

UTT/0028/08/FUL - NEWPORT	2
UTT/0169/08/OP - LITTLE CANFIELD.....	6
UTT/0159/08/FUL - CLAVERING.....	10

UTT/0028/08/FUL - NEWPORT

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 14 no. dwellings, access drive and related development

Location: Former Newport Highways Depot, Bury Water Lane. GR/TL 517-343

Applicant: David Wilson Homes

Agent: Strutt & Parker

Case Officer: Mr T Morton 01799 510654

Expiry Date: 11/04/2008

Classification: MAJOR

NOTATION: Inside Development Limit / Adjacent to Conservation Area.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: This was the Essex County Council Highways depot site, still in use at the time of the Officer's site visit in January 2008, and accommodated a number of storage, workshop and office buildings as well as outdoor storage and parking. The site is set within an old quarry and lies partially below the general ground level. It is reasonably well contained by roads that bound it and has a remnant hedge along its western and northern sides. The site is visible from the approach from the south down School Lane opposite, and when passing along Water Lane.

The surrounding area is a loose scatter of dwellings which do not make a coherent street scene, and the Newport Grammar School with its large number of buildings is the most prominent built feature in the general area.

The site is approx. 4590sq.m (0.46 ha) in extent.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: Redevelopment to provide a housing estate with 14 dwellings with a single point of access to its eastern end with dwellings arranged along an L-shaped estate road.

APPLICANT'S CASE including Design & Access statement: The lengthy design and access statement is available in full on file. It describes the site and surroundings and the proposal. In addition there is a Flood Risk Assessment statement, an Environmental Site Investigation report, a Tree Survey report, a Transport Statement, a Sustainability Statement and a Planning Statement.

CONSULTATIONS: Housing Officer. Here is the current affordable housing need for Newport from our housing register:

1 bed - 34
2 bed - 47
3 bed - 20
4 bed - 7
Total - 108

and the Rural Housing Trust's survey, which is just people with a local connection, shows the following need:

1 bed - 24
2 bed - 14
3 bed - 14
Total - 52

The Rural Housing Trust has just developed 19 units in Newport, but this would still mean there are potentially 33 applicants who would have a local connection in need of affordable housing.

Essex County Council Highways: The Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reason:

The layout as shown in drawing number 626-PL-01 is unacceptable because there is inadequate provision of pedestrian facilities within the site.

The proposal would therefore be contrary to the relevant transportation policies contained within Appendix G of the L TP 2006/2011 and Local Plan Policy GEN1.

However the highway authority would reconsider this decision should the following be incorporated in the estate design:

The principal access serving the development to the east of the site should be 4.8 metres wide for the first 15 metres with 7.5 metre radius kerbs with a further requirement of an internal footway at a width of 1.8 metres for the first 15 metres after which it would be acceptable that the internal road could become a shared surface.

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 legally protected species. The protection afforded these species is explained in Part IV and Annex A of Circular 06/2005 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System.' The presence of protected species is a material consideration in a planning application (NB PPS9 Paragraphs 15-16).

Surveys, assessments and recommendations for mitigation measures should be undertaken by suitably experienced persons holding any relevant licences. In order to assess the potential implications on protected species, any subsequent planning application should include the following information:

If protected species are suspected or present on a proposed development site then the following information should be provided by the applicant, usually in the form of an ecological survey by an appropriately qualified consultant, prior to the planning application being determined.

Anglian Water: No objection. They confirm that the foul sewage network would have capacity to accommodate this development. They have asked that no house be built within 15 metres of their nearby sewage pumping station in case it leads to complaints about smell. {NB: This is not considered to be a reasonable request}.

Council Engineer: It is recommended that conditions C.8.27A and C.29.1 (Drainage) are applied to any consent.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: Raised the following points:

1. Increased traffic
2. Confirmation required from developer that footway will be provided from the site to the pedestrian crossing near the school.
3. The development could create water problems (will affect other parts of the village particularly in the Bridge End area in terms of the effect on Wicken Water)
4. Developer should contribute to traffic calming measures, street lights and trees.
5. Each house should have system for collecting rainwater.

REPRESENTATIONS: This application has been advertised and one representation has been received. Period expired 13 February 2008.

