

UTT/0722/07/FUL - FELSTED .....	3
UTT/0390/07/FUL - LITTLE BARDFIELD.....	6
UTT/0581/07/FUL - STANSTED .....	8
UTT/0265/07/FUL - HENHAM.....	14
1) UTT/0776/07/FUL & 2) UTT/0779/07/FUL - QUENDON & RICKLING .....	18
1) UTT/0819/07/FUL & 2) UTT/0820/07/LB - DEBDEN .....	22

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS AWAITING DECISIONS WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN INCLUDED ON A PREVIOUS SCHEDULE AS AT 4 JULY 2007**

APPL NO: **UTT/0722/07/FUL**  
PARISH: **FELSTED**  
DEVELOPMENT: Replacement of existing bungalow with two storey dwelling  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs G Craig  
LOCATION: 18 Station Road  
D.C. CTTE: 13 June 2007 (see report copy attached)  
REMARKS: Deferred for Site Visit  
**RECOMMENDATION:** **Refusal**  
*Case Officer:* Mrs A Howells 01799 510468  
Expiry Date: 28/06/2007

---

**UTT/0722/07/FUL - FELSTED**  
***(Referred at request of Cllr Bellingham-Smith)***

Replacement of existing bungalow with two storey dwelling  
Location: 18 Station Road. GR/TL 672-203.  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs G Craig  
Agent: Robert Crawford Associates  
Case Officer: Mrs A Howells 01799 510468  
Expiry Date: 28/06/2007  
Classification: MINOR

**NOTATION:** Within Development Limits

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site is located to the west of Felsted on a corner plot set back from the main road. The site contains a single storey dwelling of 'Swedish kit genre' with a footprint of approx. 196sqm and a single garage. The site has boundaries of hedgerows, timber fencing and mature vegetation. The adjacent property to the south is a two storey dwelling with a window in the northern elevation.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The proposal is for the erection of a two storey replacement dwelling in place of the bungalow; the proposed footprint would increase by 62sqm to 259sqm; the proposal indicates that the second floor will be jettied. Ridge height of the proposed dwelling 8.5metres (eaves at 5.0 metres) in comparison to the bungalow's maximum of 6.5 metres and 2.6 metres respectively.

**APPLICANT'S CASE including Design & Access statement:**

Scale: The immediate neighbours are two storey houses.

Layout: The situation and orientation is predetermined by the decision to reuse the existing foundation and floor plan of the bungalow. No habitable rooms overlook adjacent properties apart from the side window of Bedroom 3 which is 11500 from the boundary. The introduction of semi-mature tree planting along this boundary will mitigate any overlooking.

Appearance: The existing single storey bungalow which is of a Swedish kit genre has no architectural merit and offers little to the built form of this part of Felsted.

Landscaping: The proposal does not seek to change the existing landscaping other than the removal of an Eucalyptus tree which the applicant is happy for the consent to be conditioned to replace with indigenous planting elsewhere on the site.

Access: No change to the current means of access is proposed other than the introduction of a suitably sized main entrance door with a flush threshold.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Erection of replacement garage – approved 2006; Conversion and extensions to bungalow to form two storey dwelling – refused 2006

**CONSULTATIONS:** Water Authority: (To be reported).

Environment Agency: Falls outside the scope and therefore have no comment.

Building Control including Life Times Homes Standards: i. Ensure there is no stepped access into the property. ii. No accessibility drawing.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** The design is a considerable improvement on the previous submission, but Felsted PC is still concerned at the scale of the building and its neighbouring 1930's – 1950's buildings in this important location at the village entrance.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** One. Notification period expired 25<sup>th</sup> May 2007.

1. The proposal appears to be as the previous application which was refused.
2. The design has two windows to the side elevation which directly overlook my property and is an invasion of privacy.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** Please see planning considerations.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS including Design & Access statement:**

The main issues are

- 1) **The principle of the development within development limits (ULP Policies S3 & H7);**
- 2) **The appropriateness of the scale and design of the proposed dwelling in the context of its surroundings. (ULP Policies S3, GEN2, H7 & [SPD](#) 'Replacement Dwellings');**
- 3) **The impact of the development on neighbouring residential amenities (ULP Policies GEN2 & [SPD](#) 'Replacement Dwellings') and**
- 4) **Other material planning considerations.**

1) The site is located within the development limits of Felsted where development of the nature proposed is acceptable in principle provided it is compatible with the settlements character and countryside setting and complies with all other relevant Local Plan Policies.

2) The existing bungalow is shown to have fully hipped roofs, no rooms or windows above ground floor level and a main ridge height of 6.5metres with lower ridge section at 4.8 metres. The proposed resultant dwelling would be 8.5metres high with projecting gables with lower elements. The neighbouring properties appear to have been built 1930's – 1950's with large floor areas and spacious character. The site slopes slightly up from west to east. Policies require the replacement dwelling to be in scale and character with neighbouring properties and that there should be no overlooking or overshadowing of neighbours.

The neighbouring properties have floor areas of approx. 205sqm and 277sqm. However, the proposed replacement dwelling would have a floor area of approx. 428sqm. The scale therefore is such that the neighbouring properties will be dominated by the proposed. The design/character of the neighbouring properties is 1930's – 1950's whilst the proposed fails to respect their character. However, taking into consideration the design of the existing building it is not considered that the design would have an adverse effect on the surrounding properties. The proposed dwelling has windows which would overlook the neighbouring property. In the design and access statement submitted as part of the application, the applicant does not consider this an issue because of mature planting along the boundary. The policy and the supplementary planning document are quite specific and state that 'there should be no overlooking'. The lifespan of the planting is likely to be shorter than the proposed dwelling and therefore it would not be acceptable to rely on this plantings.

It fails to comply with policies H7, GEN2 and the SPD on replacement dwellings, which require the replacement dwelling to be in scale and character with neighbouring properties and have no overlooking.

