the countryside contrary to policies C5 (ERSP) and S7 (ULP) and it is considered that no material planning considerations exist in this case that outweigh the resultant harm to the appearance/character of the countryside that would occur if the proposed development were to take place.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS**

The site is located within countryside beyond development limits as defined in the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan wherein permission will not normally be given for development unless the proposals relate to agriculture, forestry, appropriate outdoor recreational uses, or appropriate changes of use of existing buildings compatible with a rural area. The proposed development would be prejudicial to this policy, set out at S7 within the Local Plan and also policy C5 of the Essex Replacement Structure Plan and if permitted would detract from the character and appearance of the countryside.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*



## **UTT/0414/05/OP – NEWPORT**

Outline application for demolition of existing Nissen hut and storage building and erection of 2 no. detached dwellings with garages.

Plots 4 & 5 The Spinney, London Road. GR/TL 520-330. JMJ Construction.

Case Officer: Mr G Lyon 01799 510458

Expiry Date: 05 May 2005

**NOTATION:** Uttlesford Local Plan: Outside Development Limits of Newport.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site is located on the western side of the B1383 London Road, within a small residential close known as The Spinney, which has eight existing properties (three of which are still under construction). The site is currently slightly overgrown with an old Nissen hut in the south-western corner and it appears that the land is being used to store some building materials, possibly in connection with the erection of the adjacent dwellings. The site boundaries are a mixture of hedging and fencing of somewhat unkempt appearance, with the exception of the fencing adjacent to No.4 The Spinney. The site itself is approximately 0.073 hectares in size with an overall width of approximately 15m and a length of 45m. To the south of the site is "Bricketts", a large detached bungalow which is close to the boundary with the site known as Cornflowers (Now a semi-detached dwelling and bungalow). To the north of the site are the five properties of The Spinney and the property immediately opposite is a bungalow. "The Spinney" consists of a mixture of detached two-storey dwellings and two bungalows, one of which is still under construction but all of which are of recent construction. "The Spinney" is a narrow single track unadopted road. To the west of the application site are agricultural fields.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The applicant is seeking outline consent to erect two detached dwellings with garages. All matters are reserved for subsequent approval. The applicant has submitted a proposed site plan showing a potential layout along with an illustration of a potential house type. These are for illustrative purposes only and do not form part of any consent.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** None.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Erection of two no. semi-detached dwellings and garage to replace existing detached house approved October 2004 (Adjacent site – now being implemented). Erection of detached bungalow approved June 2004 (Adjacent site - now being implemented). Erection of single dwelling house and garage to replace existing detached house approved June 2004 (Adjacent site – not now being implemented) Dwellings on "The Spinney" have long history with some success at appeal for new dwellings, including No.5.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Essex County Council Highways and Transportation: No objections. Anglian Water: No comments received to date (to be verbally reported at the meeting). Environment Agency: Standard Advisory comments regarding residential development. UDC Environmental Services: No comments received to date (To be verbally reported at the meeting).

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No comments received (To be verbally reported at the meeting).

**REPRESENTATIONS:** Twelve neighbours were notified of the proposed development. Advertisement expired 31 March 2005. One representation has been received.

1. This development is clearly another example of infilling which has been happening to Newport in every spare space available. From one previous house we are now going to have four houses with quadruple the number of people and cars on that site requiring access onto the B1383 road. The proposed dwellings will directly overlook the rear garden of my property which is adjacent to the plot. The Planning Committee has over the recent past years granted permission to all the applications made in respect of the land around this particular plot and as a result we have a ramshackle, dense development of dwellings with tarmac and concrete where once a copse and grassland existed. I now have to look out at brick walls and roof tiles and be overlooked by them. I can see little point in having a Village Development Plan if permission is granted in this particular instance.

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

- 1) residential use on this site is considered acceptable (PPG3, ERSP POLICY BE1, H3, Uttlesford Local Plan Policy S3, S7, H1, H2, H3);**
- 2) the impact of the development on adjoining neighbours would be acceptable (ERSP Policies H3, Uttlesford Local Plan Policy GEN2),**
- 3) the proposed development respects the scale and characteristics of surrounding properties (ERSP Policy H3, Uttlesford Local Plan Policy H3, GEN2) and**
- 4) the access and parking arrangements are acceptable in terms of highway safety implications (ERSP Policies T3, T6, T7, T12, Uttlesford Local Plan Policy GEN1, GEN2 and GEN9).**

1) The site lies wholly outside but adjacent to the development limits of Newport. Ordinarily, such development would be refused as contrary to Development Plan Policy but, in this instance, one has to consider the precedent that has been set at appeal for some of the adjacent properties. In terms of milieu, the application site would be viewed within the context of "The Spinney" development and is the last feasible piece of developable land with road frontage. Once these plots have been developed, no further plots of comparable size with direct highway access would exist. Officers consider therefore that even though the site does lie outside of established development limits, the context of this application and the previous appeal decisions give sufficient weight to act as a material consideration to override the established Countryside Policy S7 of the Uttlesford Local Plan.

The preamble to Policy H3 states that "opportunities for sensitive infilling in small groups of houses outside development limits but close to settlements will be acceptable". As such it would not be necessary to consider this application as a departure from the Local Plan.

2) Given the fact that the application is in outline form only, it is difficult to fully assess any impacts to neighbouring properties. The closest neighbours to the proposed development would be those either side at "Bricketts", Nos 4 and 5 The Spinney as well as Plot 3 adjacent, which sits lower than the application site. The reserved matters stage would deal with all of the design issues, in particular those relating to amenity but it is apparent that any windows at first floor facing towards "Bricketts" would give rise to a loss of amenity for this property. The applicants drawing (Enclosure NoA) shows a 1½ storey dwelling with a front (north facing) dormer and integral garage. Although this drawing is for illustrative purposes it shows a clear indication of the type of property envisaged and indeed is a close resemblance to the already constructed dwelling at No.4 The Spinney, although this property is slightly larger in terms of overall floor area.

The overall impact on the adjacent plot 3, which is still under construction, will need careful consideration at the reserved matters stage, especially given the apparent changes in levels. Standard conditions relating to level details would be essential and also the boundary treatment between the two properties would need to take account of amenity issues. Face-to

face amenity issues, especially for No.5 The Spinney, will need to be considered and any front dormers should not result in the loss of established amenity of existing properties. Given the fact that front windows would face towards public areas, it is not envisaged that this issue should cause demonstrable harm.

Overall, officers are content that any detrimental impacts on neighbouring residential properties can be controlled by condition at the outline stage in order to guide the details of the reserved matters and achieve a satisfactory form of development.

3) The general character of this part of Newport has changed considerably over the last ten years and previous residential development at The Spinney has set a clear precedent following success at appeal.

Two dwellings on this site would be slightly below Central Government general density requirements at 27 dwellings per hectare and these plots would have small amenity areas, depending on the size of dwelling agreed at the reserved matters stage. However, amenity space is no smaller than that at Plot 3, which members resolved to approve in June 2004. Officers are of the opinion that the overall scale development is acceptable in this instance subject to relevant conditions.

4) In terms of access and parking issues, the only means of access to the two dwellings is via The Spinney and not directly onto the B1383. Essex County Council Transportation are therefore happy with the scheme and this allows all parking and turning movements to take place away from the busy road. Visibility into and out of The Spinney is good in both directions although its overall width makes it difficult but not impossible for two cars to pass. Adopted maximum standards would seek two spaces for a three-bedroom dwelling, and three spaces for four bedrooms and above, details of which would be resolved at the reserved matters stage.

Officers are therefore of the opinion that the access and parking arrangements are more than satisfactory in this instance.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The application is in outline form with all matters reserved for subsequent approval. Whilst the site does lie outside of the development limits, the precedent set by adjacent development acts as a material consideration to override the Countryside Policy S7 in this instance. It is not envisaged that the amenity of neighbouring properties would be harmed by the proposed development subject to the imposition of relevant conditions.

#### **RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

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 indicative design and siting of the dwellings, as indicated in drawing no.2 and Enclosure No.A. dated March 2005, received 10 March 2005 do not form part of this permission  
REASON: The application is in outline with all matters reserved for subsequent approval.
6. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted and agreed.
7. C.5.4. Slate Roof.
8. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
9. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
10. C.4.7. Detailed landscaping survey to be submitted (outline permissions).
11. C.4.6. Retention and protection of trees and shrubs for the duration of development.

12. Unless expressly exempted, all existing buildings on the site (including land within the site edged red and blue) shall be demolished and all the materials arising from such demolition shall be completely removed from the site within 1 month of the completion of the replacement dwelling hereby permitted.  
REASON: The removal of the existing buildings are required as part of the landscape improvement benefits.
13. C.6.2. Excluding all rights of permitted development within the curtilage of a dwelling house without further permission.
14. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), No additional windows, other than those approved under the reserved matters shall be inserted at first floor level or in the roof space of the dwellings hereby permitted.  
REASON: To avoid overlooking of the adjacent properties in the interests of residential amenity.
15. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the garages hereby permitted as part of this application shall remain available for the parking of domestic vehicles at all times and shall not be converted to any other use without express planning permission.  
REASON: To ensure that the dwelling has adequate off-street parking provision.
16. C.7.1. Details of external ground and internal floor levels to be submitted and agreed.
17. No construction works shall take place before 8am Mondays to Fridays and 9am on a Saturday. No construction works shall take place after 6pm Mondays to Fridays or after 1pm on Saturdays nor at any time on a Sunday or Public Holiday.  
REASON: In the interest of amenity of residents.
18. C.8.27. Drainage Details.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**1) UTT/0386/05/DFO, 2) UTT/0392/05/DFO, 3) UTT/0394/05/FUL,  
4) UTT/0395/05/FUL – GREAT DUNMOW**

1) Approval of reserved matters pursuant to outline approval UTT/0449/02/OP for the construction of 100 dwellings and associated estate roads, footpaths, garages, car spaces, foul and surface water drainage, amenity areas, boundary treatment and landscaping including provision of landscape margin to north west by pass.

2) Approval of reserved matters pursuant to outline approval ref. no UTT/0450/02/OP for the construction of 300 dwellings and associated estate roads, footpaths, garages, car spaces, bin and cycle stores, foul and surface water drainage, public open space, amenity areas, boundary treatment and landscaping including provision of landscape margin to north west by pass

3) Proposed construction of 17 dwellings and associated estate roads, footpaths, garages, car spaces, foul and surface water drainage, boundary treatment and landscaping including provision of landscape margin to north west by pass.