Objection to increased amounts of traffic using the road, school buses are already causing a considerable problem in the road, there is a registered disabled resident in the road and the pavement needs to be extended to meet her needs.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: The comments are noted. Highway comments are reported above and discussed below.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS including Design & Access statement:

The main issues are;

- 1) principle of development (ULP Policies S3, H3);
- 2) density, dwelling size mix, social housing (ULP Policies H3, H9, H10);
- 3) design and amenity (ULP Policy GEN2 & Supplementary Planning Document, the Essex Design Guide);
- 4) traffic and Parking (ULP Policies GEN1 & GEN8);
- 5) Flood Risk (ULP Policy GEN3);
- 6) Protected Species (ULP Policy GEN7) and
- 7) Other material planning considerations.

1) The site is within the Development Limit of Newport and in principle residential development is acceptable, subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Local Plan.

2) Policy H3 calls for infill development to, “avoid development which makes inefficient use of land”. The proposed 14 dwellings equate to a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. The general range of densities required by national policy is normally taken to be 30 to 50 per hectare, and this scheme just makes the minimum figure. However, given that this site is one which is well contained and not constrained by its surroundings; it would be feasible to develop at a higher density than proposed. The applicant has pointed to the low density nature of the surrounding residential properties; however these are set very much in edge of countryside positions, where densities would traditionally have tailed off. This site is closer to the village, and to the higher density development of the school, and development here can be designed to create a development with its own character, and a higher density would help to define such a character. The proposed 14 dwellings are considered to be an under-development of this site, and an inefficient use of the opportunity that this site provides. A figure in excess of 14 would be appropriate here. A development of 20 units for example would result in a density of 43 dwellings per hectare.

Policy H9 calls for an element of affordable housing of 40% of the total provision on appropriate allocated and windfall sites, having regard to the up to date housing needs survey and market and site conditions. The supporting text refers to such housing being sought on sites of 0.5 hectares or of 15 dwellings or more. As set out above, the Council considers this site to be capable of accommodating at least 15 dwellings, and therefore capable of making a contribution to the much needed affordable housing stock in the village.

Policy H10 calls for sites of 0.1 hectares or larger and 3 or more dwellings to include a “significant proportion” of market housing comprising small properties. The proposal includes 6 of the 14 as 2 or 3 bedroom houses, equating to 42% of the total. The Council would consider a “substantial” proportion to be around 60%. It should be noted that the District wide housing stock contains 80% houses with 4 or more bedrooms and there is a critical shortage of small 2 or 3 bedroom properties available. It is therefore necessary to weight new house building strongly in favour of smaller units.

3) The layout can be described as a low density suburban layout with houses of predominantly detached suburban form. The frontage of the site to Bury Water Lane does not have a significant frontage of housing presented to it, with only two houses, (plots 11 and 12), facing that street. The remainder of the frontage is made up of the flank elevations of buildings, considerable gaps between buildings, and side fences. This is considered to be an unacceptable form of layout to a highway, particularly as it faces across the road toward a

Conservation Area. Internally the single street has a discontinuous frontage of houses on one side only, the other side being made up of double garages with gaps between them. This is not a satisfactory way to create a sense of place or good townscape. The road takes up an excessive amount of the site area, which contributes to the inefficient use of the site resulting in a low density figure.

4) The Transport Statement concludes that the site is suitable for residential use and would generate less traffic than the depot use has done. The parking provision would appear to be short of the adopted parking standards, making it likely that on street parking would arise.

The Highway Authority has objected to the layout which lacks a suitable pedestrian footpath on the internal road. They have not objected on any other grounds and the highway network must therefore be presumed to be capable of carrying traffic from this site.

5) The Flood Risk Assessment concludes that the site is not at risk from flood as it would only be breached by a minor area of potential flooding and this can be mitigated by introduction of a footway alongside Bury Water Lane. The site can be drained by a SUDS (Sustainable Drainage System) method to Wicken Brook.

6) An objection has been lodged by Natural England on the basis of impact on Protected Species but do not say which species it thinks is at risk. We have no record of Great Crested Newt in the vicinity, and the buildings are modern sheds used for storing highway materials, a very active and noisy operation unlikely to be a suitable location for bats to be here. In the absence of definite records there is not considered to be a risk of harm to Protected Species.