3) The significant size and scale of the dwelling, which would occupy a depth of nearly 21 metres, and the position of the windows to the southern elevation is likely to have a harmful effect on neighbouring residential amenities. The windows are proposed at first floor level on the south elevation. Window 1 to bedroom 3 is a second window to the room it would not be unreasonable to require this window to be obscure glazed or to require the window to be removed. Window 2 is to a landing and floor level condition may be appropriate to ensure that overlooking would not occur. Window 3 is to a bathroom and an obscure glazing condition would be appropriate. Although overlooking from windows could

be controlled the scheme due to its size and bulk would be contrary to policy GEN2 of the Local Plan and the aforementioned SPD, which in paragraph 16 states “The Council will require the replacement dwelling to be in scale and character with neighbouring properties and there should be no overlooking or overshadowing of neighbours.

4) The Council will only usually grant planning permission for the replacement of buildings which are lawful, structurally unsound or poorly constructed - The applicants have not submitted any information which satisfies this statement. However from a site inspection the dwelling appears to be lawful and of reasonable soundness and construction.

**CONCLUSIONS:** In light of the above considerations officers recommend that the application be refused for the following reasons.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS**

The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its scale and design will fail to respect the scale and character of the neighbouring properties and the character of the locality in general. It would thereby be contrary to policies S3, GEN2 & H7 of the Uttlesford Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document 'Replacement Dwellings'.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **UTT/0390/07/FUL - LITTLE BARDFIELD**

***(Referred at request of Cllr Foley)***

*(Reasons: concern from Parish Council and residents – for further comments and discussion from community)*

Change of use from grounds associated with Little Bardfield Hall to be used to hold concerts twice a year & weddings/social/parish events ten times a year. Erection of marquees, stage and toilets and use of land for car parking for the events

Location: Little Bardfield Hall. GR/TL 653-304

Applicant: Mr A Goldsmith

Agent: Lucy Carpenter

Case Officer: Mr T Morton 01799 510654

Expiry Date: 31/05/2007

Classification: OTHER

**NOTATION:** Outside Development Limit.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The land is open 'paddocks' to the front of the parish Church and Little Bardfield Hall, laid to grass and with a considerable number of mature trees scattered within it. A large lake stands in the centre of the area proposed for concerts.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The proposal is for the field adjacent to the church to be used for marquees for weddings, and for associated car parking up to 10 times per year with access from the Church access road, and secondly for the larger area to the front of the Hall to be used for stages and marquees for concerts and associated car parking twice a year, with access through an existing gate directly onto the highway.

**APPLICANT'S CASE including Design & Access statement:** The statement is available in full on file. It describes the site and surroundings and the proposal. The principal supporting concept is that an Entertainments License has already been granted by the Council, so all issues must have already been considered and found acceptable. Comparison is made to the concerts at Audley End house which have operated for many years, and which have never been the subject of a planning application. The case is presented as being primarily for village events or charitable events, and the village has no village green on which such events might be held.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** This case was considered at the meeting on 13 June 2007 when it was resolved to approve the proposal subject to conditions to be reported to this meeting of the Committee – the draft conditions are reported below.

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

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development.
2. No more than [number to be advised by Members] cars are to attend any single event held within the terms of this consent. Any cars exceeding this number shall result in the immediate cessation of the event in question.  
Reason: To limit the amount of traffic movements in the interests of the amenity of nearby occupiers and in the interests of road safety.
3. Marshals are to be provided for all events held within the terms of this consent to supervise the movements of vehicles both within the site and on the adjoining highway.  
Reason: In the interest of road safety to prevent excessive queuing back from the entrance along the public highway.

4. Advance traffic warning signs are to be placed on the highway at a distance of 400 metres and 200 metres in each direction from any entrance being used in connection with all events held within the terms of this consent, the signs to contain the words "Warning Traffic Queue Ahead" or such other text as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and Highway Authority. The events shall not operate unless this signage is displayed.  
Reason: In the interests of highway safety.
5. The ponds within the site shall be securely fenced by post and rail fencing or such other means of enclosure as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Details of the proposed fencing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and installed before the use is commenced and shall be maintained permanently thereafter, and no event shall take place in the absence of this fencing on the site as agreed  
Reason: In the interest of public safety
6. No form of advertising of events to take place held within the terms of this consent shall be carried out beyond the boundaries of the parish of Little Bardfield.  
Reason: To ensure that events are held for local benefit only and not for a wider audience, in the interest of public amenity and to reduce excessive travel distance in the interest of sustainability.
7. The use hereby permitted shall not operate except between the hours of 09:00 and 23:00 on any day, including bringing to the site and setting up and breaking down and removing equipment associated with events.  
REASON: In the interest of the amenity of nearby residents.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## UTT/0581/07/FUL - STANSTED

Consolidation and minor modification to extant planning permissions references:  
UTT/0833/91 UTT/1481/03/REN, UTT/0239/05/DFO, UTT/0347/06/FUL, UTT/0345/06/FUL,  
for demolition of existing buildings and the development of 15,424 Sqm of B1 space, new  
access road and new drainage lagoons and electricity substations  
Location: Parsonage Farm Forest Hall Road. GR/TL 516-229.  
Applicant: FREP (Stansted) Ltd  
Agent: Frogmore Property Company  
Case Officer: Mr T Morton 01799 510654  
13 week Date: 23/07/2007  
Classification: MAJOR

**NOTATION:** Largely within Policy Area SM5 / Within MGB

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site consists of two linked pieces of land, accessed by a long private road from Foresthall Road. The site contained a collection of ageing buildings in various business uses, which are in the process of being vacated and demolished.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** This application seeks to simplify the trail of permissions that have previously been granted for the redevelopment of this land, into one consolidated submission and permission. There are effectively two series of permissions for two different variants of the use mix; one with an 80% / 20% mix of industry to office, and the second series for a 50% / 50% mix of industry and office. This application refers only to the 50 /50 mix and would supersede the permission (Outline and Reserved Matters) for the main part of the development and the separate permissions for part of the access road and for two balancing ponds.

**APPLICANT'S CASE including Design & Access statement:** The statement is available in full on file. It describes the site and surroundings and the proposal.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Various permissions for the Class B1 redevelopment of site have been approved.

