

**UTT/2364/11/OP (QUENDON & RICKLING)**  
**(Committee case as proposal is a Major application in addition to Applicant related to Councillor)**

**PROPOSAL:** Outline application for erection of 14 dwellings with access, layout and scale to be determined.

**LOCATION:** Foxley House, Green Road, Rickling Green

**APPLICANT:** Mrs J Rich

**AGENT:** Donald Insall Associates

**GRID REFERENCE:** TL 512-299

**EXPIRY DATE:** 5 March 2012

**CASE OFFICER:** Miss K. Benjafield

**APPLICATION TYPE:** Major

---

**1. NOTATION**

1.1 Outside Development Limits

**2. DESCRIPTION OF SITE**

2.1 The site is located adjacent to the B1383, on the southern edge of Quendon and to the east of Rickling Green. The site covers an area of 0.63ha and comprises an area of garden land associated with Foxley House. The land is covered in grass but does not have the manicured appearance of lawn. The southern and eastern boundaries of the site comprise mature hedges and vegetation. To the west the site bounds the playing field to Rickling Green Primary School and remaining land forming part of the garden to Foxley House. The northern boundary also adjoins land relating to Foxley House.

**3. PROPOSAL**

3.1 The application relates to the proposed erection of 14 dwellings comprising 3, 4, 5, and 6 bedroom properties on this site. It has been submitted in outline form with the access, scale and layout to be determined.

3.2 It is proposed that a new access would be created onto the B1383. This would be located at a point approximately 65m from the southern site boundary.

3.3 A detailed layout has been submitted with the application. This indicates a farmyard style scheme with dwellings around the edge and a courtyard in the centre. A large dwelling with the proportions of a farmhouse would be positioned adjacent to the access.

**4. APPLICANT'S CASE**

4.1 A comprehensive Design and Access statement has been submitted with the application. This provides details of the site, the proposal, relevant national and local planning policies. Details of pre-application consultations that have been undertaken are set out as well as details of the characteristics of the built form within the village and traditional forms of development in surrounding villages.

4.2 The report for an ecological scoping survey is included as an appendix to the D&A statement.

## **5. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

5.1 UTT/0572/06/OP

5.2 Outline application for the erection of one dwelling adjacent to Foxley House refused June 2006 and allowed at appeal November 2006.

## **6. POLICIES**

6.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**

6.2 **East of England Plan 2006**

Policy H1 - Regional Housing Provision  
Policy H2 - Affordable Housing  
Policy ENV7 - Quality in the Built Environment

6.3 **Essex Replacement Structure Plan 2001**

N/A

6.4 **Uttlesford District Local Plan 2005**

Policy S7 - The Countryside  
Policy GEN1 - Access  
Policy GEN2 - Design  
Policy GEN6 - Infrastructure Provision to Support Development  
Policy GEN7 - Nature Conservation  
Policy GEN8 - Vehicle Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Document - "Accessible Homes and Playspace"  
Essex Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions (Adopted as Essex County Council Supplementary Guidance).

## **7. PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS**

7.1 Overview

It is noted by Quendon and Rickling Parish Council (the PC) that Uttlesford District Council are in a position regarding housing strategy which requires that they pursue opportunities to develop potential building plots in order to meet targets. Against this background the PC accepts that development of some kind is inevitable on the site (QUE5) in question. While this is accepted, it will be shown later that very few people in Quendon and Rickling are happy with this situation.

The application makes much of the consultation process, which in fact is a requirement, not a courtesy. This process has actually been wholly inadequate. Due to time constraints placed on the PC from the outset by the land owner and Mr Frances Maude (Architect), the PC has been forced to act with considerable haste, producing a questionnaire which was barely adequate and allowing no time for useful discussion with Mr Maude to achieve a mutually acceptable proposal.

### Comments regarding the introduction

Para 3 In this paragraph Mr Maude states that villagers expressed, through the questionnaire that "affordable houses should be placed elsewhere in the village at the site identified in the SHLAA as QUE6".