7) No other issues are considered to arise.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposal is considered unacceptable for the reasons given above.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS

1. The proposed development is considered to be inefficient underdevelopment of the site, failing to make the best use of the opportunity presented, and failing to meet the aims of Policy H3 of the Uttlesford Local Plan in this respect.
2. The Council considers that the site is capable of accommodating 15 dwellings or more and therefore capable of providing affordable housing in accordance with the aims of Policy H9 of the Uttlesford Local Plan.
3. The Council considers that the site is capable of providing more 'small dwellings' of 2 or 3 bedroom in size in accordance with the aims of Policy H10 of the Uttlesford Local Plan, where the Council would be looking for a substantial proportion, around 60%, of such dwellings, but this proposal only provides 6 of 14 units as such dwellings.
4. The Council considers that the proposed layout of the site is unsatisfactory providing a poor sense of townscape or sense of place, with insufficient frontage to Bury Water Lane. The proposal is considered to fail to meet the aims of Policy GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan and the aims of the Essex Design Guide which has been adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.
5. The layout as shown in drawing number 626-PL-01 is unacceptable because there is inadequate provision of pedestrian facilities within the site and thereby fails to meet the aims of Policy GEN1 of the Uttlesford Local Plan.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0169/08/OP - LITTLE CANFIELD

Outline application for the erection of 5 dwellings (includes details of layout and access)

Location: Land adjacent The Rest Dunmow Road. GR/TL 574-212

Applicant: Goldsand Estates Ltd

Agent: Frederic Chadburn

Case Officer: Mr N Ford 01799 510629

Expiry Date: 07/04/2008

Classification: Minor

NOTATION: Takeley Local Policy 3 / Island Sites Supplementary Planning Guidance.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE: The site is located approximately 1.2km to the northeast of the Takeley Four Ashes junction north of the B1256 Dunmow Road and lies within the boundary of the Parish of Little Canfield. The site covers an area of approximately 0.22ha and comprises a garden land previously associated with the dwelling named The Rest to the east and has mature trees both on site and contained within the hedgerow boundaries. It currently has a wooden summer house located to the south of the plot. Detached dwellings lie either side of the site to the east and west, to the north are new dwellings constructed on the Priors Green estate. Across Dunmow Road to the south lies the former D J Cars / petrol station site.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: This outline application is for the erection of 5 detached dwellings on an area of approx. 0.22 ha. Matters of principle and layout and access are matters to be determined at this stage. The layout drawing proposes a new access to serve the 5 dwellings.

The scale, landscaping, and appearance would all be determined at the reserved matters stage. This site is identified in the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) that covers the area as an "Island Site".

NB. The position of the proposed 'Priors Green Highway Roundabout' is shown on the submitted layout drawing.

APPLICANT'S CASE including Design & Access statement: See Design and Access Statement received 11 February 2008.

RELEVANT HISTORY: On 7 November 2006 an outline planning application for the erection of 11 dwellings from two points of access was refused (UTT/1161/06/OP). A subsequent appeal was dismissed.

The Inspector considered that the material increase in vehicle trips associated with 11 dwellings both from a new access and the greater use of an existing one would interfere too much with the free, safe and convenient flow of traffic on this stretch of road.

The adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance for 'Island Sites' requires that vehicle access to such sites be gained from the Priors Green development itself. The Inspector supported this and whilst had no objection to the principle of the residential development of the land itself considered there to be no good reason to allow the proposal contrary to well established highway policies. The Inspector considered it unfortunate that measures were not put in place to anticipate a more comprehensive development to include it and provide it with suitable access.

CONSULTATIONS: Building Control: Lifetime Homes Standards – Ensure that the SPD is adopted on these dwellings. Sustainability – Information on SUDS, public transport and local amenities is welcome. However, still require information to confirm the development will achieve the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 and 10% energy needs of dwellings will be provided by on site renewable energy systems. This can be shown by design code assessment and SAP calculations. If outline permission is granted it should carry a condition that Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 is met and 10% on site renewable energy is provided and that this is confirmed at the time of the reserved matters by providing us with independent assessment of each.

Highway Authority: To be reported.

Water Authority: No objection to sewerage infrastructure. Water is covered by Three Valleys Water.

ECC Archaeology: Recommends a trial trench and open area excavation condition.

Environmental Services: To be reported.

Landscaping: To be reported.

