

UTT/0950/07/FUL - THAXTED.....	2
UTT/1403/07/FUL - LITTLE CHESTERFORD.....	5
UTT/1347/07/FUL - TAKELEY	10
UTT/1536/07/FUL - STANSTED	14
UTT/0862/07/DFO - LITTLE DUNMOW	19
UTT/1342/07/DFO - LITTLE DUNMOW	23

UTT/0950/07/FUL - THAXTED

Construction of affordable rural housing and access road serving parking areas (alternative scheme to that approved under UTT/1259/06/FUL)

Location: Site at Newbiggen Street/Walden Road Adjacent to Clair Court. GR/TL 610-314

Applicant: Hastoe Housing Association

Agent: George F Johnson Associates

Case Officer: Miss K Benjafield 01799 510494

Expiry Date: 08/11/2007

Classification: MAJOR

NOTATION: Outside Development Limits.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is located adjacent to Clare Court on the northern edge of Thaxted, approximately 500m to the northwest of the centre of the village. It covers an area of 0.32ha and was until recently in agricultural use. The boundaries to Clare Court (south) and Newbiggen Street (east) consist of hedges and mature vegetation. To the north and west of the site there is no defined boundary to the site.

Opposite the site on the eastern side of Newbiggen St, terraced detached and semi-detached dwellings. To the south at Clare Court there is a detached property adjacent to the southwestern corner of the site and a single storey garage adjacent to the southeastern corner.

Construction works are currently underway within the site in connection with the previously approved scheme for this site.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: This application relates to a revised proposal for the erection of affordable rural housing comprising 10 houses and 2 flats, new vehicular and pedestrian access and change of use from agricultural land to residential.

The proposed revisions from the previous scheme relate primarily to the flats on Plots 8 & 9. Plot 8 has been increased in size to provide sufficient space for a second bedroom. This increase in single storey built form would allow the balcony to Plot 9 to be repositioned and slightly increased in size. The link between Plots 3 & 4 would also have a dormer window inserted to the rear elevation. It is also proposed to make minor alterations to the fenestration of some of the dwellings.

APPLICANT'S CASE including Design & Access statement:

The Site: The site lies to the north of Clare Court and the Newbiggen St / Walden Road, Thaxted. It has been identified as a suitable exception site for much needed affordable rural housing. This site faces existing housing and to the north and opposite is an area of open space including playing fields and basket ball, with a play area and a pavilion. The centre of Thaxted is accessible by a footpath from the site. The historic character of Thaxted is well known and the proposals are to reflect the vernacular of the existing cottages.

Character: The scheme comprises a mix of smaller dwellings, based on a traditional theme utilising simple shapes of vernacular proportions. A variety of dwelling types from 1 bedroom flats to 3 bedroom family houses are proposed. The village edge scheme proposes to continue the built form along the site frontage. In the two-storey dwellings a variation is achieved with steep roof pitches and the use of narrow gables fronting the street which provides visual interest.

Sustainability: The dwellings are designed to be traditional in appearance but built with modern methods of construction offering both quality and environmental benefits. The scheme will be the subject of a BRE Eco Homes Assessment where a rating of 'very good' will be required from assessment of energy use, transportation, pollution, materials, water, land use and ecology and health and well-being.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Erection of 10 houses and 2 flats, new vehicular and pedestrian access and change of use of agricultural land to residential conditionally approved January 2007.

CONSULTATIONS: Natural England: No objection.

ECC Highways: No objection subject to conditions.

Three Valleys Water: The proposal is located within a defined Source Protection Zone – the construction works and operation of the proposed development site should be done in accordance with the relevant British Standards and Best Management Practices thereby reducing the groundwater pollution risk. Copy of letter to be sent to applicant

Anglian Water: Recommends conditions regarding the disposal of foul and surface water.

Building Surveying: No comments. Accessibility Officer – standards apply to all dwellings as stated and not quote "where possible".

Essex Wildlife Trust: No objection.

Environment Agency: (due 30 August).

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: No objection.

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised and one representation has been received. Period expired 4 October.

Main points:

- Why was a new application required for what appear to be small amendments to the previous scheme?
- Application drawings for the previous application indicate the front boundary hedge to be retained – this has been removed. What steps are being taken in relation to this and in order to prevent further breaches of control?
- No drawings of the proposed foul or surface water drainage are included in the submission but the accompanying document specifies that surface water run off is to ditch or soakaways. Where are these located? It is also states that it is "assumed that flow from the site is restricted to 'green field' run off" How can this be assumed?
- The previous views and concerns of objectors to this proposal were ignored.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:

- The proposed amendments were too significant to be considered as minor amendments to the approved scheme and as none of the approved scheme had been built, a new application for the entire development is required.
- A condition of the previous approval required the front boundary hedge to be removed and a new hedge planted. This was following advice from the Council's Landscape Officer who advised that the original hedge was in a poor condition, had been poorly maintained and was not worthy of retention.
- Planning applications often do not contain information regarding drainage however the previous approval required details to be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and that condition is repeated for this proposal.
- All comments received relating to planning applications are fully considered and taken into account within the report. These reports are available to view both at the Council Offices and on the Council's website.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS including Design & Access statement:

The main issues are whether the proposed revisions to the approved scheme would constitute an acceptable form of development for this site. (ULP Policies S7, H11, GEN1, GEN2, GEN7, GEN8 & [SPD](#) – Accessible Homes and Playspace)

The principle of siting development for affordable housing on this site has been established by the approval of the previous application (ref. UTT/1259/06/FUL). This revised scheme has been submitted for consideration and would alter the mix of properties by providing one x 2-bedroom flat and one x 1-bedroom flat instead of the previously approved two x 1-bedroom flats. The revisions to Plot 8 would however maintain the overall mix of smaller units on the site and are proposed in order to accommodate a particular requirement for a local need.

The addition of a dormer window to the rear of the link between plots 3 & 4 would not result in any loss of amenity to neighbouring properties as it would overlook the agricultural land to the rear. The dormer window would also have an acceptable design.

The fenestration changes to the dwellings would result in minor alterations to the elevations and are considered to be acceptable. There would be no loss of amenity to the occupiers of any neighbouring properties as a result of the changes.