This is misleading.

The questionnaire does not ask for an opinion as to the preferred location of affordable houses.

Question 2a asks the maximum number of houses which would be acceptable on the site.

Question 2b asks what proportion of these should be low cost/housing association properties.

#### Comments regarding Legislative Background

PPS1 Para 16. The proposed development does not include a suitable mix of housing.

It does not take into account the effect of development on the social fabric of the community.

It will increase social inequality.

It does not take account of the needs of the community.

It does nothing to promote health and well being by making provision for physical activity.

Para 19. Plan policies should be based on...

iv. Recognition of the limits of the environment to accept further development without irreversible damage.

Comment - The PC believe that large scale development in this very small village will destroy the very character which makes it attractive.

Para 23. - Relating to new homes.

vii. "Ensure provision...(including an appropriate mix of housing and adequate levels of affordable housing."

Comment - It is our belief that large executive houses with small gardens have their place in the urban and suburban environment but they are not what is needed in a small rural village.

Para 27 ix. Requires the enhancement and protection of the "historic environment and landscape character".

Para 41 & 43. Addressing Public Consultation.

Consultation has consisted of members of the Rich family and Mr Maude attending two Parish Council meetings and a Public Meeting and a number of telephone calls between Mr J. Rich, Mr Maude and Alan Price (Chair Q&R PC).

At the first PC meeting Mr Maude stated that the PC would need to respond within two weeks. This was extended by one week when told that the Chairman would be abroad for one of those weeks.

At the second PC meeting Mr Maude presented the current proposal, supposedly in line with villagers wishes.

It is the view of the PC that time constraints placed on us have prevented us from fully and actively involving our community in developing this proposal and the requirement for consultation has not been met.

PPS3 Regarding planning policy for delivering Government housing objectives.

Application Page 6, para 10. - "Objectives providing context....for development plans and planning Decisions."

(ii). A mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price, to support a wide variety of households in all areas, both urban and rural.

(iv). Housing developments in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure.

Comment - These requirements are not met by this proposal on any level.

Para 13. "Reflecting policy in PPS1, good design should contribute positively to making places better for people. Design which is inappropriate in it's content, or which fails to

take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted.

Comment - The application in its present form, consisting of large executive houses with small gardens and inadequate parking does nothing to enhance quality of life for existing villagers. The survey conducted by the PC indicates a wish for fewer houses on this site, but nowhere does it suggest that they should be larger. This is an inference made by Mr Maude which has no justification.

An opportunity to make a positive contribution was offered to Mr J. Rich by the PC, in suggesting that he make a gift of land to the school, enabling them to build an additional classroom, and that he build a public playground, which could be accessed by a path across the bottom of the existing school field. However, on examination of the application, it is apparent that the size of the proposed gift of land, named 'Jubilee Playground' has become so small that it would be of little use to the school, the proposed access path is to be built at the expense of the school and the public playground has disappeared completely.

The PC conclude that the requirements of PPS3 paras 13 & 17 are not met.

The PC would draw attention to the failure of this application to adequately conform to the requirements of:

PPS3 para 46 (i) and (ii).

PPS7 (ii) and

Para 1 (vi),

#### Uttlesford Local Plan

- i. There are no shops or other commercial facilities within walking distance of Quendon or Rickling with the exception of the public house, and another in Ugley.
- ii. The school, a C of E Junior Infant School is currently very nearly at capacity, having only three places available. Some year groups, (there are two year groups in each classroom) are over subscribed, and the school is expected to remain at capacity for the foreseeable future.
- iii. The only public transport consists of a bus service on the B1383. At 'school run' times buses are full. Access to train stations at Stansted or Newport require road journeys with associated parking difficulties and costs.
- iv. Doctors surgeries at both Newport and Stansted are known to be under considerable strain.
- v. There are cricket, bowls and football clubs within the village and between them they account for almost all open space. There is no outdoor facility for pre or early school age children to play and it appears from the application that the offer to build a public access playground has been withdrawn.