4) Construction of 51 dwellings and associated estate roads, footpaths, garages, car spaces, foul and surface water drainage, amenity areas, boundary treatment and landscaping including a provision of landscape margin to north west by pass.

1 – 3) Sector 3, Woodlands Park. GR/TL 614-224. Wickford Development Co. Ltd.

4) Sector 2, Woodlands Park. GR/TL 614-224. Wickford Development Co. Ltd.

*Case Officer: Mr N Ford 01799 510468*

Expiry Date: 2 May 2005

13 weeks: 6 June 2005

**NOTATION:** Development Limits ULP Policy S1. Outstanding Residential Commitments (Woodlands Park) ULP Policy GD5. Affects the setting of a Grade II listed building ULP Policy ENV2. Lies adjacent a bank of protected trees ULP Policy ENV3.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** These four applications relate to an area (18.41 hectares) of former agricultural land to the north west of existing housing development at Woodlands Park, Great Dunmow. This area is bounded to the north by Newton Hall (Grade II listed) and its landscaped drive running east beyond Helena Romanes School. To the east are several large dwellings, public open space and land at Sector 1 with planning permission for 105 dwellings with the Emblems housing estate adjacent. To the south is Sector 2 housing development completed and under construction and to the west the area is bounded by the proposed route of the north west by-pass (constructed to a point 200m north of Hoglands Brook and including the new junction to serve Sector 3) with open countryside beyond. The land falls gradually towards the north and is interspersed with mature groups of trees particularly adjacent Sector 2.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** This submission encompasses four separate applications for residential development of which two form reserved matters applications for the 400 dwellings (UTT/0386/05/DFO and UTT/0392/05/DFO) approved with outline planning permission in 2003 (Sector 3). The other two applications are in full and propose the erection of 51 dwellings at Sector 2 (UTT/0395/05/FUL) and 17 dwellings (UTT/0394/05/FUL), which results from its allocation for housing following the Local Plan Inquiry and as carried forward into the recently adopted Uttlesford Local Plan 2005.

UTT/0395/05/FUL is a full planning application for 51 dwellings comprising 2, 3 and 4 bedroom homes. This forms the application within Sector 2 and provides a highway link from the roundabout off the existing loop road to Sector 3.

UTT/0394/05/FUL is a full planning application for 17 dwellings comprising three and four bedroom homes to the west of Newton Hall.

UTT/0386/05/DFO is a reserved matters application for 100 dwellings comprising 2, 3 and 4 bedroom homes.

UTT/0392/05/DFO is a reserved matters application for 300 dwellings of which 54 are affordable homes. The market housing would comprise 1, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom homes whilst the affordable housing would comprise 1 to 4 bedroom homes of which the majority would be smaller properties. Such housing is proposed to be located in the south east portion of Sector 3 adjacent Sector 2.

For all schemes the applicant has submitted a scheme of landscaping and details of materials to be used on external surfaces of housing.

## **Design**

The layout would consist of detached and semi detached dwellings as well as town houses and blocks of flats. Some would be located off private drives and cul-de-sacs and some in particular character areas such as squares, circuses and crescents in order to seek visual variation around areas of public open space.

A variety of designs are proposed reflecting the variety of dwelling sizes. The applicant states that areas of housing will be visually attractive and varied through the use of particular materials in certain locations to reinforce character such as gault bricks and synthetic slates to squares and crescents to reflect Georgian and Victorian architecture.

## **Affordable Housing**

The quota of housing required for Sector 2 and part of Sector 3 has been transferred to Estuary Housing Association Limited and is under construction. The remainder as required by the legal agreement dated June 2003 pertaining to the Sector 3 outline permissions is a requirement of 54 dwellings earmarked by the Master Plan to be sited adjacent the boundaries with Sector 1 and 2 in the eastern portion of Sector 3 (proposed as part of application UTT/0392/05/DFO). The applicant does not propose to provide affordable housing as part of the 17 units (UTT/0394/05/FUL).

## **Parking and Access**

Market housing would have a minimum of 2 parking spaces for dwellings up to three bedrooms whilst affordable housing would have 1 space per one bedroom dwelling, 1.5 spaces per 2 bed, 2 spaces per 3 bed and 4 bed. Cycle parking is proposed within garages, lockers, sheds or separate storage for flats. Two wheeler parking is also proposed within garages, parking spaces or rear gardens. Certain footpaths will require diversion should permission be granted. The applicant states that the necessary Diversion Orders will be sought should this be the case.

A 6m wide road is proposed as a link to the north west by-pass as part of application UTT/0386/05/DFO (100 dwellings). A further access would be provided from the existing roundabout serving Sector 2 and a minor road to the west. Various bends are incorporated to limit traffic speed to 20 mph with table junctions near pedestrian crossings. Streets, squares and circuses will form access to dwellings.

## Landscaping

Nearly 1 hectare of open space will be provided for public use between dwellings such as squares and circuses. The majority of which will be provided within the larger portion of Sector 3 where some groups of trees are proposed to be retained. Landscape margins are also proposed adjacent the north west by-pass with additional planting to be provided. Additional planting is also proposed to line avenues, open spaces and rear gardens. The landscaping is generally as shown in the agreed Master Plan.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** For a full description of works, please see supporting Design Statement received 7 March 2005 (available at the Saffron Walden Offices, London Road). Also, Wickford Development Company letter dated 14 April 2005 and Melville Dunbar Associates letter dated 26 April 2005 copies attached at end of report.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** In June 2003 outline planning permission (all matters reserved) was granted for the erection of 300 dwellings (UTT/0450/02/OP). This outline permission is subject to conditions and a legal agreement to secure the provision of off site transportation measures and affordable housing.

In June 2003 outline planning permission (all matters reserved) was granted for the erection of 100 dwellings (UTT/0449/02/OP). This outline permission is subject to conditions and a legal agreement to secure the provision of off site transportation measures and affordable housing.

In May 2003 planning permission was granted for the erection of 130 dwellings at plots 417-546 (part of Sector 2).

In September 2002 a revised Master Plan was approved for Woodlands Park incorporating Sector 3.

In December 1988 outline planning permission was granted for residential development (UTT/0733/88).

**CONSULTATIONS:** ECC Highways: This matter will be dealt with by the Estates Design Section at County Hall.

ECC Estates Design: Various detailed comments on the estate roads and their layout relating to inadequate junction and visibility standards. *Comments from ECC Estates Design on revised drawings and any suggested conditions will be reported.*

Water Authority: No objection in principle subject to a condition relating to details of foul and surface water drainage (UTT/0392/05/DFO – 300 dwellings). *Note: A similar condition is already attached to the outline planning permission.*

Environment Agency: Operational development flood zone 1. Objection without a flood risk assessment. UTT/039205/DFO – 300 dwellings UTT/0386/05/DFO – 100 dwellings.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer: Various Concerns (UTT/0392/05/DFO and UTT/0386/05/DFO – 300/100 dwellings) relating to rear footpaths, some in excess of 30m, which means women and children will walk along paths flanked by fencing with no illumination creating fear of crime. Footpaths should be shortened. There should be lower fencing with trellis to allow natural surveillance. Blind spots should be re-designed and appropriate gates should be provided with. Parking spaces for plot 28 are concealed. Featureless end gables should have windows to increase surveillance. *Comments on revised drawings will be reported.*

Ramblers Association: Object to the development. Cannot find provision for several rights of way affected by the development and the effect of development on public rights of way is a material consideration in the determination of applications for planning permission. The use

of estate roads should be avoided, preference being given to paths through landscaped or open spaces away from vehicular traffic.

ECC Archaeology: No archaeological recommendations are being made on this application.

Essex Wildlife Trust: To be reported (due 29 March 2005).

English Nature: The development does not affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest. The sites could include a suitable habitat for protected species. If protected species are suspected then an ecological survey should be submitted prior to determination.

UDC Environmental Services: Concern on the widths of some of the access roads not complying with Building Regulations. It appears that no consideration has been given to refuse collection (shared footpath) – UTT/0392/05/DFO and UTT/0395/05/FUL (300 and 17 dwellings). *Comments on revised drawings will be reported.*

UDC Drainage Engineer: No comment. Drainage agreed at outline planning stage.

UDC Building Surveying: No comment.

UDC Housing (affordable housing comments): The site appears to be high density. It is disappointing to see the affordable housing all together and only on a small strip of the site. The layout of the site raises concerns over the potential management problems.

UDC Policy: No objection to the 400 dwellings proposed for Sector 3. Land allocated in the 1995 adopted plan included the application site for the 17 dwellings. The deposit draft plan drew this line but Wickford objected and UDC reconsidered and the objection was withdrawn. No objection in principle to the additional 17 dwellings in Sector 3. The supporting text to Policy GD5 says the plan proposed development of 417 dwellings in Sector 3 and this is taken into account in the overall provision for the site. The affordable housing requirement for 400 dwellings in Sector 3 has been established through approval of the Master Plan and the outline planning permission. There is no mention of affordable housing provision in respect of the additional 17 dwellings but this is of a size and number of units that would fall within the requirements of Policy H9 and the developer should be approached in relation to this. Parking for the four applications is referred to as a minimum standard. This is contrary to Policy GEN8. Further information should be sought from the developer to justify exceeding the maximum standards set out in the Adopted Plan.

UDC Landscaping: To be reported (due 22 March 2005).

Go East: The Government does not wish to comment on the applications at this stage, as to do so may prejudice the Secretary of State's position.

Leisure Manager: To be reported (due 1 May 2005).

UDC Specialist Design Advice: To be reported (due 27 April 2005).

**TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS:** House Type E2: The roof line is disproportionate to the rest of the dwelling in that it is too high. House Type P: This style of dwelling is completely unsuitable for a small rural market town. The sizes of the garages are disproportionately large for the type of dwelling. Requests street scene and colour drawings.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** These applications have been advertised and 3 representations have been received. Period expired 7 April and 5 May 2005.

1. We would ask that the planning authority ensure that adequate action is taken to ensure trees are protected during the development. The proposed houses facing the balancing pond and open space are specified as 3 storey type. This will overlook our property and remove any privacy that remains. We also consider that these will be out of character with the surrounding residence. Hence we would ask that these be re-specified as 2 storey dwellings.