There are now two series of permissions 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 – Outline approval for redevelopment of site for B1 uses incl. Condition limiting Office and Research floorspace increased to a minimum of 50% light industry.
UTT/0003/94 – renewal of 833/91 (80/20 mix)	UTT/890/95 – renewal of 1392/92 (50% mix)
UTT/962/95 – renewal of 0003/94	UTT/1123/97 – renewal of 890/95
UTT/1122/97 – renewal of 962/95	UTT/887/00 – renewal of 1123/97
UTT/888/00 Renewal of 1122/97	UTT/1725/01 – renewal of 887/00
UTT/1724/01 – renewal of 888/00	UTT/1481/03/REN – renewal of 1725/01
UTT/1480/03/REN – renewal of 1724/01	UTT/0239/05/DFO details for 1481/03
UTT/0238/05/DFO details for 1480/03	

In addition the following consents are related to the development

UTT/1309/05/FUL - Access Road. Approved

UTT/ 0345/06/FUL – Drainage Lagoon (north) Approved

UTT/0347/06/FUL - Drainage Lagoon (south) Approved



This application refers to the righthand column of the table and the decisions beneath the table.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Essex County Council Highways section: Comments awaited.

Environment Agency: The application, as submitted, does not sufficiently consider pollution control. The pollution of ground water and/or surface water is an offence under the Water Resources Act 1991. Advisory comments.

i) Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from parking areas and hard standings susceptible to oil contamination shall be passed through an oil separator designed and constructed to have a capacity and details compatible with the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor. All washdown and disinfectant waters shall be discharged to the foul sewer. Any detergents entering oil separators may render them ineffective.

ii) All cleaning and washing operations should be carried out in designated areas isolated from the surface water system and draining to the foul sewer (with the approval of the sewerage undertaker). The area should be clearly marked and a kerb surround is recommended.

Vehicles' loading or unloading bays and storage areas involving chemicals, refuse or other polluting matter shall not be connected to the surface water drainage system.

iii) No foul sewage or trade effluent, including cooling water containing chemical additives, or vehicle washing water, including steam-cleaning effluent, shall be discharged to the surface water drainage system.

iv) Only clean, uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.

v) Any facilities, above ground, for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be provided with adequate, durable secondary containment to prevent the escape of pollutants. The bunded area shall be designed, constructed and maintained in order that it can contain a capacity not less than 110% of the total volume of all tanks or drums contained therein. All filling points, vents, gauges and sight glasses should be bunded. Any tank overflow pipe outlets shall be directed into the bund. Associated pipework should be located above ground and protected from accidental damage. There shall be no gravity or automatic discharge arrangement for bund contents. Contaminated bund contents shall not be discharged to any watercourse, land or soakaway. The installation must, where relevant, comply with the Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) (England) Regulations 2001 and the Control of Pollution (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) Regulations 1991 and as amended 1997.

vi) All drums and small containers used for oil and other chemicals shall be stored in bunded areas that do not drain to any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway.

vii) Facilities should be provided to ensure that waste oil is stored and disposed of in a manner that will not lead to pollution.

Site occupiers intending to purchase or install pollutant secondary containment (bunding) should ensure that the materials are not vulnerable to premature structural failure in the event of a fire in the vicinity.

viii) The Agency has issued a series of downloadable Pollution Prevention Guidelines (PPGs) which are accessible at [www.environment-agency.gov.uk/ppg](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/ppg). Each PPG is targeted at a particular industrial sector or activity and aims to provide advice to developers on their statutory responsibilities and good environmental practice. Given the nature of the proposed development, it would be advisable that the applicant refers to these notes for further information.

ix) In the event of any work taking place that will affect a watercourse - Any culverting or works affecting the flow of a watercourse (including ditches) will require the prior written Consent of the Environment Agency under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991/Water Resources Act 1991. The Environment Agency seeks to avoid culverting and its Consent for such works will not normally be granted except as a means of access.

Natural England: Based on the information provided, Natural England objects to the proposed development. We recommend that the local planning authority refuse planning permission on the grounds that the application contains insufficient survey information to demonstrate whether or not the development would have an adverse effect on legally protected species.

Our concerns relate specifically to the likely impact upon bats that may use the existing buildings marked for demolition as roost sites.

This information should be submitted to and considered by Uttlesford District Council prior to determining the planning application. If the submitted information leads you to conclude that you need further advice then please do not hesitate to contact us. Once Natural England has received this information we will be able to comment further.

BAA: Response awaited to second consultation.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Stansted: "No comments".

**REPRESENTATIONS:** This application has been advertised and two representations have been received. Period expired 22 May 2007.

One letter claims that the respondent has lived on the site in a vehicle for more than 10 years, and he has submitted an application for a Certificate of lawfulness this effect.

A second letter objects to any damage to trees and asks for a Tree Preservation Order to be placed on all trees [NB This has been passed to the Arboricultural consultant for evaluation]

An occupier of a business unit on the site objects to the proposal on the basis that his business is being forced to close.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** The position of existing business tenant is a matter for the landlord and tenant and the contracts that may exist between them, and is not a material planning consideration.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS including Design & Access statement:**

The main issues are

- 1) **The principle of development (ERSP Policy C2 PPG2 Greenbelts, ULP Policy SM2);**
- 2) **Design (ULP Policy GEN2);**
- 3) **Highways issues (ERSP Policies T1, T3, T6);**
- 4) **Landscape and Wildlife issues (ULP Policy GEN7) and**
- 5) **Other material planning considerations.**

1) The principle of the redevelopment of this site has been established with the outline permission, and this is also reflected by an allocation in the Local Plan. The planning history of the site is protracted and complex, but business use was seen as established by 1991 with the first application for redevelopment, and redevelopment was seen by the Council as the way to tidy up and improve the site. The Outline permission 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 (4830 sq m).

The proposal is for a total of 6855 sq m of industrial space in 18 units, and 7732 sq m 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.”

PPG2 is generally supportive of redevelopment of major developed site subject to various criteria.