CONCLUSIONS: The principle of development on this site has previously been accepted and the revised proposal is also considered to comply with the requirements of all relevant Development Plan policies.

RECOMMENDATION: VARIATION OF S106 AGREEMENT RELATING TO MIX OF UNITS ON THE SITE AND 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.4.4. Retention of tree.
6. C.5.1. Samples of materials to be submitted agreed and implemented.
7. C.6.2. Excluding all rights of permitted development within the cartilage of a dwelling house without further permission.
8. C.7.1. Details of external ground and internal floor levels to be submitted agreed and implemented - buildings.
9. C.8.27. Drainage details to be submitted agreed and implemented.
10. The drainage details to be submitted in relation to condition C.8.27. shall incorporate a scheme of sustainable drainage.
REASON: To protect the surrounding countryside and prevent pollution of the water environment.
11. C.8.29. Details of sustainable construction required.
12. C.8.30. Provision of bin storage.
13. C.28.1. Implementation of accessibility scheme.
14. The proposed junction bellmouth with the county road B184 shall be provided with radius kerbs of 10.5m returned to an access width of 5.5m for the first 10m within the site.
REASON: In the interests of highway safety.
15. There shall be no obstruction above ground level within the area of 4.5m x 70m visibility splay and a 2.0m parallel band visibility splay across the entire site frontage.
REASON: In the interests of highway safety.
16. C.10.26. Prevention of run off from access.
17. C.10.19. Access gradient.
18. C.10.18. Unbound material/surface dressing and reason.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/1403/07/FUL - LITTLE CHESTERFORD

(Referred by Cllr Redfern)

(Reason: to assess the effect on the listed building)

Erection of salvaged barn for use as garage/store

Location: Little Chesterford Manor. GR/TL 514-417.

Applicant: Mr H Hughes

Agent: John Ready Architects

Case Officer: Mr T Morton 01799 510654

Expiry Date: 28/09/2007

Classification: MINOR

NOTATION: Outside Development Limit / setting of Listed Building.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The property consists of an important Listed dwelling and a courtyard arrangement of former farm barns which are not listed in their own right but benefit from 'curtilage listing' being in the grounds of the dwelling, and these are used as outbuildings to the dwelling. A tennis court stands to the north west of the group of barns. The property, and particularly the site of the proposed development, is open to view from public highways running on the west, north and east sides.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: This is a resubmission of a similar application made earlier this year and withdrawn before determination. The proposal is the erection of a barn for use as a garage store, using materials salvaged from a historic timber frame barn formerly erected in Kent.

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 barn is intended to accommodate 3 cars and a horse transporter and other equipment, enhancing the setting of the courtyard complex and screening the recently installed tennis court from the north-east. The C18th threshing barn was found in north Kent and is of a scale and character wholly in sympathy with the setting of Little Chesterford manor. Prior to its authorised removal in 1979 the barn stood in the curtilage of a Listed Building It will be clad in black feather edged boarding and reclaimed clay peg tiles. The classification of the site as 'open countryside' does not reflect the close adjacency of the existing courtyard complex. Historically there is evidence of a number of barns that stood on this current paddock.

RELEVANT HISTORY: UTT/1381/05/FUL – proposed tennis court pavilion. Approved 17 October 2005.

UTT/0642/07/FUL - Erection of a barn for use as a garage store, using materials salvaged from a historic timber frame barn formerly erected in Kent. Withdrawn.

CONSULTATIONS: English Heritage: Comments awaited

Conservation Officer: Little Chesterford Manor is a rare example of an early domestic building, originally an early C13 manor house (circa 1200) partly rebuilt and altered in the C14 and C16, listed grade I.

At one time The Manor was supported by a substantial farmstead with numerous farm buildings most of which have been lost. The cartographic evidence indicate that as recently as 1930's large group consisting of impressive six bay barn a smaller three bay barn and a selection of 5 other farm buildings existed to the north of the Manor in the parcel of land called Hunt's Piece and further to north west.

The proposal subject of this application is to erect a modest barn in the North West corner of the Hunt's Piece to be used as utilitarian storage to the Manor.

The new building would be a timber framed structure (historic building relocated from elsewhere) under a hand made plain clay tiled roof. In terms of design the building due to its traditional form, detailing and materials would not diminish the setting of the listed building and the character of the locality. Its location to the side of the existing outbuildings would in this instance, be in the spirit of the historical farmstead which has been lost some time in the C20.

In conclusion and should there be no planning objections I suggest approval subject to the following conditions.

All weather boarding to be black painted timber feather edge.

All external joinery to be black painted timber.

All roofs to be hand made plain tiles to LA approval.

The Garden History Society: No comments.

Council Drainage Engineer: If approved condition C.29.1 should be applied to require flood risk management measures to be implemented.

Essex County Council archaeological advice: The Essex Historic Environment Record shows that the proposed site lies within an area associated with the 13th century Church and Hall complex. The groundworks for the erection of the barn will be located close to earthworks possibly related to the former extent of the medieval village. In addition, Roman and prehistoric finds have been made in the vicinity, including Neolithic flints. There is a high probability that archaeological deposits of a medieval date will survive beneath the proposed development, and it is possible that prehistoric and Roman remains may also be present. Due to the groundworks required for the erection of the barn it is recommended, following the guidance within PPG 16 that a full archaeological condition be attached to any planning consent.

The following recommendations are in line with DoE Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning (PPG16).

RECOMMENDATION: Archaeological monitoring followed by excavation

"No development, or preliminary groundworks, of any kind shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work and recording in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant, and approved by the planning authority."

Environment Agency observation submitted on the earlier application UTT/0642/07/FUL

The application, as submitted, does not sufficiently consider pollution control. We therefore recommend that a condition is imposed to cover this aspect.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: Consultation period expired 2 September 2007

The PC has no objections to this application in principle. Concerned about potential for business use, no objection to use of new hand made tiles, concerned about fire safety and emergency assess.

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised and four representations have been received. Period expired 5 September 2007.