**Note: Conditions are attached to the outline planning permissions to address the protection of trees, which is the area characterised by an existing tree belt.**

2. I wish to register my objection to the proposal to build three-storey houses in this situation. There are no existing houses of this height in the proximity. This height is out of keeping and too dominating in the area overlooking existing gardens of Newton Hall Lane and the recreational area. The houses along Newton Lane are too close to the lane. This



has been a semi-rural land and the gardens of the houses backing onto this should be longer, so as to retain a rural feel.

3. Object to development with no additional public services. Concern at increased traffic and general over development of Great Dunmow.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS: The main issues identified by Officers are whether:**

**1) these applications provide a form of housing development which accords with the requirements of the Woodlands Park Master Plan and Policy GD5 in terms of comprehensive design, townscape, dwelling form and materials, vehicular and pedestrian access, open space and landscape, affordable housing and services.**

Members will be aware that when considering reserved matters applications the planning permission is the outline permission with the reserved matters application not being a separate permission but filling in the details not agreed at the outline stage. Two of these four applications are reserved matters applications.

In addition there is an approved Master Plan relating to Sectors 1, 2 and 3. This has been approved by the Council following public consultation. The Council may reasonably expect that a submitted application will be in accordance with the Master Plan. Furthermore, the applicant may reasonably expect that if it submits an application that is in accordance with the Master Plan that there will be a positive recommendation, subject to agreement of details not covered by the Master Plan. As the site for 17 houses is not subject to the Master Plan the issues that may be considered are broader than with the other three cases.

In addition Policy GD5 requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the Master Plan, therefore adding weight to the context of the approved Master Plan.

The applications include land already granted outline planning permission for 400 dwellings (Sector 3) incorporated in the Master Plan. The application for 17 dwellings has come forward as part of the development plan process but follows the form, type and design of dwelling proposed throughout these schemes. The application for 51 dwellings (Sector 2) is designed to blend with the form, layout and design of the remainder of the development area such that the scheme is comprehensive.

Built frontage is provided to streets to provide active frontages and there are a variety of house types with two and three storey houses in detached, semi detached and terrace form. Various character areas surround crescents and squares such as town houses facing into the square in the eastern half of the site to provide local identity.

The layout is generally considered to follow the indicated layout shown in the Master Plan in terms of roads, formal open spaces, landscaping strips and the area identified for the location of affordable housing. The Master Plan is clear in its requirement for the number and layout of dwellings and does not provide for any other community facilities or retail use and in this context the applicant has provided a scheme that responds to its requirements.

**2) these applications provide an appropriate density in accordance with PPG3 and the Woodlands Park Mater Plan.**

Given that the land has been granted outline planning permission for 400 dwellings and Policy GD5 accounts for 417 dwellings as a result of the development of Sector 3, the schemes are considered, therefore, to provide an adequate density to about 30 dwellings per hectare.

**3) the scale, form, design, layout, appearance and proposed materials of the dwellings accords with the character of the area and surrounding buildings (ULP Policy GEN2).**

As a whole, the schemes provide a clear sense of identity whereas compared to earlier phases of more standard house types. Terraces front squares and streets and particular character areas are created by crescents. Traditional designs and features are proposed to dwellings that draw on Georgian and Victorian architecture, the character of the layout and design of which is considered an improvement to earlier development.

Generally, garages are set back from dwellings but are sometimes sited in conspicuous positions that often serve only to detract from a potentially interesting street scene and this is considered true of the formal open spaces that have garages sited around them such that what could otherwise be a high quality public realm is just satisfactory.

Chimney stacks play an important architectural role in the composition of houses and such features punctuate rooflines and provide visual interest. In this context there are some house types that do not provide this feature and consequently are considered to suffer aesthetically. This occurs particularly with the affordable housing proposed in Sector 3 and is considered detrimental both to providing a visually integrated design for the scheme as a whole and inclusive development that does not identify such housing as different. However, Members should be aware that the lack of chimneys has been accepted elsewhere on Woodlands Park, including affordable housing and Officers consider that on balance continuing this approach is acceptable.

There are also several instances where garden sizes are small for two and three bedroom dwellings but this may be controlled by condition so as to restrict permitted development rights. Thereby avoiding erosion of already small gardens.

With regard to the acceptability of the layout in terms of highway considerations and prevention of crime, the comments of the County Council Estates Design section and the Police Architectural Liaison Officer on revised drawings will be reported.

**4) the proposed developments provide an adequate proportion of affordable housing in accordance with ULP Policy H9.**

As stated above, the outstanding requirement for 54 dwellings is allocated in Sector 3 within the reserved matters application for 300 dwellings in the general area envisaged by the Master Plan.

The application for 17 dwellings came forward as a result of the review and adoption of the Uttlesford Local Plan and would be expected to provide an element of affordable housing as the number of homes and site area is in excess of the threshold provided by ULP Policy H9. Legal advice has been received to indicate that as the site for 17 houses is not covered by the Section 106 Agreement dated 10 June 2004, therefore it is legitimate to require affordable housing. Forty percent of 17 units is seven units to the nearest whole number and this is the number of units required. These units should be provided with the 0394/05 site.

UDC Housing has concern regarding the siting of the other affordable housing in one strip and potential management problems resulting from its layout. However, the mix of dwellings is in accordance with the Housing Needs Survey and its location is in the area agreed in the Master Plan.

**5) the proposed developments provide an adequate mix of smaller market housing in accordance with ULP Policy H10.**

The schemes provide a range of dwelling sizes between one and five-bedroom properties.

6%	one-bedroomed dwellings
18%	two-bedroomed dwellings
35%	three-bedroomed dwellings
40%	four-bedroomed dwellings
1%	five-bedroomed dwellings

In these terms the majority of dwellings are four-bed properties. However, the supporting text to Policy H10 states that developments of three or more homes must include an element of small two and three-bed homes, which must represent a significant proportion of the total, for those households who are able to meet their needs in the market and would like to live in a new home. In this context 59% of dwellings are three-bedroom or less, which is considered to satisfy this requirement.

**6) there would be any detrimental harm to the amenity of neighbouring dwellings (ULP Policy GEN2).**

Throughout the applications the dwellings are considered to be adequately spaced to prevent any material overlooking or detriment to residential amenity. In relation to the representation relating to overlooking from the townhouses in the north eastern portion of the site towards Woodmancote these will face the open space and dry balancing pond and will not directly overlook this dwelling or its garden.

**7) there is appropriate parking and access (ULP policies GEN1 and GEN8).**

The parking provision for the applications is stated as a minimum standard, but planning policy states that this should be maximum. UDC Local Plans also has concern that the parking provision required by Policy GEN8 has been exceeded. Officers consider that this is generally against the principle of promoting sustainable residential environments required by PPG3 and in places serves to denigrate the visual quality of development that could be significantly enhanced by unnecessary hard standing and built form.

A condition relating to the outline planning applications requires that parking be in accordance with the Uttlesford Local Deposit Draft Plan i.e. that it is appropriate for its location and in this context it is considered difficult to argue that it is not appropriate given the lack of public transport to the area.

The applicant, however, considers that it would be irresponsible not to make 'proper' allowance because this would lead to indiscriminate parking on residential roads and as such the provision for parking is made in this context. Some garages are stated to for use as storage of cycles and motorcycles. Members are asked to consider the parking provision and the applicant's justification for such a departure in relation to the above comments and the integration of the schemes as a whole. It is acknowledged that Members have been concerned about perceived under provision of car parking on developments elsewhere.

**8) there would be any detrimental affect upon the setting of an adjacent listed building (ULP Policy ENV2).**

Newton Hall, which is Grade II listed is located some distance to the east of the proposed development (particularly the area for 17 dwellings). It is considered that the housing would

be some distance from Newton Hall and separated by a bank of landscaping and rear gardens such that the setting of Newton Hall would not be detrimentally affected.

- 9) **it is adequately demonstrated that the development would not lead to an increased risk of flooding (ULP Policy GEN3).**

***The Environment Agency originally objected to the applications due to a lack of a flood risk assessment, however, this matter has now been resolved with the Environment Agency as a result of existing measures carried out and the objections have been withdrawn.***

- 10) **the proposed developments would have a harmful affect upon protected species, habitats or other wildlife (ULP Policy GEN7).**

English Nature has commented on the applications and stated that the proposed developments would be unlikely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest. The sites could, however, include a suitable habitat for protected species.

It is therefore considered appropriate to attach conditions such that if at any time during the course of construction a protected species is discovered then work shall cease until a licence has been granted by DEFRA.

- 11) **the proposed developments would adversely affect landscape elements such as protected trees, woodland, tree belts, hedgerows and semi natural grass lands and provided for appropriate new indigenous species as part of the applications (ULP Policies ENV3 and ENV8).**

The existing trees are generally retained in areas of public open space designated by the Master Plan.

**CONCLUSION:** The schemes are considered to accord with the requirement of the Master Plan and Policy GD5 relating to the development of Woodlands Park and are therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

1) **UTT/0386/05/DFO - 100 DWELLINGS**  
**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.3.3. To be implemented in accordance with original and revised plans.
2. C.6.3 (remove permitted development rights for extensions/freestanding buildings/hardstandings) plots 27, 33, 86 and 87.  
REASON: The gardens to which these dwellings relate have small gardens and therefore it is necessary to retain control over their development in the interests of satisfactory amenity.
3. C.11.6 (layout of parking before occupation)  
REASON: In the interests of highway safety.
4. C.6.7 (excluding conversion of garages).  
REASON: In the interests of highway safety and to prevent over development.
5. If at any time during the course of construction of the development hereby approved, a species of animal or plant (which include bats and great crested newt) that is protected under the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c Regulations 1994) is discovered, all construction or other site work shall cease until a licence to disturb any protected species has been granted by DEFRA.  
REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and to protect species of conservation concern.