2) The overall design remains very similar to that approved under reference UTT/0239/05/DFO, though there are some styling differences particularly on the office buildings. These relate mainly to the fenestration and the new design still produces buildings of satisfactory appearance.

3) The approvals already issued involve the formation of a new road from the public highway at Forest Hall Road running to the new units. This runs along a separate course from the existing access road, which is to be blocked to vehicular traffic and used solely for bridleway use which follows the carriageway of the old road. The junction detail with the public highway has been previously agreed.

4) 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. Although no ecological survey has been submitted with this application, 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 was provided, and 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 to Protected Species is not over-riden by any planning consent, but the planning authority 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.

5) No other issues are considered to arise.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The proposal is considered satisfactory.

**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.5.2. Details of materials to be submitted agreed and implemented.
4. C.20.3. If Protected Species discovered get Licence from DEFRA/Natural England (amended to include badgers)
5. C.8.29. Details of sustainable construction for new residential or commercial development.
6. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.

7. Lockable bollards and warning signage as shown on drawing 05\_0343 CL\_01 rev T2 shall be provided and maintained at all times except for purposes of maintenance access to the bridleway track along the carriageway of the old access road to Parsonage Farm  
REASON: To provide a segregated traffic free route for users of the statutory bridleway in the interest of the safety of users of this route.
8. The public right of way in the vicinity of the site should not be obstructed or adversely affected in any way by the proposed development either during construction or at any time following completion of the development.  
REASON: To protect the safety of users of public right of way.
9. Detailed drawings showing actual cross sections in each of two directions at right angles of the two balancing ponds to serve the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before their construction.  
REASON: to clarify their form of construction in the interest of protection of the appearance of the countryside.
10. Before the commencement of construction of the development hereby approved the applicant shall either;
  - a) Net the entire area of open water in the balancing ponds, details of netting to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority  
OR
  - b) Produce a Bird Management Plan, details of which are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
The Bird Management Plan should include the following:  
Visits to the balancing ponds by a nominated person(s) need to be conducted three times a day, at dawn, noon and dusk (time periods to be arranged)  
A log must be kept of numbers and types of birds and times they were spotted  
The log must be kept available for audit and inspection when requested by BAA.  
Details of dispersal methods  
There will be target groups of species specified and maximum numbers of each species allowed, possibly zero tolerance for water fowl (details to be agreed)  
Failure criteria to be agreed  
The measures that are agreed shall be put in place before first use of the pond and shall be maintained permanently thereafter.  
REASON: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority and BAA that the risk of birdstrike to aircraft is minimised.
11. C.8.3. No outdoor working (amended).
12. C.8.22. Control of lighting.
13. C.9.1. No outdoor storage.
14. C.10.1. Bell Mouth junction.
15. C.10.17. No occupation until spaces laid out.
16. Prior to the commencement/occupation of the development the details of the number, location and design of powered two wheelers and bicycle parking facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved facility shall be provided before occupation and retained at all times.  
REASON: To ensure appropriate powered two wheeler and bicycle parking is provided in accordance with policy T6 of the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Replacement Structure Plan.
17. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory method of pollution control.

18. The vehicle parking spaces and service yards shown on drawings 236 034 and 236 022 date stamped as received 23 April 2007 shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles in association with the use of the Class B1 accommodation hereby permitted. No vehicle shall be parked in the approved parking spaces or service yards unless it belongs to or was driven there by a person who is working at the premises hereby approved. No vehicle parked at the site by or on behalf of a person visiting the premises hereby approved shall remain on the site overnight unless that person is working at the premises hereby approved on the night that the vehicle is parked.

REASON: To ensure adequate car parking spaces are provided to serve the Class B1 accommodation in the interests of highway safety. Furthermore, it is the policy of the Council that all parking required for Stansted Airport should be accommodated within the airport boundary, in order to protect the appearance of the countryside.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**UTT/0265/07/FUL - HENHAM**

***(Managing Director of applicant company related to a member of staff)***

Change of use from agricultural to B1 and B2  
Location: Parsonage Farm. GR/TL 544-284  
Applicant: J F Pimblett & Sons  
Agent: Mr A D Chapman FRICS  
Case Officer: Mr H Laird 01799 510464  
Expiry Date: 06/07/2007  
Classification: OTHER

**NOTATION:** Outside settlement limits. In grounds of a Grade II Listed Building. Conservation Area.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The application site comprises a range of farm buildings in several rows made up from a mixture of modern and traditional styles. The application building comprises an open-sided (to the east elevation) cart shed barn with a corrugated sheeting roof over wooden planks, and a concrete floor. The walls are of red brick to 3 sides. It forms part of a larger complex of buildings, and is linked to a two-storey (in height), residential barn conversion to the north which is attached to the application barn by an arch, with vehicular access to barns to the west running underneath.

A range of two, single storey livestock buildings of concrete breeze block construction is attached to the western wall of the application barn. It has two sets of sliding steel doors and is capped with corrugated sheeting roofing. A further single building of similar construction to the above two units is attached to the east side of the application barn. This is used as a machinery store/workshop.

The barn lies within the historic curtilage of the Grade II Listed Parsonage Farm, and is contained within, but on the boundary of the Henham Conservation Area. The residential barn conversion on site immediately to the north is occupied by members of the applicant's extended family.

Access to the site is derived from Church Street.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The application seeks planning permission for the Conversion and Change of Use from Agricultural to Class B1 Use (Light Industry) and/or Class B2 Use (General Industrial) with a specific view to accommodating a micro-brewery, there being a specific occupant in mind.

This micro brewery would cover approximately 25% of the available floorspace, the rest would be used for the storage of boxes, crates and office.

A Bat Survey has been submitted with the application.

**APPLICANTS CASE (Design & Access Statement):** The applicants have submitted a Report outlining the case for the conversion of the buildings. This advises that the building is no longer suitable for housing modern farm vehicles and equipment/machinery. It was originally a cart store in 5-6 bays. The internal floor is concrete. The site has mains water and electricity. It is proposed that the open side of the barn will be infilled with timber weatherboarding over a studwork frame. Any doors and windows required will be of stained softwood.