All respondents see the collection of equipment that is currently stored in the open as unsightly and think that the erection of a barn to contain the equipment would be preferable. One respondent would object to the introduction of any external lighting.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The comments are noted and the issues discussed below. The installation of outside lights in residential property does not require planning permission, and thus could not be controlled by condition.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS including Design & Access statement:
The main issues are

- 1) **Principle of Development PPS 7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Area & ULP Policy S7);**
- 2) **Listed Buildings issues PPS 15 (Planning and the Historic Environment & ULP Policy ENV2);**
- 3) **Development and flood risk PPS 25 (Development and Flood Risk & ULP Policy GEN3) and**
- 4) **Other material planning considerations.**

1) Development outside of settlements with a designated Development Limit is described as development in the open countryside. Little Chesterford does not have a Development Limit, and therefore all proposals have to be assessed against the relevant countryside protection policies. The principal aim of those policies is to protect the countryside for its own sake, and for its appearance, and to restrict new development to that required for agriculture or other necessary rural purposes.

PPS 7 states:

Sustainable development is the core principle underpinning land use planning. The following key principles should be applied in combination with all the policies set out in this PPS:

(i) Decisions on development proposals should be based on sustainable development principles, ensuring an integrated approach to the consideration of:

- social inclusion, recognising the needs of everyone;
- effective protection and enhancement of the environment;
- prudent use of natural resources; and
- maintaining high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

The approach to planning for sustainable development is set out in more detail in Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1).

(ii) Good quality, carefully-sited accessible development within existing towns and villages should be allowed where it benefits the local economy and/or community (e.g. affordable housing for identified local needs); maintains or enhances the local environment; and does not conflict with other planning policies.

(iii) Accessibility should be a key consideration in all development decisions. Most developments which are likely to generate large numbers of trips should be located in or next to towns or other service centres that are accessible by public transport, walking and cycling, in line with the policies set out in PPG13, *Transport*. Decisions on the location of other developments in rural areas should, where possible, give people the greatest opportunity to access them by public transport, walking and cycling, consistent with achieving the primary purpose of the development.

(iv) New building development in the open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans, should be strictly controlled; the Government's overall aim is to protect the countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the

wealth of its natural resources and so it may be enjoyed by all.

(v) Priority should be given to the re-use of previously-developed ('brownfield') sites in preference to the development of greenfield sites, except in cases where there are no brownfield sites available, or these brownfield sites perform so poorly in terms of sustainability considerations (for example, in their remoteness from settlements and services) in comparison with greenfield sites.

Policy S7 – The Countryside states:

"The countryside to which this policy applies is defined as all those parts of the Plan area beyond the Green Belt that are not within the settlement or other site boundaries. In the countryside, which will be protected for its own sake, planning permission will only be given for development that needs to take place there, or is appropriate to a rural area. This will include infilling in accordance with paragraph 6.13 of the Housing Chapter of the Plan. There will be strict control on new building. Development will only be permitted if its appearance 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".

Whilst it is accepted that properties already exist in the countryside and it is necessary to accept some degree of change to meet changing needs, the scale of this has to be carefully considered. Small extensions to existing dwellings may be acceptable, and some small outbuildings may be acceptable, but if the impact of a proposed development upon the countryside is significant then it may not be acceptable in policy terms.

This proposal has to be viewed as the erection of a new residential outbuilding in the open countryside. The nature of the materials to be used is not of relevance to these considerations, and the use of an old reclaimed timber frame as the skeleton of the building gains no extra support from policy. The issue to be considered is the impact of this new building on the countryside.

The existing house and its barn outbuildings form a group with a defined edge, and with an open grass paddock beyond this on the north side. It is considered that the barn would intrude into the countryside beyond the existing buildings, and would be very apparent from the nearby public highways and from houses that face onto the highway on the east side of the paddock. It should be noted however that even in cases where a new building cannot be seen by the public it can still be judged as harmful to the countryside.

It may be argued that the erection of this outbuilding would enhance the setting of the listed building.

The quality or authenticity of the external materials however carries little weight, and the applicant's judgement that another barn would enhance the group of buildings does not over-ride the intent of policy to restrict new buildings in the countryside. Likewise the needs of the applicant to accommodate vehicles and so forth, carries no weight in these considerations.

The tennis courts are essentially 'see-through' in nature and do not intrude into views across the site, nor have a materially adverse impact upon the countryside. It is therefore considered that the need to screen them as advanced in support by the applicant carries little weight, particularly where the impact of the screen (the proposed barn itself) would be greater than the tennis courts.

A further argument advanced in support of the barn is to remove parked vehicles from view, however it is noted that a hardened area is proposed outside the barn, and there would be

no means of preventing vehicles being parked there in full view from the highway and nearby houses. The existing vehicles are not permanent fixtures and have a materially different and lesser impact upon the countryside than a permanent and large barn would have.

The proposed new building is considered to have an unacceptable and visually intrusive impact upon the countryside.

2) The dwelling house is a Listed building, and the barn outbuildings are considered to be curtilage Listed.

The Conservation Officer has raised no objection to this proposal as it is in the spirit of the outbuildings that formerly stood north of the farmstead.

It should be noted however that planning policies for development in the countryside do not recognise the principle of erecting a building that might be in the spirit of former buildings now long removed from a site. While members may wish to give weight to the re-erection of as "imported" historic building, in terms of planning policy there is no justification unless it can be demonstrated that the setting of the listed building would be enhanced. It is not evident, from the information presently available, that this is the case.

3) The Environment Agency comments are noted, and whilst there are issues of concern if the building were to be considered otherwise acceptable it would be possible to address these issues through conditions. However as set out above there are issues of planning policy that oppose this development in principle.

4) No other issues are considered to arise.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposal is considered contrary to planning policy to protect the countryside from inappropriate development.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS

The proposed outbuilding, by way of its position, scale, height and design, would result in the introduction of a substantial and excessive amount of additional built form at this site. This would be visually intrusive in the countryside and harmful to the rural and spacious character of the immediate locality, lending it a more built up and residential character. The development would tend to extend the scale and extent of domestic clutter associated with residential use of the property further into the countryside. As such, the development would be contrary to policies H8, S7 and S8 of the Adopted Local Plan.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/1347/07/FUL - TAKELEY

Erection of detached office building for B1a (office) use with associated car parking

Location: Land adjacent Skyway House Parsonage Road. GR/TL 560-217

Applicant: Habendum Ltd

Agent: Garry Trim Architectural Design

Case Officer: Miss K Benjafield 01799 510494

Expiry Date: 22/10/2007

Classification: MAJOR

NOTATION: Within Development Limits and Takeley Local Policy 5 (Safeguarding of existing Employment Area).