ECC Education: ECC seeks an education contribution under Section 106 of the Act.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: To be reported (due 12 March 2008).

REPRESENTATIONS: One. Notification period expired 18 March 2008.

1. Queries neighbour notification process.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: Neighbouring properties surrounding the proposed development have been notified including the new dwellings to the north of the application site in the Priors Green estate.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS: The main issues are

- 1) **whether the development would be compatible with the Master Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (PPS3, ULP Local Policy 3, H10, GEN1, GEN2) and;**
- 2) **whether social, amenity and infrastructure contributions are required (ULP Policy GEN6).**

1) The Development Plan policies do not permit development of this site in isolation. Development of this site is however acceptable in principle provided it is contiguous with the development of the Prior's Green site overall. Policy LP3 recognises that there is opportunity for infill of development where there are remaining pockets of existing housing with the allocation of the master plan for Priors Green 'The Island Sites'. Development should use existing access ways and those in the master plan.

The SPG emphasises that the principle of development of this and the other "island sites" is acceptable; that new development should gain access from the approved internal road network; that financial contributions should be made towards education, transport, sports, community and landscaping facilities; that affordable housing should be provided; and that no permissions should be granted on the island sites until UTT/0816/00/OP has outline planning permission.

The appeals Inspector considered that the previous scheme for 11 dwellings to be cramped with generally little space between dwellings. He considered that the then proposed arrangement of dwellings would much contrast with and be out of sympathy with the lower densities being achieved with housing constructed to the north of the site in Priors Green. He also considered that the resultant scheme would amount to over development and give rise to a poor level of amenity.

This scheme proposes 5 dwellings and would result in a density of nearly 23 dwellings per hectare (dph) whereas the previous scheme proposed 11 dwellings at 44 dph. 30 dph is the national minimum density target for guiding housing until local density policies are in place through the development framework. More intensive development is however not always appropriate but when well designed and built in the right location, it can enhance the character and quality of an area. The proposed development falls below the threshold for the requirement of affordable housing which is for sites of 0.5 hectares or 15 dwellings or more.

The density and layout is now considered to be appropriate. It is significantly improved to the scheme refused and dismissed at appeal. It provides for five detached dwellings that will be set back from Dunmow Road and facing the highway with a building line that will respect that of adjacent properties. Two-storey dwellings as proposed would be characteristic here.

Garden sizes are mostly adequate for the size of dwellings proposed. However, Plot 5 would have a very small private rear garden and this would not be adequate useful amenity space for what would be a family size home.

It is considered that the dwellings are adequately sited so as there would not be significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties. Whilst the position of windows would be considered at the detailed design of reserved matters stage it is considered appropriate that there be no first floor windows facing west or east from Plots 1 or 5 to prevent overlooking and this could be attached as a condition.

The applicant states that they were unable to agree with Countryside Homes for access to made available for later development of this site and hence internal access onto estate roads required by the SPD is not possible.

With regard to the previously refused application and access onto Dunmow Road the Inspector considered that the material increase in vehicle trips associated with 11 dwellings both from a new access and the greater use of an existing one would interfere too much with the free, safe and convenient flow of traffic on this stretch of road.

The adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance for 'Island Sites' requires that vehicle access to such sites be gained from the Priors Green development itself. The Inspector supported this and whilst had no objection to the principle of the residential development of the land itself considered there to be no good reason to allow the proposal contrary to well established highway policies. The Inspector considered it unfortunate that measures were not put in place to anticipate a more comprehensive development to include it and provide it with suitable access. This may however stop any development of the site. Development carried out at Priors Green now precludes providing a means of access other than via the B1256. The comments of the Highway Authority on the proposal will be reported. On balance Officers are of the view that if the Highway Authority agree to the proposed access it would be wrong to maintain an objection in principle to an access to the B1256 as this would prevent development of the land.

The advice of the arborist in relation to removal of trees (4 no. Conifers of Cypressus type) to provide access to the dwellings and their amenity value will be reported to Members.