There are two options proposed in this application, hence the request for both Use Class B1 and B2 approval.

The applicants preferred option is to convert the building for use as a micro-brewery. The proposed tenant is a local company trading under the name of The Saffron Brewery. The brewery currently works from smaller premises in the locality and now wishes to move to slightly larger and more suitable premises.

The barn will be split into three areas. The first will be used for brewing, the second for racking barrels and bottles and for storage, whilst the third area will be a small office/board room where tasting will be carried out. The brewery is small and will brew between one and two barrels per week. The actual brewing process takes around 4 hours, with little or no smell or noise. Once the beer has been brewed, it is left to ferment and is then either bottled or put into barrels. Equipment in the brewing/bottling areas would comprise two vats, a cold room to cool the fermented beer, and a bottling and barrelling area. The office area would double-up as a small boardroom/tasting area for groups of visitors.

With regard to parking, it is proposed that there be no more than one van and two cars on site at any one time. Car parking would be on the existing concrete area which is large enough to contain all vehicles associated with the proposed conversion without impeding access to adjoining farm buildings

Waste disposal from the brewing process would be via a septic tank and reed bed system which would in turn link into the main farm systems. The reed bed and septic tank would have clear water outlet into a ditch that runs across the farm.

Two deliveries of malt and bottles are per month are proposed. Initially, one or two part-time casual workers plus the owner will be employed, with the possibility of a full-time employee in the next 9-10 months.

In the event of the micro-brewery (Use Class B2 – General Industry) not proceeding, the proposal seeks the use of the building for Use Class B1 (Light Industry).

A Bat Report is enclosed with the application.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** None of relevance

**CONSULTATIONS:** Design Advice: No comments received.

Building Surveying: No objections.

Essex Wildlife Trust: No objections subject to a condition for the protection of Bats.

Natural England: No objections.

Environmental Health: No objections subject to safeguarding conditions relating to controls on outdoor working and the operation of commercial vehicles. These should be limited to 08.00 – 18.00 Monday – Friday; and, 08.00 – 13.00 on Saturdays.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** Henham Parish Council comments that whilst no obvious objections are raised, there is concern regarding an increase in traffic visiting the site should the proposals go ahead, although it is understood that this is likely to be small vehicles as opposed to HGV's. The Council has also been made aware that any pollution arising from the beer making process will be disposed of in an environmentally friendly manner.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** The application has been advertised both in the local newspaper, and by way of a site notice. In addition, 12 Letters to neighbours have been sent out. Period expired 14/6/07. No representations have been received.

**COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:** n/a

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

- 1) Principle of proposed use (ERSP Policies C2, CS5, BE1, ULP policies: S7, E5, GEN2, ENV);
- 2) Design & Access (ERSP Policies C2, CS5, BE1, ULP policies: S7, GEN1, GEN2, ENV2);
- 3) Neighbour's amenity (ULP policies: H8, GEN2 and GEN4)
- 4) Other material planning considerations.

1) In terms of the principle of the proposed change of use the key policy contained in the ULP is E5.

**Policy E5 – Re-Use of Rural Buildings** - advises that:

**The re-use and adaptation of rural buildings for business uses, small scale retail outlets, leisure uses or for tourist accommodation will be permitted in the countryside, including the Metropolitan Green Belt, the Countryside Protection Zone and beyond, if all the following criteria are met:**

- a) The buildings are of a permanent and substantial construction;
- b) They are capable of conversion without major reconstruction or significant extension;
- c) The development would protect or enhance the character of the countryside, its amenity value and its biodiversity and not result in a significant increase in noise levels or other adverse impacts;
- d) The development would not place unacceptable pressures on the surrounding rural road network (in terms of traffic levels, road safety countryside character and amenity).

It is considered that the proposed development would comply with the requirements of Policy E5 in that the traditional building is capable of re-use without major adaptation or alteration, and would be improved and maintained as a result.

2) It is considered that the buildings are capable of conversion without major adaptation or re-construction. The design of the alterations to respect the original building as per the proposal to enclose the open side of the barn with timber weatherboarding over a studwork frame, plus the addition of any doors and windows required to be of stained softwood, can be conditioned. No new openings are proposed in the brickwork to the other three sides of the barn.

The enclosed Bat Report is considered acceptable. Natural England and the Essex Wildlife Trust have both raised no objections, with the latter requesting a condition for the protection of Bats and their roosts. Traffic movements are unlikely to be much more than the farm use which consists of a number of slow moving or heavy vehicle movements associated with farming operations on the site. No objections have been received from Environmental Health regarding the proposals, conditions relating to no outdoor working, and restrictions on traffic movements as advised, can be conditioned. Therefore, in the context of Local Plan Policies S7, E5 and GEN2, the proposal is considered acceptable.

3) There would be no adverse impact on neighbour's amenities.

4) The proposed drainage system is considered to be appropriate and sustainable in this case, and there are no other material considerations.



**CONCLUSION:** The proposed development is acceptable. There would be no adverse impact on the character of the farm yard, or on the setting of adjoining historic buildings and the Conservation Area. Neighbours amenities would not be harmed.