#### Other General Comments

- i. Access. The PC acknowledge the efforts of Mr Maude to reduce the potential danger to traffic entering and leaving the site, and welcome the suggestion that the village gateway and associated 30 MPH speed limit be moved further South to enhance road safety. However, at present the proposed access point is situated in the 50 MPH zone. Any future support for this proposal from the PC will be conditional on the above suggestion being put in place, together with other, preferably physical traffic calming measures.
- ii. The survey showed that a smaller development was desirable. But the inference that this means a few huge houses shows a misunderstanding and a lack of consultation. The reality is that a lower density of smaller housing using a larger part of the plot would be more conducive to a rural development.
- iii. The PC are concerned that at some point in the future a subsequent application might be made to develop the Northern end of this plot. Current UDC policy of allowing up to fourteen houses to be built without the requirement to include affordable housing has resulted in a loophole through which a developer can

split a plot into sections, build fourteen houses on each and never have to be concerned with the need to build affordable units. Mr J. Rich has assured the PC that there is no such plan for QUE5 but he will not own the land forever. The PC would seek some form of assurance from UDC that this loophole will be closed.

- iv. While we await detail of the Localism Act on the subject of planning we can probably agree that it is in the spirit of the Act to devolve authority on planning issues to Local Government. There is no expectation that this will mean a PC right to veto planning proposals, but surely it is in the spirit of the Act to place greater importance than ever before on local opinion. The survey conducted by the PC, while a hurried affair, clearly shows the wishes of the people of Quendon and Rickling and the PC respectfully ask that they be given careful consideration.

### Conclusion

Quendon and Rickling PC do not object outright to the concept of development on QUE5. However, we cannot support the application in its present form. Given constructive negotiation with the applicant and the time to properly consult with the community we feel that a mutually agreeable proposal could be found but at present this is not the case.

## **8. CONSULTATIONS**

### ECC Highways

- 8.1 No objection subject to the imposition of conditions relating to the construction of the new access.

### Engineer

- 8.2 The application states that surface water drainage will be to soakaway and adjacent watercourse. The former is the preferred option under PPS25 but no further information is provided. There is a large area of vehicle access/hardstanding which is to be of tarmac/chippings. No details of the drainage proposals are provided. Requests a condition regarding drainage.

### Environment Agency

- 8.3 No objections to the planning application. Offers advice and guidance relevant to the proposal.

### ECC Schools

- 8.4 This development falls in the Newport ward. The ward has no full Day Care or Nursery and the Pre School is at 100% full capacity according to the Essex Childcare Sufficiency Assessment published in June 2011.

According to our forecasts, and information published in the latest Commissioning School Places in Essex plan, there should be sufficient Primary and Secondary school places at a local school serving this development.

It is clear that at Early Years and Childcare action will be needed to provide additional places and that this development will add to that need. Based on the information you have provided, may I formally request on behalf of Essex County Council's Schools Service, that a S106 agreement to provide an EY&CC contribution is drawn up on the basis of the formula outlined in our Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contribution Guidelines Supplement, published July 2010. On the unit mix stated in this planning application, the contribution would amount to £15,822.

#### Access and Equalities Officer

- 8.5 This site will be subject to the Supplementary Planning Document on Lifetime Homes. There is no clear lay out for parking and how this will meet the SPD. As there are 14 dwellings as part of this application, one dwelling will need to meet the requirements of the Wheelchair Housing Standard as set out in that document. This may require the dwellings to be re-drawn to meet the requirements.

#### Climate Change Manager

- 8.6 Please apply conditions for compliance with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 and compliance with the 10% rule.

#### Natural England

- 8.7 This application is in close proximity to Quendon Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest; given the nature and scale of this proposal, Natural England raises no objection to the proposal being carried out according to the terms and conditions of the application and submitted plans on account of the impact on designated sites.