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site covers an area of 0.2ha and is located on the northern edge of Takeley village. It currently forms an unused/under used car park to the rear of Skyway House, a two-storey, flat-roofed, office building fronting Parsonage Road. To the north are pairs of semi-detached dwellings and to the south is Weston House, another office building. To the east is agricultural land and to the west on the opposite side of Parsonage Road are residential properties. The site boundaries are currently formed by mature vegetation to the north, post and wire fencing with some vegetation to the west and post and wire fencing to the south where the site adjoins the car parking area for Weston House. Access to the site is via Parsonage Road and past the existing offices within Skyway House.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: This application relates to the erection of a detached office building. The building would be located to the rear of Skyway House and would be a two-storey, flat-roofed structure similar in design and appearance as the existing building to the front of the site. It would have a maximum height of 7.1m and would cover an area of 630m².

The building would provide approximately 1080m² of office and associated ancillary space over two floors and would have a total floor area of approximately 1180m²; 36 parking spaces would be provided within the site, with an additional 2 disabled parking spaces to the front of the building. In addition, 9 visitor and 19 space cycle parking spaces and 4 motorcycle spaces would be provided within the site.

APPLICANT'S CASE including Design & Access statement: See letter dated 16 August in addition to summary of Design and Access statement below (full statement is available to view at the Council Offices):

The site: The site is set back behind an existing office development, Skyway House and currently forms part of the car park serving that building. Vehicular access is from Parsonage Road via a barrier controlled site entrance that serves Skyway House. Parsonage Road has a mix of residential and commercial development. The site for the proposed offices adjoins Skyway House and the site access to the west and a modern commercial development to the south. East of the site is Countryside Protection Zone (CPZ) and this wraps around part of the northern boundary with the remainder of that boundary abutting a strip of undeveloped land beyond which are some residential units. The northern boundary has a natural hedgerow growing along a ditch line and it is intended that this will remain with only minor pruning if required. The land on which the site is located has a fall from north to south averaging approximately 0.5m but sits 0.75m-1.2m lower than the adjoining CPZ. Takeley is identified as a 'key rural settlement' in the written statement of the Uttlesford Local Plan and the application site is located within the 0.1ha zone indicated on the proposals map as a 'key employment area' and the subject of Local Policy 5.

Design of the Proposed Development: The development proposed is 'new detached office building with associated car parking'. Skyway House is owned by the applicant and currently has an over provision of car parking relative to its floor area. By reducing car parking allocation for the existing building to an acceptable level, part of the car park becomes available for the proposed development. The location of the proposed offices within the allocated site was chosen to provide an aspect towards Parsonage Road that displays the entrance to the building whilst allowing most of its associated car parking to be screened from view of the passer by. It is suitably separated from the residential units to the north and by virtue of the difference in site levels, it will not impose upon the landscape when viewed from across the CPZ. Some naturally growing trees and bushes exist along the boundary in the neighbouring land and they assist in softening the edge of the developed area.

The parking standard applied to the development is in accordance with Appendix 1 of the ULP of one space per 35m² of floor area. This amounts to 36 spaces to which two additional spaces have been specifically designed for use by the disabled and located adjacent to the building entrance. Covered parking for bicycles and powered two wheeled vehicles is included in the scheme in addition to 9 uncovered visitor cycle spaces adjacent to the entrance of the building.

Externally the elevational treatment of the proposed building has been designed to be in keeping with Skyway House and comprises a rainscreen cladding panel system punctuated with ribbon windows glazed with tinted glass. The corner wrap around windows accentuate the horizontal and this is counter balanced on the front elevation by the verticality of the projecting main entrance.

It is intended that the new offices should relate to Skyway House and so the cladding panels are silver grey although the panel joint would be subtle on the chosen cladding system by comparison with the existing building. Doors and window frames would be powder coated aluminium in a dark colour in contrast to the panels and the brise soleil would also match these elements.

Access: Pedestrian and vehicular access is gained directly from Parsonage Road. The existing bellmouth radii, sight lines and access are ample to cope with the aggregate number of vehicle movements generated by both the existing and proposed buildings.

The site is conveniently located for access by bus from Braintree, Felsted, Great Dunmow, Bishop's Stortford, Chelmsford, Saffron Walden and Stansted Mountfitchet as the 133, 33 and village link services all run through Takeley. The proximity to the airport also makes access by train a possibility in association with the 133 bus service which runs from the airport along Parsonage Road.

Conclusion: The scheme has been designed with due regard for the environment and neighbouring properties and will harmonise with Skyway House and the commercial building next door to maintain the high standard that have been set by these developments.

It is well served by public transport with a catchment area of twenty miles radius by bus and further by train and bus from Stansted Airport. Also, all relevant facilities have been provided for travel by bicycle or powered two wheeler.

The development is compatible with the designation of the site in the Local Plan and fully accords with its policies. It puts the land to better use than the current oversize car park and provides the opportunity for more employment in the area which can benefit the local economy.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Various applications relating to former factory use of the site in 1980's. Erection of new factory, ancillary offices and construction of new access conditionally approved 1987. Residential development refused 2000. Variation of condition to allow office use unconditionally approved 2001.

CONSULTATIONS: Environmental Services: No concerns.

Natural England: Objects due to insufficient survey information regarding whether the development would have an adverse effect on legally protected species.

Thames Water: No objection.

Environment Agency: This proposal falls within the scope of the EA's Flood Risk Standing Advice which indicates that Sustainable Drainage methods should be used.

Essex Wildlife Trust: No objection.

Building Control: No adverse comments.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: No objections subject to:

- Planting of mature trees/established planting along northern boundary to provide screening for residential properties.
- The PC accepts that this proposal sits within the existing boundary of Skyway House however this development should not set a precedent for further commercial / industrial development in Parsonage Road. This is predominantly a residential area and further development will compromise the rural nature of the locality.