- 6, All electrical and telephone services to the development shall be run underground. All service intakes to dwellings, apart from gas, shall be run internally and not visible on the exterior. All meter cupboards shall be positioned on the dwellings in accordance with details, which shall have been previously submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. All buildings containing flats shall be equipped with a communal TV and radio aerial and satellite dish in positions, which shall have been previously submitted to and approved by the local planning authority (unless the development is in an area served by cable distribution). On all buildings satellite dishes shall be of dark coloured mesh unless fixed to a light coloured, rendered wall, in which case a white dish should be used. Satellite dishes shall not be fixed to the street elevations of buildings or to roofs. All soil and waste plumbing shall be run internally and shall not be visible on the exterior. Rainwater goods shall be black. The rights of utility companies to deemed consent under the General Permitted Development Order to construct electrical substations and gas governors within the development are withdrawn and planning consent will be required.  
REASON: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development.

2) **UTT/0392/05/DFO - 300 DWELLINGS**  
**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.3.3. To be implemented in accordance with original and revised plans.
2. C.11.6 (layout of parking before occupation)  
REASON: In the interests of highway safety.
3. C.6.3 (remove permitted development rights for extensions/freestanding buildings/hardstandings) plots 21-23 inclusive, 72-77 inclusive, 162-163 inclusive, 220, 227.  
REASON: The gardens to which these dwellings relate have small gardens and therefore it is necessary to retain control over their development in the interests of satisfactory amenity.
4. C.6.7 (excluding conversion of garages).  
REASON: In the interests of highway safety and to prevent over development.
5. If at any time during the course of construction of the development hereby approved, a species of animal or plant (which include bats and great crested newt) that is protected under the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c Regulations 1994) is discovered, all construction or other site work shall cease until a licence to disturb any protected species has been granted by DEFRA.  
REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and to protect species of conservation concern.
6. All electrical and telephone services to the development shall be run underground. All service intakes to dwellings, apart from gas, shall be run internally and not visible on the exterior. All meter cupboards shall be positioned on the dwellings in accordance with details, which shall have been previously submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. All buildings containing flats shall be equipped with a communal TV and radio aerial and satellite dish in positions, which shall have been previously submitted to and approved by the local planning authority (unless the development is in an area served by cable distribution). On all buildings satellite dishes shall be of dark coloured mesh unless fixed to a light coloured, rendered wall, in which case a white dish should be used. Satellite dishes shall not be fixed to the street elevations of buildings or to roofs. All soil and waste plumbing shall be run internally and shall not be visible on the exterior. Rainwater goods shall be black. The rights of utility companies to deemed consent under the General Permitted Development Order to construct electrical substations and gas governors within the development are withdrawn and planning consent will be required.  
REASON: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development.

3) **UTT/0394/05/FUL - 17 DWELLINGS**  
**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS AND SECTION 106**  
**AGREEMENT REGARDING SEVEN AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS**

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.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
4. C.6.7 (excluding conversion of garages).  
REASON: In the interests of highway safety and to prevent over development.
5. C.7.1 (slab levels).  
REASON: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development.
6. C.11.6 (layout of parking before occupation).  
REASON: In the interests of highway safety.
7. If at any time during the course of construction of the development hereby approved, a species of animal or plant (which include bats and great crested newt) that is protected under the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c Regulations 1994) is discovered, all construction or other site work shall cease until a licence to disturb any protected species has been granted by DEFRA.  
REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and to protect species of conservation concern.
8. All electrical and telephone services to the development shall be run underground. All service intakes to dwellings, apart from gas, shall be run internally and not visible on the exterior. All meter cupboards shall be positioned on the dwellings in accordance with details, which shall have been previously submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. All buildings containing flats shall be equipped with a communal TV and radio aerial and satellite dish in positions, which shall have been previously submitted to and approved by the local planning authority (unless the development is in an area served by cable distribution). On all buildings satellite dishes shall be of dark coloured mesh unless fixed to a light coloured, rendered wall, in which case a white dish should be used. Satellite dishes shall not be fixed to the street elevations of buildings or to roofs. All soil and waste plumbing shall be run internally and shall not be visible on the exterior. Rainwater goods shall be black. The rights of utility companies to deemed consent under the General Permitted Development Order to construct electrical substations and gas governors within the development are withdrawn and planning consent will be required.  
REASON: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development.
9. No development shall commence until detailed drawings of the pump area have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
REASON: In order to protect the character and appearance of the area.

4) **UTT/0395/05/FUL - 51 DWELLINGS**  
**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.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
4. C.6.3 (remove permitted development rights for extensions/freestanding buildings/hardstandings) plots 33, 38 and 43-44 inclusive.  
REASON: The gardens to which these dwellings relate have small gardens and therefore it is necessary to retain control over their development in the interests of satisfactory amenity.
5. C.6.7 (excluding conversion of garages).

- REASON: In the interests of highway safety and to prevent over development.
6. C.7.1 (slab levels).  
REASON: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development.
7. C.11.6 (layout of parking before occupation).  
REASON: In the interests of highway safety.
8. If at any time during the course of construction of the development hereby approved, a species of animal or plant (which include bats and great crested newt) that is protected under the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c Regulations 1994) is discovered, all construction or other site work shall cease until a licence to disturb any protected species has been granted by DEFRA.  
REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and to protect species of conservation concern.
9. All electrical and telephone services to the development shall be run underground. All service intakes to dwellings, apart from gas, shall be run internally and not visible on the exterior. All meter cupboards shall be positioned on the dwellings in accordance with details, which shall have been previously submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. All buildings containing flats shall be equipped with a communal TV and radio aerial and satellite dish in positions, which shall have been previously submitted to and approved by the local planning authority (unless the development is in an area served by cable distribution). On all buildings satellite dishes shall be of dark coloured mesh unless fixed to a light coloured, rendered wall, in which case a white dish should be used. Satellite dishes shall not be fixed to the street elevations of buildings or to roofs. All soil and waste plumbing shall be run internally and shall not be visible on the exterior. Rainwater goods shall be black. The rights of utility companies to deemed consent under the General Permitted Development Order to construct electrical substations and gas governors within the development are withdrawn and planning consent will be required.  
REASON: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **UTT/0358/05/FUL & UTT/0378/05/LB – WIMBISH**

Erection of stable block and manege for commercial livery  
Wimbish Hall Farm. GR/TL 590-366. David Hawkes.  
*Case Officer: Mr G Lyon 01799 510458*  
Expiry Date: 29 April 2005

**NOTATION:** Uttlesford Local Plan: Outside Development Limits. Grade II listed building.  
Public footpaths and bridleways to south, north and east.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site is located on the western side of Maple Lane between Tye Green and Radwinter, approximately 5km east of Saffron Walden, as the crow flies. At the entrance to the site are three private dwellings, Wimbish Lodge and Mariners on the western side of Maple Lane and Aldridges on the eastern side opposite the entrance. The application site is accessed via a 350 metre long private single width track, which passes by a further private dwelling known as Farm Cottage, which is not in the ownership of the applicant. The access road splits into two, one road going to Wimbish Hall, All Saints Church and Old Vicarage whilst the other continues onto the application site, which is part of the historic farmstead of Wimbish Hall. The application site includes a grade II listed barn of C17 origins, a more modern open fronted barn, a rendered and slate roof building currently used for stabling and an open fronted cartlodge with accommodation above, which was given consent to be converted to a dwelling in 2000. Other adjacent farm buildings include a Dutch barn and a large modern atcost barn, both of which are used in connection with the functioning farm at Wimbish Hall, which has a holding of 700 acres. Behind the atcost barn the land slopes down to a field, which itself lies adjacent to a stream beyond.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The applicant is seeking full permission to erect a stable block and manege for use as a commercial livery yard. The proposed stable would be 22.95 metres long and 5.3 metres deep with a height to eaves of 2.7 metres and a height to ridge of 5.55 metres. The building would be attached to the southern wall of the grade II listed barn and would accommodate five stables and a tack room including a tea point and disabled toilet. The open fronted barn opposite would be converted to provide eight stables. Works would involve new block work and translucent sheeting to block up the open side with new central sliding doors and hardwood internal stable partitions. The yard would be secured with post and rail fencing with two new five-bar gates. The manege would be sited beyond the atcost barn in the field and would be accessed across an existing concrete track, which would require an extension. The manege would be 50 metres long and 30 metres deep and be enclosed by a 1.2 metre high post and rail fence. The manege would have a surface of sand and will require some ground works to create a level surface. No details of ground level works have been submitted. The livery yard itself would accommodate a maximum of 13 horses and would be a full livery service.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** The applicant has submitted a supporting statement to accompany the submitted plans. A copy of the report can be inspected on the Council's website or at the Council Offices.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Relocation of stables approved 1989. Conversion of agricultural store to dwelling; erection of oil tank; 1.1m high post and rail fence and 0.3m high brick wall approved 2000.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Essex County Council Highways and Transportation: no objections.  
Anglian Water: No comments received to date (To be verbally reported at the meeting).  
Environment Agency: Standard Advisory comments regarding Stables



UDC Specialist Design Advice: The proposed new structure would be traditional in terms of design, detailing and materials. It would have a steeply pitched roof with natural roof cladding and weather boarded walls. In principle such a range would be in keeping with the character of such a rural site and would not detract from the setting of the farmhouse or the listed existing farm buildings. No design objections subject to conditions.

Environmental Services: No objection subject to conditions.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** The Parish Council would like to support the proposed application for a commercial livery. The Parish Council agrees with supporting local rural businesses in line with the Wimbish Parish Plan, which is in preparation.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** The application was advertised with both press and site notices. Five neighbours were notified of the proposed development. Advertisement expired 19 April 2005. One letter has been received to date. Summary of comments: - No objections in principle to the plan to open a commercial livery but do have two concerns. The existing single track road leading to Wimbish Hall known as Church Lane serves only four properties and the church. The church has an ever decreasing congregation and typically has about two weddings a year so generates little traffic. Would not want to see a DIY livery service as there would be a substantial increase in traffic. I would like to see a condition restricting the use to full livery only. The manege should not be lit.