#### Environmental Health

- 8.8 No objections subject to a condition to require submission of a management scheme during the construction phase to control waste, noise and dust.

#### ECC Ecology

- 8.9 The ecological report recommends (in section 8) that a precautionary approach should be undertaken for other species including reptiles, birds and hedgehogs. The recommendations in the report should be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist. Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement should also be sought, as proposed in section 9 of the report.

### 9. REPRESENTATIONS

- 9.1 22 Representations have been received. Period expired 19 April.

9.2 Support:

Well designed and attractive  
There was also no affordable housing at Hall Field next to this site.  
Would relieve pressure on Coney Acre  
Additional housing is required and the proposed site is perfectly situated for it.  
Advantages for the school is the proposal went ahead with the gift of land.  
The village needs "new blood", young people/families to keep it going - the development could help achieve that.

9.3 Object:

Many responses indicate no objection to some development but raise concerns relating to this proposal.  
Out of keeping with character of village  
Lack of affordable housing - 50% should be affordable  
Lack of capacity within the primary school  
Uncertainty regarding the rest of the land associated with/surrounding this site  
Alternative proposal would be preferable with provision for village hall and nursery school  
30mph speed limit should be moved further south  
There should not be any affordable housing as part of this development  
The houses would be large, expensive and would affect the social mix of the village  
The development would be too high a density.

No details or binding agreement to prevent further development of adjacent land  
Previous suggestions from the developer indicated that a children's park would be provided, this is not included in the plans

Would have ample parking for each house, direct access to the main road and is tucked away with access to the school and pub

A vibrant and real community should contain a mixed demographic and these houses would exclude those who are younger and have new families. Even the three bedroom properties are large with capacity for loft development.

The architectural heritage of the village contains workman's cottages and this should have a mix of properties.

Concern that this development should be counted as part of the larger housing plan for Uttlesford.

Concern that by proposing 14 dwellings, this is an attempt to avoid affordable housing  
Is the parcel of land to be assigned to the school adequate for their needs for expansion?

Other developments of this size in the District have provided recreational space/amenities for the benefit of the community.

The development should cover a larger area including adjacent land belonging to the applicant.

Concerns regarding the generation of noise, dust, waste disposal, heavy vehicles, dirt and mud on the roads etc resulting from the construction of the development.

Lack of public transport will lead to additional car usage.

There is a general lack of amenities, eg doctor/post office/policing etc that will be exasperated.

There is not sufficient demand for this level of development; this area has existing houses for sale without takers.

The height of the proposed dwellings would create a blot on the character of the village.

I dislike the proposal to fence in the children in the school playing field.

It is inaccurate for the applicants to claim that extensive local consultation has been carried out.

The site is designated as Greenfield and outside the development limits

There is an ongoing water and sewage infrastructure issue along the eastern end of the area.

It is not clear where the access would be. *[N.B. not all documents were originally on the council's website - this has been remedied with additional time for further comments to be made]*

Electricity supply to some existing properties is poor and fluctuates - concern that the proposal would make this worse.

Concerns regarding overlooking and loss of privacy - requests high fencing to prevent this.

Proposal would erode the rural character of the countryside.

There is no requirement for further housing of the type in the proposal.

The views of the community have been disregarded.

There are errors in the supporting documents.

The part of the plot not provided for in this application is not well-suited to a separate housing development of this kind.

The agent for the application has described QUE6 elsewhere in the village as "the one the village preferred for affordable homes" - this is not clear cut and should not exclude this application making any provision for affordable homes.

- 9.4 The application must be considered as submitted and land it is not possible to restrict development on land that is outside the application site area.

The land marked as "Jubilee Playground" does not form part of the application site area.