The matter of dwelling size and mix must be considered at this stage as it would not be covered under the reserved matters i.e. scale, appearance and landscaping. Policy H10 of the Local Plan requires that for all developments of 0.1 hectares and above or three or more dwellings are required to include a significant proportion of market housing comprising small properties and this is defined as 2 and 3 bed homes. The application proposed five detached dwellings but the number of bedrooms is unspecified. However, the Design and

Access Statement indicates that each dwelling will have 1750-1800sq.ft of habitable accommodation. The approved phase of the Priors Green site to the north has three bedroom dwellings significantly smaller in floor area. By way of comparison it is therefore considerably likely that given the size of these dwellings they would be larger than three bedroom dwellings and they compare in floor area to four bedroom dwellings as such would not accord with this policy.

2) SPG requires that all the island sites other than the land adjacent to Takeley Nurseries should make appropriate and proportionate contributions to social, amenity and infrastructure requirements. These are based on an assessment of the costs of primary and secondary education, a contribution to transport enhancement and a contribution to the enhancement of local sports and/or community facilities, a contribution to fitting out, equipping and furnishing the on-site community centre and a financial contribution to structural landscaping and a 15-year landscape sum for its proper maintenance. The total basic financial contribution for wider and longer-term benefits excluding affordable housing and any associated additional educational payments and landscape contributions totals £5,969 per dwelling at current prices. Because this site is outside the Master Plan area these contributions will need to be made in full. If the proposal was acceptable this requirement could be the subject of a Section 106 Agreement.

CONCLUSIONS: The development of this site is unacceptable in this instance because it indicates dwellings of a size that would not provide for smaller market housing. Furthermore, the layout is inadequate because it results in an inadequate amenity space for plot 5.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS

1. The proposed development is unacceptable because it would not include a significant proportion of market housing comprising small properties in the interests of achieving mixed and balanced communities in accordance with Policy H10 of the Uttlesford Local Plan adopted 2005.
2. The proposed development is unacceptable because the layout would result in an deficient area of amenity space for Plot 5 contrary to Policy GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan adopted 2005 and the Essex Design Guide 2005.

Background papers: see application file.

UTT/0159/08/FUL - CLAVERING

Erection of 7 no. dwellings, construction of new pedestrian and vehicular access. Erection of garage and car port to existing dwelling

Location: Land at Barlee Close. GR/TL 474-314

Applicant: B F Contracts Ltd

Agent: Andrew Martin Associates

Case Officer: Mr T Morton 01799 510654

Expiry Date: 03/04/2008

Classification: MINOR

NOTATION: Inside Development Limit

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: The site stands on the corner of Barlee Close and Stortford Road and comprises an area of 1763 sq m. of open land, and also includes part of the rear gardens of the existing houses at numbers 1 and 2 Stortford Cottages. On the opposite of Barlee Close is the village shop, with two-storey houses at the eastern end of the site facing towards it across the width of the road.

APPLICANT'S CASE including Design & Access statement: The design and access and planning statements are available in full on file, describing the site and surroundings and the proposal. The following text is the conclusion from the planning statement.

7.1 Based on the previous Inspector's decision on application local planning authority reference UTT/0178/07/FUL the principal issues in this application are considered to be whether or not the development, if carried out, would:

- (i) have an overbearing impact on existing plots 7 and 8 Barlee Close;
- (ii) be contrary to the criterion of policy, GEN2 and 53 of the UDLP and
- (iii) whether there are any other material considerations that warrant permission being granted.

7.2 It is the applicant's case that, for reasoning set out in this Statement, the proposals will not, if implemented, be detrimental to the character and appearance of Clavering and would not be detrimental to the living conditions of the existing, neighbouring or proposed property.

7.3 The proposal has been formulated with full regard to all relevant policies and would not conflict, nor would cause harm, to any interest of acknowledged importance. Indeed the proposals would be wholly compatible with all recent advice on good practice relating to design.

7.4 For the reasons set out in this statement, therefore, the LPA is respectfully requested to grant planning permission for the proposed development.

RELEVANT HISTORY: UTT/0771/05/FUL - Proposed erection of eight dwellings and garaging. REFUSED 25 July 2005 for the following reason:

The proposed development is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site, which would be out of keeping with its surroundings, to the detriment of the character and appearance of this rural village. The area is characterised by a more loose-knit and spacious pattern of development, and the proposed terrace would appear unacceptably cramped in the street scene. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the aims of the Essex & Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan Policy CS2 and contrary to Policies GEN 2 and S2 of the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan.

UTT/1460/05/FUL - Proposed erection of six dwellings and garages, construction of new pedestrian and vehicular access; alterations to existing dwellings including an erection of a garage. APPROVED 03 November 2005.