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

- 1) **the principle of a livery yard and associated development is acceptable on this rural site (PPS 7, ERSP POLICY CS1, CS2, CS3, CS4, CS5, C5, HC3, BIW3, LRT3, RE1, RE2, T1 and T3, Uttlesford Local Plan Policy S7, GEN1, GEN2, GEN8, E4, E5 and ENV2);**
- 2) **the impact of the development on highway network would be acceptable and comply with the principles of sustainability (PPS 7, ERSP Policies T1, T3, T12, Uttlesford Local Plan Policy GEN1, GEN8, E4, E5),**
- 3) **the proposed development would cause material harm or disturbance to surrounding dwellings beyond the holding (ERSP Policy CS4 C5, RE1, RE2, Uttlesford Local Plan Policy GEN2, E4, E5);**
- 4) **the development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the countryside (PPS 7 ERSP Policies C5, Uttlesford Local Plan Policy S7),**
- 5) **the design of the proposed development is acceptable (ERSP Policies HC3, Uttlesford Local Plan Policies GEN2, ENV2) and**
- 6) **there are any other material considerations.**

1) The principle of development on this site needs to be considered within the context of policy basis, that being in this case, Central Government Guidance contained within PPS 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, Structure Plan guidance contained in ERSP (Policies C5, RE1, RE2) and local guidance in the form of Uttlesford Local Plan, most notably policies S7, E4 and E5.

PPS 7, places a strong emphasis on the principles of **sustainability** whilst seeking to raise the quality of life and the environment in rural areas through the promotion of thriving, inclusive and sustainable rural communities, ensuring people have decent places to live by improving the quality and sustainability of local environments and neighbourhoods; sustainable economic growth and diversification; good quality, sustainable development that respects and, where possible, enhances local distinctiveness and the intrinsic qualities of the countryside; and continued protection of the open countryside for the benefit of all, with the highest level of protection for our most valued landscapes and environmental resources.

PPS7 also seeks to promote more sustainable patterns of development by focusing most development in, or next to, existing towns and villages; preventing urban sprawl; discouraging the development of 'greenfield' land, and, where such land must be used, ensuring it is not used wastefully; promoting a range of uses to maximise the potential benefits of the countryside fringing urban areas; and providing appropriate leisure opportunities to enable urban and rural dwellers to enjoy the wider countryside.

Paragraphs 30-32 of PPS 7 focuses on farm diversification and equine related activities. It states that local planning authorities should be supportive of well-conceived farm diversification schemes for business purposes that contribute to sustainable development objectives and help to sustain the agricultural enterprise, and are consistent in their scale with their rural location. However it also states that a supportive approach should not result in excessive expansion and encroachment of building development into the countryside and LPAs should encourage the re-use or replacement of existing buildings and have regard to the amenity of nearby residents or other rural businesses that may be adversely affected by new types of on-farm development.

Paragraph 32 states that horse riding and other equestrian activities are popular forms of recreation in the countryside that can fit well with farming activities and help to diversify rural economies. There should be support for equine enterprises that maintain environmental quality and countryside character and provide for a range of suitably located recreational and leisure facilities and, where appropriate, for the needs of training and breeding businesses. They should also facilitate the re-use of farm buildings for small-scale horse enterprises that provides for a useful form of farm diversification. The definition of small-scale as defined in PPS 7 are enterprises involving up to ten horses.

Essex Replacement Structure Plan Policy C5 focuses on rural areas and states that the countryside will be protected for its own sake, which includes its recreational value. This will be achieved by the restriction of new uses to those appropriate to a rural area required to support agriculture, forestry or other rural uses. Development should be well related to existing patterns of development and of a scale, siting and design sympathetic to the rural landscape character.

Uttlesford Local Plan Policy S7 again repeats the aims of the Structure Plan Policy C5 by protecting the countryside for its own sake and only allowing development that needs to take place there, or is appropriate to a rural area.

Members will no doubt be aware that, although the Uttlesford Local Plan was adopted on 20 January, this was developed in accordance with the older PPG7. Clearly the arrival of PPS 7 and its clear emphasis on the principles of sustainability mean that this document must be given significant weight over and above the recently adopted Local Plan when determining this application.

In terms of this application, it is the opinion of officers that PPS7 would clearly support the principle of appropriate agricultural diversification including equine related activities provided that such development would accord with the principles of sustainable development, as stated above, and provided that it would not result in excessive or other rural expansion or encroachment into the countryside or adversely affect the amenity of any nearby residents or other rural businesses.

2) PPS 7 has clearly established a strong emphasis towards the principles of sustainability. Access to the site in terms of location and associated highways arrangements form a fundamental part of this sustainability principle. The application site, although certainly not isolated, is none the less located away from development limits on the rural road network. The site is 1 km from the B1053 to the north and 3 km from the B184 to the

south. The nearest settlement is Tye Green, 1.7km to the south (which does not have a defined settlement limit) Radwinter is 1.9 km to the north, the edge of Saffron Walden is 7.8 km and the edge of Thaxted is 7.7 km using existing road networks by the quickest route. To reach the B-roads one would have to travel along a country lane, which becomes very narrow in places, most notably near to the junction with the B1053. Certainly it cannot be guaranteed that the users of the livery yard would be local or would use any means other than the private motor car. This means therefore that one must assume that every trip into and out of the site would be via the private motorcar. One must also add vehicular movements associated with the delivery and collection of horses and veterinary care etc. Furthermore, riders may choose to exercise their horses on the public road in addition to using the bridleways and footpaths and this additional traffic will add to the potential hazards on the road network.

The application involves the erection of 13 stables. It is not unfeasible that there could be thirteen vehicle movements into and out of this site each day (91 per week) during the summer months, more if the owner of the horse is very keen. This would represent a material increase in traffic generation. The applicants supporting statement, pages 16-19, makes reference to the overall impacts on the countryside including highways considerations. This suggests that there would be only 26 vehicle movements per week assuming twice weekly visits. This might well be the case in the winter months when the weather is poor and the nights are long but the summer months would provide a greater opportunity to ride the horses and this is the period when activity would be at its highest, especially when attending shows or dressage events.

Essex County Council Highways have commented on the submitted plans but have raised no objections stating that it is not contrary to the policies contained with the Structure Plan. As stated above in 1), the weight given to the Structure Plan policies has shifted since the emergence of more recent Planning Policy Statements from central government, most notably PPS 7, which has a strong emphasis on the principles of sustainability. It is therefore the opinion of officers that the proposed development would undermine the principles of sustainable development by virtue of its heavy reliance on trips to and from the site by private motor vehicle with no guarantee that users of the facility would either walk or cycle to the site. Public transport is available along the B-roads to Radwinter and Thaxted but users would be faced with a 1-3 km walk to Wimbish Hall Farm and this would preclude even the most ardent fan of public transport.

In terms of highway safety, officers are concerned that the increase in traffic along the rural road network could increase the potential for traffic conflicts, particularly at narrow points along Maple Lane, to the detriment of highway safety.

3) Given the potential material increase in traffic associated with the proposed development, one also has to consider the impact on adjoining neighbours or businesses outside of the holding. PPS 7 clearly states that in determining such applications, local authorities should have regard to the amenity of any nearby residents or other rural businesses that may be adversely affected by new types of on-farm development. In this instance there are three properties immediately adjacent to the entrance to Wimbish hall Farm and one further dwelling close to the main farmyard. Clearly the coming and going of vehicles at this site associated with the livery yard would give rise to a material loss of amenity. The applicants report (pages 18-19) refers to this issue but suggests that there would be no detrimental impacts to any of the dwellings, especially in comparison to the existing traffic levels created by the church. In fact the report implies that at times when there are weddings the church creates significant levels of traffic and hence disturbance to the adjacent neighbours. In reality there are on average two weddings per year. Therefore, although the occasional weddings may give rise to disturbance, their infrequent occurrence would not mask any traffic increases associated with the proposed development.

Officers are therefore of the opinion that the frequent presence of traffic entering and leaving the site in association with the proposed development would give rise to a material loss of amenity to adjacent residents close to the site entrance. The lack of neighbour objections to the proposed development is not in itself an indicator of development acceptability.

4) Other than the issues considered above, the impacts on the countryside would be limited to the presence of new development and additional members of public seeking recreation. The new built form would consist of the stable block, manege and associated fencing. The stable block and fenced enclosure would be located within the confines of existing built development and would be viewed with the context of the farm. However, Council policy would support re-use of rural building but would strictly control the construction of new buildings for commercial purposes. The increased built form in this rural location for non-agricultural purposes would not be acceptable.

The manege would result in a 1500 square metre area of field being developed with a new sand surface and associated post and rail fencing surrounding it to a height of 1.2 metres. The applicant has suggested that levelling works would need to take place but these details have not been provided and therefore it is not possible to comment in detail on how the proposed manege would affect countryside character. However, such facilities have been developed elsewhere in the district and these facilities, although appearing quite stark following initial construction, do weather down and their visual presence diminishes. However, compared to the existing open field, the proposal would increase the sense of built development on the site and may be viewed from a bridleway and public footpath that runs adjacent to the site.

Members of the public using the site would, most probably, ride along the local bridleways, footpaths and roads. Horse riding is not an uncharacteristic activity in rural locations and, other than the comments referred to above in 2) and 3), would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the countryside in principle.

5) In terms of actual design quality, the proposed stable has been considered by the Conservation Officer to ensure that it is appropriately detailed in relation to the grade II listed building that it would be physically attached. Conservation advice has confirmed that the design of the stable block is acceptable in this instance subject to the imposition of relevant conditions to secure appropriate materials etc in its construction. No design advice was given in relation to the fencing or manege but these should be considered in relation to the comments in 4).

6) It is evident that policy advice contained in PPS 7 favours sustainable forms of development. However, the development proposed in this application would clearly be in breach of those laudable sustainability aims. Nonetheless, the proposed livery yard is a use that one would reasonably expect to take place in the countryside. The question is therefore, if such a use cannot take place here then where can it reasonably take place? Ideally, from a sustainability perspective, such recreational activities would take place adjacent to existing settlements thus reducing the trip length and heavy dependence on the private motor vehicle through the availability of public transport that the larger settlements can support. But if such sites on the edge of settlement limits are not available to accommodate recreational activities, does that provide sufficient justification to approve a less acceptable solution in terms of sustainability? Council policies would support the re-use of rural buildings with an emphasis of support towards community and/or business uses. However, it would be probable that such uses may in fact create their own significant levels of traffic above that of the livery yard hereby proposed.