**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. The parking provision on site for the use hereby permitted shall be laid out in accordance with the submitted 1:500 scale 'Parking Space Location' drawing franked 7 June, 2007. Thereafter, the parking spaces shall be made available for vehicle parking in connection with the permitted use only.  
REASON: To ensure the development will be carried out as approved and that sufficient on-site parking for the permitted use is provided and maintained.
4. C.6.1. Excluding future changes of use without further permission.  
The premises shall be used for Use Class B1 or B2 uses and for no other purpose (including any other purposes in Class B8 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning Use Classes (Amendment) Order 2005, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).  
REASON: In the interests of amenity and to ensure the development is compatible with the character of the surrounding area.
5. C.6.8. Excluding Permitted Development extensions or alterations to industrial [warehouse] premises
6. C.8.16. Restriction of hours of operation.
7. C.8.3. No outdoor working.
8. C.5.3. Matching materials.
9. C.5.9. Painted wood.
10. C.8.22. Control of lighting.
11. C.8.29. Details of measures providing energy and water efficiency and sustainable power and drainage for new residential or commercial development
12. C.20.1. Acceptable survey and mitigation and management plan – Implementation of scheme.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **1) UTT/0776/07/FUL & 2) UTT/0779/07/FUL - QUENDON & RICKLING**

*(Joint report)*

*(Referred at request of Cllr Wilcock)*

*(Reason: unknown)*

- 1) Extension to marquee to provide catering area
- 2) Amendment of condition C.90A of UTT/1366/05/FUL to allow the use of the marquee until March 2015 and removal of condition C.90C of UTT/1366/05/FUL to extend the months of permitted usage

Location: Quendon Hall Quendon Park Estate Quendon GR/TL 515-318

Applicant: Mr W Lusty

Agent: Savills (L&P) Ltd

Case Officer: Mrs K Hollitt 01799 510495

Expiry Date: 06/07/2007

Classification: OTHER

**NOTATION:** Outside Development Limits/Curtilage of Grade I Listed Building/Historic Parkland/Ancient Woodland/County Wildlife Site.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The site is located in the Quendon Park estate to the north of the village and west of the B1383. It comprises about 40ha of attractive undulating parkland with historic trees and woods set around Quendon Hall. The setting is of high architectural and environmental quality.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** UTT/0776/07/FUL: The proposal seeks to retain a marquee, used as a catering area. The marquee measures 6m by 9m and has a ridge height of 3.1m. The marquee is located adjacent to a larger marquee (the subject of application UTT/0779/07/FUL) and behind a brick wall.

UTT/0779/07/FUL: The proposal seeks consent to retain the use of the marquee for 12 months of the year for weddings, conferences and other social functions. The marquee measures 35m x 12.3m and has a ridge height of 4.8m. It is located to the north of Quendon Hall, behind a brick wall.

### **APPLICANT'S CASE including Design & Access statement:**

UTT/0776/07/FUL: Site located to north of and within grounds of Quendon Hall. Site is well screened behind the Hall. Marquee used for weddings and functions which contributes to local economy. No consultation has been undertaken owing to its minor nature. Extension has been positioned to minimise any impact. The scale of the proposed development is no greater than needed to meet functional requirement. Design very similar to existing marquee and consequently can be considered appropriate. In terms of accessibility, owing to the nature of the proposal, the extension is accessible to all.

UTT/0779/07/FUL: See letter dated 1 May 2007 attached at end of report.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Retrospective permission granted for erection of temporary marquee between months of May and September for use associated with weddings, functions and conferences in April 2004. Variation of condition to allow use for additional month granted October 2005.

**CONSULTATIONS:** English Heritage: Quendon Hall is a fine country house dating from the 16<sup>th</sup> century and later. It is now listed at grade I. Planning permission was granted for the erection of a marquee for the summer months, to help provide an income towards the upkeep of the house. In this it has been successful, but the marquee also detracts from the

architectural character of the house and the way in which it sits in its setting. Approval now sought for use of marquee until 2015 and approval sought for the erection of the marquee throughout the year rather than for the limited period annually that is now permitted. Both applications would be regrettable in their implications. The extension would prolong the detriment caused by the marquee to the house and its setting, while the removal of the limit on the period for which the marquee can be erected each year would intensify it. Argument for allowing marquee until 2015 may be reasonable, provided that it remains a temporary structure; but no clear argument seems to have been advanced to show that the use of the marquee throughout the year is necessary to the upkeep of the house. Applicant's case throw doubt on the viability of private use of houses such as Quendon Hall. Significant change in market for large country houses with many reverting back to residential use. Large country houses should not be considered to be "at risk" unless there are specific reasons that appear to jeopardise their future. English Heritage advises your Council to attach significant weight to the architectural and historic importance of Quendon Hall and to the detriment done to it by the marquee in determining this application.

Design Advice: It is clear that the marquee has a significantly damaging visual impact on the setting of the building and on the appearance of the park. The original compassionate decision has been made to encourage a budding business and consent for periodical erection has been given. Consider that a permanent continuation of the marquee would compromise the desirability of preserving the setting of the Grade I listed building and its parkland to an unacceptable degree, as there would be no respite from the existence of the present unsightly form. Recommend refusal.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** None

**REPRESENTATIONS:** These applications have been advertised and one representation has been received. Period expired 6 June 2007.

Object on basis of noise. Live very close to the marquee and the noise that is generated, especially when a live band is playing, is very substantial. It is impossible to sleep until the wedding is finished sometimes later than 12 on a Sunday. You can hear it all the way to Rickling Green Church.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS including Design & Access statement:**

**The main issues are whether the retention of both or either of the marquees would harm the setting of this listed building (ERSP Policy HC3, ULP Policy ENV2; this parkland (ERSP Policy NR5, ULP Policy ENV9) or whether there are any material planning considerations that would warrant a decision contrary to policy.**

The visual impact of the marquees on the setting of this listed building is considered to be significant, primarily due to their proximity to the north face of the Hall, in particular the larger marquee. Although they are partially hidden by a brick wall immediately to the west, their roof forms are visible from the front of the Hall and on the approach to the Hall. It should be noted that the first view of the Hall is on the approach from the vehicular access. This leads directly to the western elevation of the building and the marquees are more visible than the façade of the building. Whilst a temporary consent has been granted previously for the larger marquee, this was a decision which was contrary to development plan policies. The temporary consent allowed for some respite from the detriment caused to the setting of the building, but its use for 12 months of the year, effectively a permanent consent, would result in the harm throughout the year. The erection of a second marquee, even on a temporary basis on an annual basis, would exacerbate the detrimental impact the marquees have on the setting of the listed building. Therefore, it is considered that the proposals fail to comply with policies aimed at protecting the character and setting of listed buildings.