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised and 1 representation has been received. Period expired 21 September.

"I do not think there are enough car parking spaces for an office of that size. We have problems in Parsonage Road at present with office worker parking in roads and lay-bys."

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: See planning considerations.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS including Design & Access statement:

The main issues are whether the proposal would comply with policies regarding:

- 1) **The principle of development and safeguarded employment land (ULP Policies S3, E2 and Takeley Local Policy 5);**
- 2) **Design (ULP Policy GEN2);**
- 3) **Vehicle parking standards (ULP Policy GEN8) and**
- 4) **Other material planning considerations.**

1) The site is located within the development limits for Takeley and is allocated as a key employment area within ULP Takeley Local Policy 5. Therefore the principle of the development of this site for employment purposes is acceptable subject to the proposal complying with all other relevant Development Plan policies.

2) ULP Policy GEN2 requires development to be compatible with the scale, form, layout, appearance and materials of surrounding buildings. The proposed building has been designed to replicate the form, materials and appearance of the existing building, Skyway House, to the west. The proposal would also result in a more modest building than Weston House which is located on the adjacent site to the south. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be compatible with the existing office buildings to the west and south of the site.

The location of the proposed building in relation to the residential properties to the north is considered to be distant enough to prevent it being materially overbearing on occupiers of those properties. There would be the potential for overlooking of the closest dwellings to the site from parts of the first floor of the building. This could be prevented by the installation of

obscure glazing to the wrap-around window to the north-western corner of the building and the adjacent window in the northern elevation. Therefore, subject to the imposition of a condition regarding obscure glazing, it is considered that the proposal would comply with the requirements of ULP Policy GEN2.

3) ULP Policy GEN8 specifies that development will not be permitted if the number, design and layout of vehicle parking places proposed are not appropriate for the location. Skyway House currently has parking provision for 95 vehicle parking spaces but has a similar floor area as the proposed building. At the time of the Officer's site visit, the majority of the existing parking provision was unused. The proposed building would require the provision of 31 parking spaces for the proposed B1 use and it is considered appropriate that a similar amount of provision should remain for the existing use office use within Skyway House. The submitted plans indicate that the existing parking provision to the front of Skyway House would remain and the overall provision for that building would amount to approximately 33 parking spaces. The plans also indicate that 36 parking spaces would be provided for the proposed building and therefore it is considered that sufficient parking provision would remain on the site to accommodate both Skyway House and the proposed office building. The Design and Access statement refers to the availability of alternative means of transport to and from the site and it is considered appropriate that a condition is imposed requiring a travel plan to be submitted and approved in order to ensure that the proposed development makes provision for sustainable means of transport and also avoids a situation where the existing parking problems along Parsonage Road, referred to in the local resident's letter, is exacerbated.

4) Natural England has objected to the application on the basis of insufficient information having been provided with the application to demonstrate that there are no protected species present within the site. The agent for the application has contacted Natural England to explain that the site is currently a tarmac car park. In light of the current use of the site, it is considered unlikely that any protected species would be present however it is proposed to impose a condition requiring work to cease on the site and a licence obtained from Natural England, in the event that any protected species is found.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposal would comply with all relevant Development Plan policies subject to the imposition of conditions.

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.7.1. Details of external ground and internal flood levels to be submitted agreed and implemented – extension.
6. C.8.22. Control of lighting.
7. C.8.27A Surface water disposal arrangements.
6. C.8.29. Details of measures providing energy and water efficiency and sustainable power and drainage for new residential or commercial development.
7. C.10.23. Travel plan.
8. C.19.1. Avoidance of overlooking – 1.
9. C.20.3. If Protected Species discovered get licence from Natural England.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/1536/07/FUL - STANSTED
(Referred by Cllr Councillor Sell)

Change of use of former agricultural barn to office use. Change of use of farmyard to car park

Location: Building adjacent to No's 49 & 53 Bentfield Causeway. GR/TL 505-253.
Applicant: Liz Lake Associates Ltd
Agent: Liz Lake Associates Ltd
Case Officer: Mr T Morton 01799 510654
Expiry Date: 19/10/2007
Classification: OTHER

NOTATION: Outside Development Limit / Metropolitan Green Belt.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The application site consists of a dilapidated brick and flint barn and attached stables and lean-to, together with a former farmyard. The site is set just outside of the Development Limit and within the Green Belt. The building is bounded on its north side by a trackway about four metres wide which is also a public right of way footpath, and this would serve as vehicle access to the proposed car parking area on the farmyard. To the east side of the barn is an open area that provides car parking space and garden for residential premises at 47 & 49 Bentfield Causeway which are Listed Buildings.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: Repair and Conversion of the barn involving change of use to offices, with construction of a car park on the farmyard area across the trackway.

APPLICANT'S CASE including Design & Access statement: A D&A statement and Transport statement have been submitted with the application. The full statements are available on file.

The proposal is amended from the previous version to omit the contentious use of a grassed field to provide the car parking for the development.

The proposal will provide a new office for a company based in Stansted who are landscape architects and urban designers and who need to expand.

Support is quoted from PPS 7 for the re-use of existing buildings, and that Planning Authorities should be particularly supportive of the re-use of buildings that are adjacent to or closely related to country towns and villages for economic purposes. PPG2 Green Belts sets out criteria for re-use of buildings, that re-use of buildings should not prejudice the openness of the green belt (since the buildings are already there), and can help to diversify farm enterprises. The applicant contends that the car park does not conflict with the openness of the green belt because landscape planting will enclose it. The Structural report submitted with the application concludes that the building can be converted without major reconstruction, and the form and general design will be in keeping with the surroundings. The requirements of Policy C2 and RE2 of the Essex & Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan will be met, as will policy E4 and E5 of the Uttlesford Local Plan. The proposal would have no detrimental effect on nearby listed buildings. The building is described as sound, and some repairs have been carried out to it since the previous application. The conversion is based upon remedial repair, new entrance on the west side partly by cutting into the roof, a new gallery is inserted internally, an obscured glazed screen replaces the timber barn doors on the east side. New windows and enlarged existing windows are proposed for natural lighting. The new car parking entrance area is heavily landscaped to provide a transition from countryside to village.