With the change in emphasis that PPS7 brings, Members may face the task of making difficult decisions to support the sustainability objectives clearly laid down by central

government. The applicants report makes no reference to the diversification on this farm being essential to support the future viability of Wimbish Hall Farm. Indeed one could assume that the 700-acre farm is a success. Having visited the site it is the view of officers that the livery yard is a diversification to provide employment for family relatives of the owners of Wimbish Hall Farm. Although creating employment for family members would not be a cause for material concern in itself, the intensification in use on the farm would be. PPS7 makes reference to small-scale horse enterprises being those involving up to ten horses. This application involves 13 horses and it is the opinion of officers that this may be considered too many on this site given its distance away from settlement limits. It is not apparent that the development is anything less than speculative and there is no supporting information to justify the need to keep 13 horses rather than 10 or less. However, the number of horses as part of the livery yard would need to be commensurate with the future financial sustainability of the enterprise but, without these details, it would be impossible to comment further.

**CONCLUSIONS:** It has been demonstrated that, given the policy shift and guidance from central government, Members should take care to ensure that proposals for farm diversification accord with the principles of sustainability contained throughout PPS 7. Whilst this guidance would support the principle of farm diversification, there is a clear need to consider whether such diversification is indeed sustainable and would not in fact be better located closer to established settlement limits where there are alternative access means other than the private car.

The countryside provides an ideal place for equestrian recreational activities to take place but, in this instance, the distance needed to travel along country roads where provision of means other than the private motor vehicle is at best limited would lead to the long-term pattern of unsustainable development continuing in the district.

This additional traffic on the rural road network would also give rise to potential conflicts to the detriment of highway safety.

Furthermore the presence of vehicles entering and leaving the site would give rise to a loss of amenity to neighbours adjacent to the entrance to the Farm.

### **RECOMMENDATION UTT/0358/05/FUL & UTT/0378/05/LB: REFUSAL REASONS**

It is the policy of Central Government PPS7, ERSP (Policy CS1, CS2, CS3, CS4, CS5, C5, HC3, BIW3, LRT3, RE1, RE2, T1, T3, T12), Uttlesford Local Plan (Policy S7, GEN1, GEN2, GEN8, E4, E5, ENV2) to ensure that proposed development in the countryside is appropriately located and of a size commensurate with the sustainable rural development principles clearly identified in PPS7. Furthermore, such development should not have an adverse impact on adjacent properties nor increase the potential for highway dangers on the rural road network.

In this instance, although the proposed development is in an area where one would reasonably expect equestrian activities to take place, the sites distance from the larger established settlement limits would mean that there would be a heavy reliance on the private motor vehicle due to the lack of alternative transport means. Furthermore, the size of the proposed livery yard would contribute to excessive vehicle movements on the rural road network to the detriment of highway safety.

Importantly, such additional traffic entering and leaving the site would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of adjacent residential dwellings that are located outside of the agricultural holding but on the entrance to the site.

Planning policy would support the re-use of rural buildings for commercial purposes, but this proposal also includes a significant element of new build, including a large riding arena. Although located in part within a complex of other buildings, the new build would be unnecessary built form in this rural setting, to the detriment of the countryside as a whole.

It has not been demonstrated that the proposed diversification would support the long-term viability of Wimbish Hall Farm, but instead would be a separate commercial enterprise in the countryside.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## UTT/0399/05/DFO - GREAT DUNMOW

Erection of 63 bedroom Travelodge and associated parking. Alteration to existing vehicular and pedestrian access.

Hoblongs Industrial Estate Chelmsford Road. GR/TL 635-206. Travelodge Hotels Ltd.

*Case Officer: Mr M Ranner 01799 510556*

13 Weeks Date: 7 June 2005

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits and within part of an Industrial Estate covered by ULP policy GD7 – Safeguarding of Existing Employment Areas.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The application site is located on the southeastern edge of the town, to the west of the old Chelmsford Road, now a cul-de-sac. The eastern part of the site is vacant and was formerly used as a distribution depot until 1999. The remainder of the site, fronting Hoblongs Industrial estate, comprises a substantial commercial building currently occupied by a company/companies carrying out welding and various metal works on the premises. To the northeast is a garage/car showroom and petrol filling station, to the west (rear) other general industrial units, to the south the proposed Civic Amenity and Depot site, and to the southeast the Ambulance Station and 3 dwellings. The site extends to about 0.6 ha (1.5 acres).

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The application seeks approval of matters reserved under outline planning permission ref: UTT/1591/01/OP, pertaining to the erection of a 90-bedroom hotel. These matters relate to details of siting, design and external appearance of the building, the means of access thereto and the landscaping of the site. A condition of the outline permission does however require that vehicular access onto the site accords with drawing ABT/J379/1, which depicts the main access with radius and visibility splays on the eastern boundary of the site. Access has therefore been considered at the outline stage but only in part. The submitted details now for consideration, accord with the requirements for this condition but also include a second access for service vehicles sited on the sites northern boundary.

The reserved matters application seeks approval for 63 bedrooms as apposed to 90 as approved at the outline stage although a condition on the outline permission limits the hotel to a maximum of 90 bedrooms. As the reserved matters application does not exceed this total it can therefore be considered under the reserved matters procedure.

In terms of detail the application proposes a rectangular shaped building sited adjacent to the northern boundary of the site in the approximate position of the existing buildings. At 54 metres by 14 metres the building will provide approximately 2268m<sup>2</sup> of accommodation arranged over three floors. This is to comprise a bar, lounge and dining area at ground floor, in addition to a kitchen, staff room, office, reception/foyer, toilets, plant room and linen room. Two stairwells and a lift will provide access to the upper two floors and the 63 bedrooms, all with en-suite facilities, will be arranged over all three floors.

The building is of a simple design with a rectangular building form set below a shallow pitched roof with over sails at each end. The submitted plans indicate a ridge height of a fraction over 11 meters above finished ground levels and external materials of construction to comprise of clay facing brick, cedar cladding at second floor level and aluminium roof.

Pedestrian access to the building will be gained from the buildings south-facing (front) elevation, which fronts the parking area located immediately to the south of the building, and extends to the east towards Chelmsford road. A total of 102 spaces are provided, six of which will be for the disabled.

The northeastern part of the site has been excluded from this application and depicted on the plan as a 'site for possible future restaurant 465m<sup>2</sup>'. Similarly the opposite western part of the site has also been excluded from the application and annotated as an 'area for future extension or industrial development.'

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** None.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** There have been a number of industrial permissions granted over a long period. More recently apart from the outline planning permission that this application follows, a proposal for a 120 bed hotel on five floors with parking for 120 cars and 260m<sup>2</sup> fast food drive thru outlet (UTT/1952/03/OP) was appealed against non – determination although this was subsequently dismissed. Later still a second outline application (UTT/1781/04/OP) sought outline permission for a 120-bed hotel, although this was refused on 20<sup>th</sup> December 2004. The site is also subject to a current outline application for a single storey family restaurant, comprising 465m<sup>2</sup> with 23 car parking spaces with all matters reserved. It has been resolved to grant outline planning permission however this is subject to the applicants entering into a Section 106 legal agreement, which has yet to be signed.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Environmental Services: make the following comments: - "There are only 4 bins (refuse) indicated. Not sure this is sufficient on once per week collections."

With regard to contaminated land, internal advice is that a standard site investigate followed by remediation condition be included if approved.

The Architectural Liaison officer of the Essex Police raises no objections to the proposal although seeks that the development achieve Secured by Design and Safer Parking Award – Park Mark as part of the planning conditions.

Essex County Council advises that the site lies in a potentially significant area of archaeological deposits. A condition is therefore recommended in order to secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological work and recording in accordance with a written scheme of investigation.

The Environment Agency has no objection to the proposed development although makes a number of recommendations in order to protect the water environment from pollution.

Essex County Council Highways & Transportation Group raise no objection to he application subject to the following:

1. The provision of the access onto Chelmsford Road as shown in principle on drawing PD01 to include footway links into the site from the existing footway network.
2. There should be no obstruction above 600mm in height within the area shown hatched on the attached plan.
3. A financial contribution towards the investigation and improvement of capacity and safety at the B184 Chelmsford Road/A130 junction (Already addressed by the S106 Agreement attached to the outline permission).
4. The extension of the footway to the northwest along the southern side of Chelmsford Road to a road crossing point to be provided with dropped kerbs details of which to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.
5. The provision of bus stop facilities on Chelmsford Road for southeast and northwest bound buses to include raised kerbs, bus shelter and timetable information details of which to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.



6. The provision of secure parking for powered two wheeler vehicles in accordance with the Essex Planning Officers Association Vehicle Parking Standards dated August 2001.
7. The provision of secure and covered cycle parking on site in accordance with Essex Planning Officers Association Vehicle Parking Standards dated August 2001.

Further advice is offered, the most relevant of which is as follows:

- Prior to any works taking place in public highway or areas to become public highway the developer shall enter into an appropriate legal agreement to regulate the construction of the highway works. This will include the submission of detailed engineering drawings for approval and safety audit.
- Recently there have been various applications made for a hotel and restaurant facility on the above site. Individually the developments are unlikely to exceed 50 employees but it is likely that the combined workforce of a hotel and restaurant will exceed 50 people and require the submission and implementation of a multi site Travel Plan. The content of the Travel Plan should be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The County Council will require a fee of £2500 for checking and monitoring of the Travel Plan.
- Steps should be taken to ensure that the developer provides sufficient turning and off loading facilities for the construction delivery vehicles, within the limits of the site together with an adequate parking area for those employed in developing the site.

**TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Dunmow Town Council support the application provided that Essex stock bricks are used for the brickwork and the development is screened with semi-mature trees and shrubs.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** Two letters of objection have been received from occupiers of nearby industrial units. Their main points of objection can be summarised as follows: -

- The industrial estate already suffers from parking, congestion and access problems. The proposal will exacerbate these problems.
- The extra traffic generated by the development will make the Chelmsford road junction dangerous.
- The development should not result in restrictions being imposed on nearby occupiers of commercial units in relation to access, noise and working hours.

The expiry date for reply is 05/05/2005.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** The relevant issues raised will be addressed in the following section.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issues for consideration in this case are: -

- 1) **The appropriateness of the design and layout of the proposed development (ULP Policy GEN2.),**
- 2) **Matters of highway safety (ERSP Policies T3, T6 and T11 & ULP Policies GEN1, and GEN8) &**
- 3) **Any other matters of material importance.**

It should firstly be recognised that the principle of developing a hotel up to a size of 90 bedrooms has been accepted on this site by the granting of outline planning permission (UTT/1591/01/OP). Matters of principle should not therefore be questioned and only those details reserved from the outline permission need to be considered in this case.