UTT/1481/06/FUL - Erection of 8 houses etc. Refused by Committee 2 November 2006
Appeal Dismissed.

UTT/0178/07/FUL - Redevelopment to retain 2 existing dwellings and provide 8 new dwellings with a parking courtyard to their rear. Appeal Dismissed

UTT/0270/07/FUL - Erection of eight dwellings, construction of new pedestrian and vehicular access. Alteration of existing dwelling including erection of garage and carport. Refused.
Appeal Dismissed

CONSULTATIONS: None.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: To be reported (due 8 March 2008).

REPRESENTATIONS: None received. Notification period expired 28 February 2008.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS: To be advised.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS including Design & Access statement:

The main issues are;

- 1) Principle and Density of development (ULP Policies S3, H3);
- 2) Design and amenity (ULP Policy GEN2);
- 3) Parking provision and traffic issues (ULP Policy GEN8) and
- 4) Other material planning considerations.

1) The development site lies within the Development Limit of Clavering and therefore in principle the proposal is acceptable. Compliance with planning standards and other policies is discussed further below.

UTT/1460/05/FUL was approved at Committee by members who indicated that 6 dwellings was the maximum that they considered acceptable for this site. All other proposals have been refused.

This submission returns to the concept of 6 dwellings fronting the road but also seeks to inset a seventh to the rear (called Plot 9) in the form of a two-storey detached dwelling.

The previous submission UTT/0178/07/FUL a refused for the following reason;
The proposed development is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site, which would be out of keeping with its surroundings, to the detriment of the character and appearance of this rural village. The area is characterised by a more loose-knit and spacious pattern of development, and the proposed housing would appear unacceptably cramped in the street scene. In particular, the provision of two houses at the rear of the development is not characteristic of the frontage pattern of development in the area. The style and detailed design of these two dwellings at the rear of the site is unacceptable and would be inappropriate in the street scene. The scheme as a whole does not accord with the approaches to the provision of car parking advised in the Essex Design Guide in a satisfactory manner, and the resultant development would detract from the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the aims of the Essex & Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan Policy CS2 and contrary to Policies GEN2, S3 and H3 of the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan.

The Appeal Inspector accepted that the row of 6 houses fronting the street was acceptable, as has the Council in its approval of 6 dwellings previously; the contentious issue was the introduction of two additional houses to the rear. The Inspector considered that houses to the rear would not provide for continuity of the street scene as suggested by the appellants. They would appear cramped and would detract from the character and appearance of the site. This proposal did not gain support from PPS3 or PPS1 because the local environment

should not be compromised and good design should add to the overall character and design of the area.

The current submission changes the development proposed by reducing the 2 new houses at the rear to one house. It is not considered that this overcomes either the Council's concerns or the Inspector's views. There is an in principle objection to the development of the site with more than six houses and any development to the rear would be out of character with the pattern of development in the area and would not make a positive contribution to the overall character and design of the area.

2) The houses in Barlee Close are separated from the proposed development by the width of the road and the length of their own front gardens, and at this distance their windows will not suffer any material loss of daylight. Traffic to the parking courtyard will have to pass close to the front of those houses. The dwelling on Plot 9 will create material overlooking of adjacent properties.

The gardens of the houses at 1 and 2 Stortford Cottages are reduced in length by about half, but the remaining area is considered to be adequate for houses of this size.

3) New development should be designed to make appropriate provision for access for all forms of transport and should promote high standards of road safety. Parking provision is to be made in accordance with published parking standards. The parking standards suggest that 2 spaces be provided per dwelling and this provision is shown. It is common for visitors to houses to park on-street and that could cause conflicts with other residents and the supermarket however there is no need for any occupier to park on the street due to this scheme.

4) No other issues arise.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposed development is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site incompatible with the form and character of the surrounding pattern of development.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASON

The proposed development is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site, which would be out of keeping with its surroundings, to the detriment of the character and appearance of this rural village. The area is characterized by a more loose-knit and spacious pattern of development, and the proposed terrace would appear unacceptably cramped in the street scene and incompatible with the settlements character and overall residential density. The dwelling on Plot 9 would also create material overlooking of adjacent properties. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the aims of Policies GEN2 and S3 of the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan.

Background papers: see application file.