An ecological survey has been carried out, looking especially at Bats. This is dated 13th October 2005, and concludes that no bats were found to be present in the buildings but it is probable that bats in nearby roosts will forage in the garden and paddock to the west of the property. It was concluded that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the local bat population. The assessment also looked at the possible use of the site by amphibians and concludes that it is unlikely to be so used. There is no evidence of badgers in the vicinity. The proposal provides potential to increase the nature conservation benefit of the site by native tree and hedge planting and creation of a void under the building ridge with access for bats and provision of bird nesting boxes on the building.

A transport assessment has been provided. This describes the local geography and states that bus routes 306 (single daily trip) and Village Link 7 (hourly service) stop within close proximity to the site. Other routes follow Cambridge Road about 500m away. The site is within a residential area and is accessible by modes other than the car. Of the existing 14 employees four are local and walk to work. Others presumably come by car, but this is not stated. Of the proposed 20 staff six are expected to come by non car modes, with 10 staff movements by car accessing the site in the morning, and 32 movements over the typical day. The proposed parking provision is slightly above adopted standards to meet the occupiers' expected needs. It is accepted that Stansted does not have the level of alternative modes of transport that would be available in town centre position. The track will be re-surfaced and sightlines at the highway junction are good. The proposal will have a negligible impact on the highway network.

A landscape and visual impact assessment has been provided which considers visual amenity residential amenity, effect on listed buildings effects on nature conservation and planning designations. This is lengthy and seeks to justify the development but accepts that approx 840 sq.m. of grazed paddock would be lost and replaced by approx 400 sq m of hard surfacing and 440 sq m of amenity grass and planting. There would be clear views of the proposal from the public footpath. The windows in the eastern elevation of the barn will be obscure glazed to protect residential amenity, with a 1.8m high fence erected on the boundary. The proposal would have no adverse effect on the setting of the listed buildings at 47 & 49.

RELEVANT HISTORY: UTT/1986/06/FUL - Repair and Conversion of the barn involving change of use to offices, with construction of a car park on part of the field to the west side of the building, with vehicle access from the adjacent trackway. Refused 29 January 2007.

CONSULTATIONS: Thames Water: We recommend that petrol / oil inceptors be fitted in all car parking areas. There are public sewers crossing the site and no building works will be permitted within 3 metres of the sewers without Thames Water approval.

Council Engineer: Condition C.8 27B should be applied to ensure all surface water drains to soakaways unless an alternative is agreed.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: Consultation period expired 27 September 2007.

The PC comments that it is concerned about the principle of establishing a car park in the green belt. We seek decision by committee for the decision on this principle. We are also concerned about the effect of cars upon the public right of way that goes through the site and the safety of pedestrians.

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised and no representations have been received. Period expires 18 October 2007. Any comments received will be reported at the meeting of the Committee.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS including Design & Access statement:

The main issues are

- 1) Green Belt policy (PPG2, PPS7 ULP Policy S6);**
- 2) Conversion of redundant rural buildings (ULP Policy E5);**
- 3) Landscape character (ULP Policy ENV8);**
- 4) Traffic and pedestrian issues (ULP Policies GEN1 and GEN8);**
- 5) Biodiversity issues (ULP Policy GEN7);**
- 6) Amenity of adjacent residential premises (ULP Policy GEN2);**
- 7) Setting of Listed Buildings (ULP Policy ENV2) and**
- 8) Other material planning considerations.**

1) The building lies within the Green Belt, where Policy sets a general presumption against inappropriate development. PPG2 Green Belts explains the purpose of policy is; To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
To prevent neighbouring towns from merging
To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
And to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of urban land.

PPG 2 sets a general presumption against inappropriate development and sets out specific categories of exception to this which includes the re-use of buildings.

Part of the proposal involves the formation of a small new pedestrian footpath to the new entrance to the office conversion upon currently open agricultural land. However, these works would be quite minor in nature and would not have a marked impact upon the openness of the green belt, and are therefore considered to be acceptable under Green Belt Policy.

PPG 2 states:

"The re-use of buildings inside a Green Belt is not inappropriate development providing:

- (a) it does not have a materially greater impact than the present use on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it;
- (b) strict control is exercised over the extension of re-used buildings, and over any associated uses of land surrounding the building which might conflict with the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it (eg because they involve extensive external storage, or extensive hardstanding, car parking, boundary walling or fencing);
- (c) the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction, and are capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction; and
- (d) the form, bulk and general design of the buildings are in keeping with their surroundings. (Conversion proposals may be more acceptable if they respect local building styles and materials, though the use of equivalent natural materials that are not local should not be ruled out).

Policy E5 of the Uttlesford Local Plan allows for;

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).

The applicants describe the building in their submission based upon a consultants report as being a robust structure of brickwork all in good sound condition with no major defects, with some minor fractures in the walls that can be stitched, and with the masonry walls able to support the mezzanine. The adjoining stable section is described and it is stated that some replacement of timbers would be required. The south west section is a lean-to structure with distorted wall and failing roof with western flint wall in poor condition needing remedial work. Some repairs have been carried out to the building during recent months to remedy some of these defects.

It is considered that in principle a small scale use of this redundant building in the Green Belt could be acceptable in policy terms.

3) The proposal involves a car park for the proposed office use formed on the former farmyard area between existing buildings. Whilst this is strictly located in the Green Belt, it does not extend beyond the general edge of development defined by the surrounding buildings and is considered not to impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. There will be some enhancement by new landscape planting associated with this to generally improve the character of this corner of Stansted.

4) There are some concerns about the proposed access, along a narrow track, which is also a public right of way. Policy GEN1 of the Uttlesford Local Plan requires that the design of the site should not compromise road safety and must take into account the needs of cyclists, pedestrians etc. The vehicle access is already used by one adjoining house, and formerly served the farmyard when it would have had farm traffic using it. The level of vehicle flows into this essentially traffic free footpath is predicted to be low, and by the very nature of the site the speeds of vehicles would be slow, and their presence would be very obvious to pedestrians. Shared use roadways are of course accepted for example in the layout of new housing estates, and provided that vehicle speeds are low this is a satisfactory arrangement. On this basis the shared use is not considered to be problematic.