The description of the listed building states that *“On the north side there is an avenue of trees forming a vista with the axis of the Church of St Mary the Virgin, Newport, about 1.5 miles to the north.”* The marquees, in particular the larger marquee, intrude into this vista and damage the important relationship of the Hall with its surrounding parkland. This damage would be increased during the winter months when there is less tree cover to provide a degree of screening to the site. Consequently, the proposals also fail to comply with the Parkland protection policies.

Whilst an exception to policy has been made previously, this was in respect of a period of initially 5 months per year, increased to 6 months per year. However, it is considered that the permanent use of the larger marquee and the erection of a second marquee would have considerable detrimental damage to the setting of the listed building and the parkland. It is considered that insufficient information has been submitted which substantiates a need for this structure on a more permanent basis. An application for the use of the larger marquee for 12 months of the year was refused in March due to the damaging impact on the setting of the listed building and the parkland and due to insufficient case being made for the permanent use of the structure. No economic case has been made to justify the retention of these structures and as such there is not considered that this could be a material consideration for a decision contrary to policy. There is no evidence that the listed building is “at risk” and English Heritage do not consider that this is necessarily a justifiable reason to grant consent for inappropriate development which would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of a Grade I listed building. The erection of the second marquee exacerbates the impact of the original marquee and it is considered that the erection of these sporadic, ad hoc features, imply that the retention of the marquees may not be sufficient to meet the long-term needs of the business and as such it is considered that a more permanent solution is sought to cater to the needs of the business.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The architectural and environmental importance of this location is too great to allow the harm which would result from the retention of a large marquee throughout the year. The retention of the smaller marquee would exacerbate the damage caused to the setting of the listed building and no case has been made to justify an exception to policy.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

#### **1) UTT/0776/07/FUL – REFUSAL REASONS**

1. The proposed erection of a large marquee for 12 months of the year and retention to 2015 in this sensitive location would harm the setting of this Grade I Listed Building by introducing a prominent alien modern element of excessive size which would have a damaging visual impact, contrary to ERSP Policy HC3, ULP Policy ENV2, and advice contained in PPG15.
2. The proposed erection of a marquee for 12 months of the year, and the retention of the structure to 2015 in this sensitive location would harm the Parkland setting of this Grade I Listed Building and its vista to the north by introducing a prominent alien modern element of excessive size which would have a damaging visual impact, contrary to ERSP Policy NR5 and ULP Policy ENV9.
3. The commercial case put forward in support of this proposal is not considered to be of sufficient weight to warrant an exception to these policies.

#### **2) UTT/0779/07/FUL – REFUSAL REASONS**

1. The proposed erection of a marquee for 12 months of the year and retention to 2015 in this sensitive location would harm the setting of this Grade I Listed Building by introducing a prominent alien modern element of excessive size which would have a

damaging visual impact, contrary to ERSP Policy HC3, ULP Policy ENV2, and advice contained in PPG15.

2. The proposed erection of a marquee for 12 months of the year, and the retention of the structure to 2015 in this sensitive location would harm the Parkland setting of this Grade I Listed Building and its vista to the north by introducing a prominent alien modern element of excessive size which would have a damaging visual impact, contrary to ERSP Policy NR5 and ULP Policy ENV9.
3. The commercial case put forward in support of this proposal is not considered to be of sufficient weight to warrant an exception to these policies.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**1) UTT/0819/07/FUL & 2) UTT/0820/07/LB - DEBDEN**

***(Referred at request of Councillor Knight)***

*(Reason: unknown)*

Infill of courtyard area to create new communication centre. Installation of rooflights.

Demolition of store/wc

Location: Debden C of E Primary School High Street. GR/TL 555-333.

Applicant: Debden C of E Primary School

Agent: Wilby & Burnett

Case Officer: Madeleine Jones 01799 510606

Expiry Date: 11/07/2007

Classification: MINOR

**NOTATION:** ULP: Within Development Limits. Grade II Listed Building.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:** The property is a red brick with stone dressing village school building erected in 1862, situated in the high street of Debden village. The roof of the historic part of the building is a steeply pitched clay tiled roof. The school comprises a central block with gabled wings at the east (two storey) and west ends (single storey) with stopped gables. New additions to the south of these buildings create a courtyard which is accessed via a wrought iron gate supported by two red brick pillars. To the east of the west wing is a flat roofed extension which extends the length of the courtyard from the main central block southwards to the new range. There are further new buildings and a relocatable classroom to the south of these buildings. The red brick, east wing (at the southern end) has a lean-to single storey extension with a slate roof and feature chimney. To the rear of this lean-to (within the courtyard) are two small single storey further extensions which house a toilet building and store. The windows to the north elevation of the main building are original iron latticed casements (although they no longer open).

The school is set amongst residential cottages and the public house and village pond are opposite.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The proposal is to demolish the two small single storey extensions to the rear of the east wing and to enclose the courtyard by covering the existing open space. The area between the 'H' form of the listed building and the new existing buildings to the south would be covered with a new self supporting roof. The roof would comprise of a felt monopitch roof with standing seam leadwork above the entrance and to all vertical roof/high level areas. It would also have a large patent glazed rooflight in the centre. A window to the south elevation of the main school building would be replaced with a timber window. There would be two new velux conservation rooflights to the rear of the main building tiled roof and two to the north elevation of the south range building (of the courtyard) The existing flat roof in the courtyard would have three rooflights fitted. The area is approximately 9m by 6.5m and would provide an area of 59m<sup>2</sup>. The entrance would have two brick piers, with two glazed doors etched with the school logo.

**APPLICANT'S CASE:** (Summary of Design and Access Statement) The proposal would create a Communications Centre. The self supporting roof means that the original walls of the building are unaffected. The new centre would be able to be used out of hours and be isolated from the rest of the buildings. The centre would not be visible from the road. The new floor would provide level access from outside to other areas of the building for wheelchair users. The proposed works have been designed to avoid alteration to the existing original features of the school. The entrance doors are only visible from the east side of the building.