1) Looking firstly at the design of the hotel building, it is considered that this is of particular importance in this case, as at 54 metres in length by just over 11 metres in height, the building will be of considerable size. Consequently it is likely to be of some prominence within the context of its surroundings, which forms the southern edge of the town. The site also offers an opportunity to improve and enhance the visual amenities of the area, which at present is generally poor.

Policy GEN2 – Design, of the Local Plan is of relevance to this proposal as is recent Government advice contained within PPS1 ‘Delivering Sustainable Development’. Paragraph 34 of this document is of particular relevance to the consideration of this case and states: -

“Planning authorities should plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes. Good design should contribute positively to making places better for people. Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted.”

Similarly, PPG21 entitled ‘Tourism’ advises on design in paragraph 5.30 and states:

“The appearance of proposed development and its relationship to its surroundings are material considerations and good design should be the aim of all those involved in the development process.”

It is considered in this case that the proposed hotel building is of poor quality design and in this respect represents a missed opportunity to improve the quality and character of the area, contrary to the specific advice contained within PPS1.

This is by virtue of the buildings considerable length, its general uniformity and lack of articulation, which results in a bland and uninteresting building that lacks quality of design and distinctiveness. The unbroken footprint of the building and the long ridgeline, allied with the chosen fenestration details all combine in this case to produce poor quality design.

The surrounding area is predominantly commercial in nature, and common with many such areas, the visual amenities of the area are generally poor. This does not however justify poor quality development and in line with advice contained in PPS1 the development of this site represents an opportunity to improve the quality and character of the area. For the aforementioned reasons, the proposed development fails in this respect.

With regard to the design of the layout, although it is dominated by parking, sufficient space has been retained to introduce small areas of soft landscaping. The scheme would benefit from additional landscaping and the amenities that this would afford and so could be criticised in this respect, however this could be addressed by planning condition.

2) Turning to matters of highway safety, Essex County Council, Highways and Transportation Group raise no objections to the proposal, subject to the compliance with a number of conditions and the applicants entering into a legal agreement concerning financial contributions towards road improvements and other matters in order to safely accommodate the development at this site. This second issue has already been addressed by a S106 Agreement attached to the outline permission.

There is potential for the second access to be used by other vehicles other than the intended service vehicles. This could lead to conflict between traffic generated by this site and that accessing the industrial estate. This concern can however be overcome by positioning a controlled barrier at this entrance to deny access to non-service vehicles, which can adequately be dealt with by the imposition of an appropriately worded condition.

With regard to parking, 102 spaces are provided which exceeds the maximum requirement of 63 spaces for the development. This provision does however take into account the future provision of the restaurant, which although not part of this proposal justifies the proposed parking provision in this case. The Highways Authority also raises no objections to parking provision.

3) Turning to other matters of material importance, the development will be located in close proximity to a number of industrial users and so there is potential that occupants of the building could be subject to noise disturbance. This can be overcome however by the use of effective noise insulation within the building and the use of double or triple glazed windows.

In terms of neighbouring residential amenity, the nearest residential properties are located approximately 60 metres to the south of the proposed building, which is sufficient in the view of officers to ensure that the development does not give rise to any significant overlooking, overshadowing etc.

With regard to land contamination and archaeology, both of these matters can be adequately dealt with by the imposition of appropriate conditions.

Officers have during the course of this application been in discussion with the applicant's advisors regarding the concerns already expressed about the design of the building and the layout of the site. In response the applicants have indicated that they intend to submit a revised building design and layout in an attempt to try to address officer concerns. A fax copy of these revisions were available at the time of compiling this report, which depicted a slightly revised layout with additional soft landscaping, the inclusion of a barrier on the service access and a slightly revised building design.

The revised layout represents an improvement when compared with the current drawings due to the increased amount of soft landscaping achieved. The revisions to the building however fail to address officers concerns. The exterior to the building has been revised to comprise of brickwork with a predominance of render to the first and second floors. The cedar cladding from the second floor has also been omitted. The over sails to each end of the roof have also been removed and a gable projection has been introduced to the main pedestrian entrance to the buildings front elevation.

The gable only projects marginally from the main footprint of the building and the overall proportions and shallowness of the roof appears rather awkward and sits uncomfortably with the building. These revisions do not therefore represent a quality design solution and consequently the building as a whole remains bland and lacks distinctiveness and quality in design

**CONCLUSIONS:** Although acceptable on matters of layout, landscaping and means of access, the proposal is recommended for refusal due the poor design and appearance of the building, contrary to policy GEN2 of the ULP and Government Guidance contained in PPS1 and PPG21.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS:**

The proposed building is considered to be of poor design, by virtue of its uniformity and lack of distinctiveness, which results in an uninteresting building of bland appearance. If permitted the proposed development will fail to improve or make a positive contribution to its surroundings, contrary to policy GEN2 of the Local Plan and Government Guidance contained in PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' and PPG21 'Tourism'.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0486/05/LB - SAFFRON WALDEN**

***(Application by District Councillor)***

Replacement door and frame.  
2 Freshwell Street. GR/TL 535-386. Ms B Hughes.  
Case Officer: *Madeleine Jones 01799 510606*  
Expiry Date: 24/05/2005

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

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** This is an end of terrace brick built property on Freshwell Road. At present it has a 6-panel door with overlight above. An additional wooden insert has been added between the overlight and the doorframe to accommodate a door that was too short for the original frame.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The proposal is to replace the doorframe and the existing door with a 4-panel door and to remove the wooden insert between the overlight and the doorframe.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** The doorframe is rotting at the base. The threshold is loose so that rain comes under door. The door is warped and is sometimes very difficult to open and close.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Specialist Design Advice: The proposed change of existing modern door for an alternative nineteenth century traditional doorway would greatly improve the façade and is acceptable subject to: The new door and frame shall be painted timber.

**TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS:** None received. To be reported (due 1 May 2005).

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and no representations have been received. Period expired 5th May 2005.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** **This application would not normally be referred to Committee. However, the applicant is a Councillor for Uttlesford District Council. The main issue is the effect on the historic character, appearance and fabric of the Listed Building (ULP Policy ENV2).**

As stated by Specialist Design Advice this development would greatly improve the façade of the Listed Building and would be in keeping with the special characteristics of the building and its setting.

**RECOMMENDATION: 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. The door frame hereby permitted shall be of painted timber.  
REASON: In the interests of preserving the historic character and appearance of the listed building.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **UTT/0191/05/FUL – FELSTED**

Erection of extension to Lord Riche Hall; erection of new classroom block  
Felsted School Stebbing Road. GR/TL 679-206. Felsted School.

Case Officer: Mr R Aston 01799 510464

8 week date: 14 April 2005

12 week date: 19 May 2005

**NOTATION:** ULP: Outside Development Limit/Adjacent Conservation Area.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site for the extension of the Lord Riche dining hall is located on the western side of the hall where approval was granted for the construction of additional car parking in 2003. The proposed new classroom block would be located on the opposite side of the road, on the site of the previously approved music school block.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The proposal details the erection of an extension to the existing dining hall to form a new music school and the erection of a new classroom block on the site of the previously approved music school building

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** See attached letter from Felsted School Bursar dated 3 February 2005 and Lucy Carpenter Supporting Statement dated 3 May 2005.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Various planning applications since 1970. Relevant history to this case includes, erection of single storey extension to existing service wing of new dining hall, approved 1989. Erection of new glazed entrance canopy adjacent main entrance to the dining hall approved 1990. Erection of Music Block approved 2003. Change of use of part of sports field to form car park, approved 2003.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Landscaping: The proposed new development would result in the loss of some 8 semi mature trees surrounding the existing dining hall and associated access road and car park area. The loss of these subjects would be mitigated by the implementation of a scheme of planting as part of the current proposals. Recommended that in the circumstances planning permission should be granted subject to conditions regarding landscaping.

Specialist Design Advice: In terms of design both new structures although traditional in overall form, include contemporary elevational details, which are likely to act as a welcomed complement to the historical features of existing buildings within the vicinity. I consider the areas of the glazed screens specifically interesting features, which by reflecting the mature and proposed planting would give the structures an air of lightness and transparency. The proposal would likely contribute positively to the quality of the area subject to the agreed high quality detailing and materials.

Anglian Water: Recommends that a condition regarding foul and surface water drainage be added.

Environment Agency: No objections.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Consider these plans to be a great improvement over the original siting on the south side of Stebbing Road, coupled with adequately increased parking facilities and would recommend acceptance regardless of being outside the village development limits.

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

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

- 1) whether there is sufficient justification for the erection of a music hall, in the form of an extension outside Development limits and a new classroom block. Furthermore, whether the proposal would have an impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the character and setting of the adjacent Conservation Area and rural amenity (ERSP Policy C5 & UDP Policies ENV1, S7, GEN2, GEN9).**

1) The land lies outside the Development Limit for Felsted in the ULP and members must decide whether there is sufficient justification the erection of a new music block/performance hall as an extension to the existing Lord Riche Hall and in addition, whether the erection of a new classroom block on the site of the previously approved music school block, is acceptable. The justification put forward is detailed in the attached letter and is mainly concerned with the improvement of the current educational provision, in summary the reasons for the proposal are:

The site of the new classroom block is broadly on the same footprint of the previously approved music school building, which would have occupied a floor area of approximately 380sqm to a height of between 8.6 and 10.6m, facing northeast with a landscaped area between the new block and the existing building opposite. The current proposal details the erection of a classroom block on the site of the approved music school, with its ridge running east to west, therefore creating a small courtyard between the main listed school building and the new classroom with hard and soft landscaping between. In addition a 10-space car-parking bay directly to the north is proposed. The new classroom block would have a front elevation 43m wide, 15m deep, covering a floor area of approximately 645sqm, an increase of 265sqm on the building previously approved.

The new classroom block would be constructed in a rectangular form and would contain three classrooms, two seminar rooms, store, principal's office and administration offices on the ground floor and five classrooms and three business studies classrooms on the first floor, with a link to the Reekie Building to the east. The building would appear in scale with the neighbouring school building because of its rectangular form and comparable scale, being 12.3m in height. The buildings form, scale and design with a mix of brick, timber cladding, glass and natural slate along with the use of forward projecting bays closely follow that of the existing Lord Riche dining hall and the proposed music school extension, resulting in a group of buildings which all have a similar form and design that would serve to protect the character and wider rural setting of the area if approved.