The parking standards indicate that about 6 parking spaces would be required for a unit of this size, whereas 8 spaces are proposed two of which are to disability standard, and a cycle parking area is also provided.

5) The Design and Access Statement contains Appendix F which is an ecological appraisal and bat survey. This concludes that the development would have no adverse impact upon the protected species, and in particular the barn is not used by bats.

The development can make gains for wildlife by providing native species for the hedge, by planning the creation of a void under the building's ridge for potential use by bats, and by the provision of bird nesting boxes or bricks on the building.

These are good ideas that would need to be secured by condition.

6) The potential negative effects of the proposals upon the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent houses, would be the introduction of additional traffic movements in close proximity to their houses with consequent noise and disturbance and headlights at night, effect upon their access to and enjoyment of their garden space and any disturbance which may arise, and the presence of a large glazed opening in the existing doorway of the barn.

However, this is a B1 office use that can take place in a residential area without detriment to amenity, and a condition restricting operating hours would overcome any potential for disturbance at unsocial hours.

The glazed opening in the barn is to be obscure glazed, and it is also proposed to provide an 'architectural screen' to a height of 1800mm inside the window, but details of this are not provided. These can be secured by condition.

7) The setting of the Listed Buildings at 47 and 49, and 53 Bentfield Causeway has to be considered. The applicant contends that repair of the former barn building will prevent it falling into dilapidation, and thus would improve the setting for the other Listed Buildings. On balance the overall impact of the development is considered neutral.

8) No other issues are considered to arise.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposal is considered to be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION: SUBJECT TO NO FURTHER OBJECTIONS BEING RECEIVED THIS APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND FOR 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.8.29. Energy Efficiency.
5. C.8.27B Soakaways.
6. C.25.1. Ban on airport related parking.
7. Details of features to make gains for wildlife by providing native species in the hedge planting, by planning the creation of a void under the building's ridge for potential use by bats, and by the provision of bird nesting boxes or bricks on the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before commencement of development and shall be implemented before occupation of the development hereby approved.
REASON: To enhance the value of the site for wildlife.
8. The glazed opening in the barn shall be obscure glazed with glass of obscuration level 4 or 5 and shall be so maintained thereafter, and an 'architectural screen' to a height of 1800mm shall be provided inside the window and shall be so maintained thereafter.
REASON: In the interest of the amenity of adjacent residential occupiers.
9. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
10. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
11. C.6.1. Excluding future changes of use without further permission.
12. C.8.15. Restriction of hours of operation.
13. The use hereby permitted shall only operate between the hours of 8.00am to 6pm Mondays-Friday; 8.30am to 1pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank and Public Holidays.
REASON: In the interests of the amenity of the occupiers of nearby residential properties.
14. C.8.22. Control of lighting.
15. C.8.30. Provision of bin storage.
16. C.9.1. No outdoor storage.
17. C.10.10. Details of parking and surface materials.
18. C.10.17. No occupation until spaces laid out.
19. C.10.20. Tree in the highway.
20. C.10.23. Travel plan.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0862/07/DFO - LITTLE DUNMOW

Details following outline application allowed under appeal reference APP/C1570/96/273656 for erection of a multi-purpose community hall

Location: Oakwood Park. GR/TL 666-204.

Applicant: Enodis Plc & Enodis Property D

Agent: G I Hearn Ltd

Case Officer: Mr M Ovenden 01799 510476

Expiry Date: 03/08/2007

Classification: MINOR

NOTATION: Within area subject to Oakwood Park Local Policy 1.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site has an area of 0.24 hectares and is situated towards the southern edge of the proposed built up area of the Oakwood Park development. Land to the north is allocated for housing, although no detailed scheme has been submitted; to the east the approved Masterplan shows there to be playing fields; to the south is shown to be landscaping leading to the proposed Nature Reserve. Essex County Council has planning permission to erect a Primary school on land to the west and it is understood that this will open in September 2008.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: The application relates to the submission of reserved matters details for the erection of a community hall, car park and play area, following the overall outline permission for the Oakwood park site.

APPLICANT'S CASE: See copy of section 9.0 conclusions and letter dated 08 October 2007 attached at the end of this report.

RELEVANT HISTORY: The original outline permission (UTT/0302/96/OP) related to the reclamation of despoiled land and the demolition of redundant structures and redevelopment for residential purposes with associated local shopping, employment, school and recreational facilities; open space, highway, engineering and landscaping works. This was granted permission in 1998 by the Secretary of State and was subject to a Planning Obligation (S106) drafted by the applicant.

This permission left details of the siting, design and external appearance of the buildings, means of access thereto and the landscaping of the site for further approval.

Planning conditions dealt with the following issues:

Condition	Comments
1-4 Submission and approval of reserved matters	This application forms part of this submission
5 Requirement for compliance with Masterplan	See body of this report
6 Requirement for details of land reclamation	Dealt with under previous submission
7-10 Requirements for landscaping scheme, management, control over loss of trees	This submission includes indicative planting information rather than the details required by condition 7. The details will have to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement.
11 Protection of Nature Reserve (south of Stebbing Brook).	Dealt with under previous/separate submission

12 Restriction on development prior to opening of new A120	The new A120 is open
13 Control over hours of deliveries and work	The development is bound by these hours
14 Noise protection	Dealt with under previous submission
15-16 Archaeology	Dealt with under previous submission
17-18 Drainage details	Dealt with under previous submission

The site was included within the area of land subject to the application for 162 further dwellings, refused by the authority in 2006, dismissed at appeal by the Secretary of state in May 2007 and currently subject to a High Court Challenge.