The applicants also submitted an educational statement giving reasons for its requirements:

In support of our Planning/Listed Building application to enclose our courtyard to form a Communications Room we would ask you to take the following into consideration: Debden School is a thriving village school whose numbers have increased from 114 pupils in summer 2005 to currently 147 pupils. Our catchment area includes Debden, Debden Green and Carver Army Barracks. Approximately half of our pupils come from Carver Army Barracks. Debden School seeks to provide the very best learning opportunities for all its pupils. We are currently unable to meet all the requirements of the Every Child Matters Agenda and the new Primary Strategy with our current accommodation. We pride ourselves on being an inclusive school but feel that with the increase in our numbers we are now not able to fully meet all the needs of our pupils.

Area	DFES Guideline	School's Actual Accomodation
Reception Class	66sq m	54 sq m
Other Classrooms	50m 60 sq m	46,50,51,54 and 59sqm
Food/Science/D&T	24sq m	none
ICT Suite	38sq m	none
Library Recourse Centre	25sq m	12sq m (in corridor)
Group Rooms	12sq m	11sq m
	9sqm	10sqm
Total	614sq m	482sq m

The courtyard area is currently used as a walk through area from the main part of the school to the office and recourse area. By enclosing the courtyard, the area (60sq m) would be used in the following ways:

- Provide a dedicated library area where pupils can access information to support all areas of the curriculum. Our existing library is 12sq m and located in a corridor which is used to access the hall/reception class toilets/playground/two classrooms and the kitchen.
- Provide a dedicated Design Technology/Food Technology Area where pupils can participate in cooking and technology practical activities to support their learning in all areas of the curriculum. We have no designated area for Design/Food Technology and currently keep our portable cooker in our main corridor.
- Provide a dedicated ICT Area where pupils can use a range of ICT technology to develop their ICT skills and support and enhance their learning across the curriculum. Currently ICT technology is used in classrooms but space is prohibitive.
- Provide an area where groups including SEN and more able pupils can work and participate in practical activities to meet their individual education plans. The current group room is not large enough to accommodate groups of pupils participating in practical activities.
- Provide an area where the whole staff can meet for staff development and curriculum planning. Our current group areas are not big enough to accommodate all of our staff.
- Provide an area where the Governing Body can hold its Governing Body meetings and an area where the Governing Body can meet for Governor Development. Currently the group area used for Governing Body meetings and training is not large enough to accommodate the whole Governing Body.

**RELEVANT HISTORY:** Two new classrooms and hall – no objections (2000). Conversion of former school house- no objections (1993). Installation of relocatable classroom approved 2003. Change of use from school playing field to domestic garden land approved 2001. change of use from agricultural land to playground/playing field approved 2002.

**CONSULTATIONS:** Specialist Design Advice (Summary): I find the proposal unacceptable for the following reasons:

1. Infilling of the area between two historic wings would detract from the H form of the historical plan.
  2. The flat roof of the extension would be untraditional and unattractive and would diminish the special architectural and historical interest of the listed building. The blocking up of the window opening of the principal hall would call for additional roof lights in the rear slopes to the detriment of its visual qualities and the loss of some historical rafters.
  3. The design of the eastern entrance to the new communication centre would be specifically unattractive. The harsh brick piers and tall glazed double doors would be visually jarring with the graceful proportions of the historical openings and would form an awkward detail with the existing lean-to.
  4. In the long term it is also possible that the necessary flashing around the flat roof would lead to the deterioration of the historical fabric at the point of contact.
- I suggest refusal of this application.

**PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** No reply received. Expiry date 16<sup>th</sup> May 2007.

**REPRESENTATIONS:** These applications have been advertised and no representations have been received. Period expired 19<sup>th</sup> June 2006.

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS: The main issues are**

- 1) **Design, scale, impact on neighbours and whether the proposal would have an impact on character and setting of a listed building (ERSP Policy HC3 & ULP Policies ENV2, S1, GEN2);**

Policy ENV2 states that Development affecting a listed building should be in keeping with its scale, character and surroundings. Development proposals that adversely affect the setting and alterations that impair the special characteristics of a listed building will not be permitted.

PPG15 states that whilst the listing of a building should not be seen as a bar to all future change, the starting point for the exercise of listed building consent is the statutory requirement on local authorities to "have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses". The proposal is considered contrary to the aims of PPG15.

Whilst the need for the extra space is appreciated, the design of the proposal is considered to be detrimental to the special architectural and historic characteristics of the listed building and its setting and as such is contrary to policy ENV2. As stated by Specialist Design Advice, the infilling would detract from the H form of the historical plan. The flat roof of the extension would be untraditional and unattractive and would diminish the special architectural and historical interest of the listed building. The design of the eastern entrance to the new communication centre would be specifically unattractive. The harsh brick piers and tall glazed double doors would be visually jarring with the graceful proportions of the historical openings and would form an awkward detail with the existing lean-to and In the long term it is also possible that the necessary flashing around the flat roof would lead to the deterioration of the historical fabric at the point of contact.

The proposal would not cause any material overlooking or overshadowing and therefore would not cause any material impact on neighbours amenity.

Although, the site appears to be the most convenient and only suitable position for an additional room (other possible sites would result in a loss of playground, which is already



considered to be too small for the current number of pupils and these numbers are due to increase in September 2007) this does not outweigh the need to protect the special architectural and historical interest of the listed building and therefore the applications are recommended for refusal.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The proposals would be detrimental to the historic character and appearance of the listed building. The harm is not outweighed by the need for the extension.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**1) UTT/0819/07/FUL – REFUSAL REASONS**

The proposal is not compatible with the form, layout, appearance and materials of the surrounding listed buildings and is therefore contrary to ULP policy GEN2.

The design and siting of the proposal is considered to be detrimental to the special architectural and historic characteristics of the listed building and its setting and as such is contrary to policy ENV2 and PPG15

**2) UTT/0820/07/LB – REFUSAL REASONS**

The design and siting and materials of the proposal is considered to be detrimental to the special architectural and historic characteristics of the listed building and its setting and as such is contrary to policy ULP policy ENV2 and Government Planning Policy Guidance PPG15.

*Background papers: see application file.*

\*\*\*\*\*