Turning to the proposed extension to the Lord Riche dining hall, an 'L' shaped extension, closely following the layout of the existing dining hall is proposed on the western side of the dining hall. The extension would be almost a mirror of the existing dining hall, but composed of slightly different fenestration and on a smaller more subservient scale. The building would occupy a floor area of approximately 787sqm, forming a courtyard with a glazed covered walkway with the western elevation of the existing dining hall. The building would be formed by central 1 ½ storey building that would act as a link between the new hall and the Lord Riche building. This element would provide a central entrance point at the head of this courtyard, providing three music offices, female and male WC's and a meeting room at ground floor level. This element would also provide a store and common room within the roof space. This building would lead into the proposed music and performance hall, which would match the layout and orientation of the existing dining hall and would provide a 225 seat performance hall, with classroom, meeting room, percussion room, music/video suites and store at ground floor level and sixteen music practice rooms at first floor with a void over the performance hall. The materials proposed, closely follow the design and appearance of the Lord Riche Hall and although this extension does not have the same rhythm as the

dining hall using smaller cat slide style projections instead of the small gable end projections as per the existing dining hall, its design would not have a detrimental impact on visual amenity nor the character of its surroundings.

Turning to the proposed car parking provision, in 2003 members approved a scheme for the change of use of part of an existing sports field to form a new car park. This scheme detailed the creation of 59 car parking spaces to the east of the dining hall, plus 4 bays for minibuses and the formation of 52 spaces on the site of the proposed extension, resulting in a total of 115 spaces. The current proposal details the overall provision of 72 spaces (including 4 minibus bays) to the east of the dining hall, the formation of a further ten spaces directly opposite and the creation of a further 34 spaces adjacent the new extension. This would result in the overall provision of 105 spaces, but would also result in the loss of what is currently open space, although it is acknowledged that a comprehensive landscaping scheme and appropriate surface treatment could overcome the visual impact, the loss of the space in any event is an unfortunate consequence of this scheme. Officers consider that the availability of 105 spaces for such a facility that can seat up to 225 people, plus the presence of a limited amount of on street car parking spaces is sufficient for the limited occasions that this number of people would be attending the venue. However, given members previous concerns regarding the level of car parking provision, the provision of extra spaces could be achieved by condition, albeit at the loss of further open space.

**CONCLUSIONS:** This is a finely balanced case, with the key issue being whether members consider that the proposals amount to development that needs to take place here and through its design, form and associated landscaping enhances the character of its surroundings or there are special reasons why the development needs to take place here. Members are familiar with the overall Felsted School site and the limited site constraints within which the school faces growth pressure. This scheme contains a far greater provision of floorspace than that previously approved, with a large amount being beyond the Development Limit. If the justification for the new music school and classroom block and the case that the school could not utilise any existing land within the Village Development Limit is accepted, then it is not unreasonable to conclude that it would be preferable to have the new music block as an extension to an existing building that closely follows the design and form of that building, rather than as a freestanding building which could be seen as piecemeal development. If this is accepted then the proposed building, although beyond the Development Limit would not cause material harm to the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area or the wider rural character, particularly to the north. If members are minded to approve the scheme, then it is suggested that a comprehensive scheme for the landscaping of the site and the use of high quality materials in the new blocks would minimise the visual impact on the character and appearance of the countryside and would help to protect the setting and character of the adjacent Conservation Area.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans.
3. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
4. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
5. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted agreed and implemented.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **UTT/0507/05/OP - LITTLE CANFIELD**

Outline planning permission for erection of 5 new dwellings whilst retaining existing bungalow.

Gameyards, Warwick Road. GR/TL 574-215. Messrs C A & J A Blackmore.

Case Officer: Miss K Benjafield 01799 510494

Expiry Date: 24/05/2005

**NOTATION:** Within Takeley / Little Canfield Local Policy 3 – Prior's Green Site.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site is located approximately 1.3km to the northeast of the Takeley Four Ashes junction and lies within the boundary of Little Canfield Parish. The site covers an area of approximately 0.18ha and currently has a detached bungalow located in the northeast corner. The remainder of the site is used for the applicants' dog breeding business and which involves kennels and runs.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** This outline application is for the retention of the existing dwelling on the site and the erection of an additional 5 dwellings. The siting, design, landscaping, external appearance and means of access would all be determined at the reserved matters stage. This site is identified in the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) that covers the area as on "island Site". Retaining the existing dwelling and adding a further five would result in a density of 33 dwelling/ha

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Retention of 2 mobile homes whilst construction work is undertaken conditionally approved 1982 and 1983. Demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of new carport, workshop and stables conditionally approved 1982. Proposed rebuilding of the existing bungalow conditionally approved 1982. Provision of 7 kennels for breeding of dogs conditionally approved 1985. Proposed addition conditionally approved 1986 and renewed 1992. Outline application for erection of 5 dwellings refused 2002 on ground of prematurity with regard to the development of the main priors green site.

**CONSULTATIONS:** ECC TOPS: No objection subject to conditions:

"No development shall take place until such time as the following has been provided to the highway authority – the payment of a financial contribution in the sum of £10,000 index linked to the highway authority for highway measures in the vicinity of the site, such as the B1256 to improve safety, capacity and /or amenity of the highway and/or public transport infrastructure."

It is understood that although being treated as an island, all matters relating to this application, including access will be decided at the reserved matters stage and that by way of suitable legal agreement, all access to this site is to be served via the internal estate roads of the overall Priors Green development.

Water Authority: To be reported (due 21 April).

Environment Agency: Makes comments regarding drainage for residential development.

ECC Archaeology: Recommends open area excavation.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: LITTLE CANFIELD:** To be reported (due 11 May).

**TAKELEY:** Object – over intensification of site drainage only to soakaways in poor drainage area island site to proposed prior green development.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** None received. Notification period expired 15 April.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** Development of this site as an "Island Site" would be acceptable if it complies with the provisions of the SPG and relevant Development Plan



policies. It would not be acceptable as a stand alone site and will be required to respect the Prior Green development which is adjacent to the site.

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

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

1) The Development Plan policies do not permit development of this site in isolation. Development of this site is however acceptable in principle provided it is contiguous with the development of the Prior's Green site overall.

The 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 the island sites until UTT/0816/00/OP has outline planning permission. These requirements can be met by the proposal.

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 April 2002 (indexed) prices. Because this site is outside the Master Plan area these contributions will need to be made in full.

With regard to ECC TOPS recommendation and requirement for a financial contribution of £10,000 it has since been confirmed that this is not necessary because the contribution has already been factored into the calculations regarding the overall contributions required through the S106 agreement.

**CONCLUSIONS:** 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 matter: 1.
2. C.1.2. Submission of reserved matter: 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.
5. C.5.2. Details of materials
6. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping
7. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping
8. C.4.6. Retention of trees and shrubs
9. C.16.2. Full archaeological excavation and evaluation  
No development shall take place on the site until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.  
REASON: To allow for excavation and recording of this site of archaeological importance in advance of and during development, as advised in DoE Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 16.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. Noise construction levels/hours.
13. No development shall take place until a program 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.  
REASON: To ensure there adequate surface and foul drainage systems are provided for the development and there are no adverse effects on the wider community.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **UTT/0351/05/FUL - LINDSELL**

***(Officers' Interest)***

Two-storey side extension.

1 Slatted Cottages, Holders Green. GR/TL 632-285 Mr R Whitman.

Case Officer: Mr N Ford 01799 510468

Expiry Date: 27/04/2005

**NOTATION:** Outside Development Limits ULP Policy S7.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** 1 Slatted Cottages forms a semi detached two-storey dwelling fronting west onto the land between Richmond's Green and Holder's Green in Lindsell. There are two dwellings located on the opposite side of the road named Lower Sweetings and Bandana-Lee. The area is surrounded by open countryside.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The scheme relates to the erection of a two-storey side extension to the north elevation to provide a kitchen and utility room at ground floor level and a bedroom and en-suite over at first floor level resulting in a four-bedroom dwelling. The footprint of the extension would be approximately 32sqm with a ridge height of 6m and an eaves height of 4m. The parent dwelling has a ridge height of 7m and an eaves height of 4.5m. Materials proposed consist of matching render and second hand natural grey slates.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** In 1999 planning permission was granted for the erection of two-storey and single-storey extensions (UTT/0115/99/FUL). In 2001 planning permission was granted for a single-storey rear extension, detached double garage and garden store (UTT/0402/01/FUL).

**CONSULTATIONS:** None.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No objection.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** None received. Notification period expired 22 March 2005.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:** The main issue is whether the scale, design and materials of the proposed extension would respect the original dwelling and if there would be any material detrimental impact to the amenity of neighbours (ERSP Policies C5 & ULP Policies S7, H8 and GEN2).

The site lies within the open countryside outside of any settlement limit where in accordance with policy S7 (and its structure plan equivalent Policy C5) the countryside will be protected for its own sake from inappropriate development. However subject to complying with policies GEN2 and H8 extensions to dwellings in the countryside need not be inappropriate.

Policy GEN2 is a general policy relating to design and lists nine criteria all of which proposals are required to comply with in order to be granted permission. In general terms the proposal complies with all criteria, with the possible exception of criterion a) which among other things requires proposals to be in scale with surrounding buildings. The attached dwelling is significantly smaller than the resultant dwelling on this site.

The issue of scale is also important in the consideration of Policy H8. This requires that the extension must be in scale with the original building. The original dwelling was only a small proportion of the dwelling that would result if this extension was permitted i.e. the area shown as Living room and bedroom 2 on the floor plans. This house has already more than

doubled in size, plus had a conservatory erected and the proposal would provide a further two storey element that is itself comparable to the size of the original dwellings. Therefore if permitted the original dwelling would be about a third of the size of the resultant dwelling and the extensions could not be said to be in scale with that original dwelling. Members will also note that the property has a modern large double garage and store above within its curtilage, occupying a footprint comparable to the original dwelling. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not be proportionate or in scale with the existing dwelling and as such does not accord with ULP Policy H8.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS**

1. This proposal is unacceptable because the extensions would result in a development of a scale and design that would not respect that of the original building and appear as a dominant feature in the street scene that would neither protect nor enhance the character and appearance of the countryside contrary to Policy S7, H8 and GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2004.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*