CONSULTATIONS: County Highways: No objections subject to conditions.
Environment Agency: Request information concerning potential land contamination.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: Little Dunmow PC: A community hall for Oakwood Park is of paramount importance to the local community; however the current design is not acceptable. Parish Council object:

- Externally, it is not in keeping with the Essex Design and does not resemble a traditional Essex barn; it looks more like a warehouse on an industrial unit. The oak and larch cladding is not visually pleasing, with large unbroken expanses of the same finish which may lead to long term high maintenance costs in the future. The main hall roof should be tiled so that it is in-keeping with residential houses.
- The single storey flat roof extension is unsightly, will lead to ongoing maintenance costs and could easily be accessed by youths. To comply with Essex Design Guide, a pitched roof should be installed which would also allow for additional storage space.
- There is not enough natural light due to lack of windows in the main hall, more high level windows that can be opened for ventilation should be considered. Interior lighting in the main hall would be more suitable as up-lighters rather than overhead lighting. The walls should be block built, which will be easier to maintain than plaster.

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised and 3 representations have been received. Period expired 12.7.07.

Oakwood Park Residents association: Distinct lack of windows. Its external appearance is reminiscent of a warehouse. To have a logo on all the windows seems excessive. Has a very unwelcoming entrance. It looks nothing like a barn conversion. Excessive amounts of cycle spaces. Out of proportion with the low level buildings of the neighbouring school and would dwarf the school. Large ongoing maintenance costs with the wooden cladding on the outside of the building. It clashes with the rest of the development which has been done in a pastiche style. The very large car park needs breaking up with some landscaping.
Other: More like an industrial unit. The cladding is not visually pleasing, will lead to long term high maintenance costs. The main hall roof should be tiled to be in-keeping with the residential houses.

COMMENTS ON CONSULTATION REPLIES AND REPRESENTATIONS:

County Highways: The requested conditions are proposed to be attached as conditions.
Environment Agency: The issue of land contamination is subject to a condition on the outline permission (noted by the Agency).
The design related comments of the Parish Council and residents are noted and covered in the main body of this report.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS: The main issues are:

- 1) Whether the proposal complies with the requirements of the outline permission, its S106 Agreement, the approved Masterplan and ULP Policy Oakwood Park Local Policy 1 and**
- 2) Whether the design and parking arrangements are acceptable (ULP Policies GEN2 and GEN8) and the Oakwood Park Design Guide.**

1) The outline permission requires the provision of the community hall as part of the facilities relating to the overall development. Appendix A of the associated S106 specifies the detailed requirements for the hall as reproduced below:

Gross internal floor area	500 square metres
Internal height	A minimum of 7.6 metres for a badminton court (to accord with Badminton Association of England recommendations)
Proposed external finish	Brick faced walls with tile roofing
Accommodation	Multi purpose accommodation to provide for sports and general cultural uses including: badminton, drama, playgroup, male/female toilets and changing facilities, a bar/kitchen area, storage area and a meeting room
Approximate construction costs (at February 1998 prices)	£313,000

The proposal complies with the requirements relating to floor area, internal height and accommodation. The proposal involves the use of materials which differ from the specification given in the S106 agreement (the drawings show the building to be clad with Larch boarding on the ground floor with Oak at a higher level and Cedar shingles on the roof) and therefore would require an amendment to the S106/Obligation if the submitted details are accepted. Further information has been sought concerning the construction cost of the proposed building and of maintenance of the proposed exterior materials.

The local plan and the outline permission require the development to be carried out in accordance with the Masterplan. The approved Masterplan dates from June 2004 and shows the hall to be located on this parcel of land. A further Masterplan was submitted in connection with the unsuccessful proposal to erect a further 162 dwellings. Originally this later (non approved) proposed Masterplan showed the community hall to be elsewhere, however during the appeal the proposed Masterplan was amended so that the hall's site reverted back to that shown in the approved Masterplan, i.e. in the location shown in this application, albeit with the parking to the south and hall to the north on this parcel of land in contrast to the opposite situation now proposed in the application. Consequently whatever the outcome of the High Court challenge to the appeal the location of the Community Hall site is unaffected. Officers are of the view that this relatively minor divergence in the precise position of the hall and car park on the approved site shown in this application is acceptable.

2) The design of the building has been the subject of adverse comment from the Parish Council and in representations. The building could be described as contemporary with its mixture of materials – Larch and Oak boarding and Cedar Shingles, brick and render – overall silhouette and fenestration. The design of school building on the site immediately to the west, although approximately 55 metres distant from the boundary, is of contemporary design too, with steeply pitched asymmetric, mono pitched and flat roofs, clad in brick, render and Larch boarding, with a contemporary placement of doors and windows. The Oakwood Park design guide provides no specific guidance on the design of the community

hall. Due to these factors officers are not suggesting a design based reason for refusal for the hall building. The proposed car park would provide 32 spaces and it is envisaged that its use would be shared by users of the hall, the adjacent school and the adjacent playing fields. A 100 m² Local Area for Play (LAP) is proposed for use of children up to 6 years of age.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposal represents an acceptable scheme for the provision of the community hall subject to an amended S106 Agreement and submission of landscaping details (which include proposed finished level, means of enclosure, parking, circulation areas, hard surfacing, minor structures, retained trees and planting specification).

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS SUBJECT TO S106 AGREEMENT TO REFLECT CHANGE IN MATERIALS FROM THOSE SPECIFIED IN THE ORIGINAL PLANNING OBLIGATION

1. C.3.3. To be implemented in accordance with original and revised plans.
2. No development shall take place until such time as the following have been completed to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority:
Access is to be provided into the site via a dropped kerb crossover with all details to be agreed with the Highway Authority.
REASON: In the interests of highway safety.
3. Prior to commencement of the development visibility splays with dimensions of 2.4 metres by 60 metres as measured from and along the nearside edge of the carriageway shall be provided on both sides of the access/junction. The area within each splay shall be kept clear of any obstruction exceeding 600mm in height at all times.
REASON: In the interests of highway safety.
4. C.8.29. Details of sustainable construction for commercial development.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/1342/07/DFO - LITTLE DUNMOW

Erection of 41 No. 2, 3 and 4 bed dwellings with associated roads, footpaths, drives parking/courts, garages and access paths

Location: Area 5D Oakwood Park (the Former Sugar Beet factory) Little Dunmow
GR/TL 661-205

Applicant: Persimmon Homes (Essex) Ltd

Agent: Jon Associates Ltd

Case Officer: Mr M Ovenden 01799 510476

Expiry Date: 22/10/2007

Classification: MAJOR

FULL REPORT TO FOLLOW UNDER SEPARATE COVER