Construction works will result in some noise and disturbance however this is not a reason to refuse planning permission if the scheme is acceptable. Conditions can be imposed where necessary to mitigate elements of this disruption however if it causes a statutory nuisance then it should be dealt with under Environmental Health legislation.

See appraisal below for other issues.

## 10. APPRAISAL

The issues to consider in the determination of the application are:

- A The principle of developing this site for housing
- B The proposed access to the site
- C The proposed scale, layout and form of the development
- D Infrastructure provision to support the development
- E Whether there would a detrimental impact on nature conservation
- F The provision of car parking for the development
- G The provision of affordable housing
- H The proposed mix of units within the development

- A The principle of developing this site for housing
- 10.1 The site is located outside the development limits for Quendon and Rickling Green and is therefore located within the Countryside where ULP Policy S7 applies. This specifies that the countryside will be protected for its own sake and planning permission will only be given for development that needs to take place there or is appropriate to a rural area. 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.
- 10.2 However, in terms of housing delivery, the Council cannot currently demonstrate an adequate five year land supply and sites that are located in the countryside are being considered for residential development by the Council to address this shortfall.
- 10.3 The northern section of this site, as part of a larger area covering approximately 1ha, has been assessed as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (site QUE5). Just under half of the application site is within the SHLAA site that was previously assessed for its development potential; the larger half of the site is outside of the SHLAA site.
- 10.4 The development of the whole SHLAA site has the potential to constitute sustainable development as advocated in the NPPF. A larger development on QUE5 would bring benefits to the village in the form of affordable housing as well as the potential for community benefits such as a new village hall. Should there be a new village hall, in addition to the increase in population to the village, the development would have the potential to encourage further services such as a small village shop run by the Parish Council or residents of the village. This could increase the sustainability of the village by providing a service within walking distance that could be accessed by residents without needing to use private cars. These factors would be material considerations that would be taken into account should an application for the development of QUE5 in its entirety be submitted.
- 10.5 With regard to this application, the separation of a small area of the SHLAA site and the incorporation of an area of land not within the developable area of QUE5 would not be sustainable. The proposal would result in piecemeal development that would be prejudicial to the ability to develop the larger area of QUE5. There would be no vehicular link between this proposal and any future proposals as a result of the layout of the dwellings. Any future development on the adjoining land would therefore require a separate means of access and as a result would perpetuate the stand alone nature of this and future development. As such, the proposed development would not benefit the village or the wider area and would create an inward facing development that would fail to relate to the existing development within the village.



10.6 Therefore, the proposal would not constitute sustainable development as required by the NPPF and would be contrary to ULP Policy S7 as there are no material considerations which would be sufficiently beneficial to the village and the wider area to outweigh the policy objection to development in the countryside.

B The proposed access to the site

10.7 The local highways authority has no objection to the proposal and the new access onto the B1383. Therefore in relation to criteria a) of ULP Policy GEN1 specifying that the access to the main road network must be able capable of carrying traffic generated by the development safely, the proposal complies.

10.9 Quendon and Rickling Green have no shops and there is only one pub and the primary school. There are limited bus services which run through the village and as a result it is likely that the occupiers of the proposed dwellings would have a heavy reliance on the private cars to access jobs, shops and services. The proposal would therefore fail to encourage movement by means other than driving a car as required by criteria e) of ULP Policy GEN1.

10.10 It is also noted that the pedestrian link to the school and the pub shown on the proposed layout does not fall within the application site area outlined in red.

C The proposed scale, layout and form of the development

10.11 The design and access statement provides details of the rationale behind the proposed development. This indicates that the character, size and materials of properties in the village and neighbouring villages were assessed, in addition to residential conversions of former agricultural buildings.

10.12 Notwithstanding the character assessment of local properties that the agents for the application have undertaken, the proposal would result in a standalone development which would have little relationship to the existing dwellings in the village, either through its form and layout or its physical location away from existing dwellings. In this respect it would fail to comply with criteria a) of ULP Policy GEN2.

10.13 The layout of the development would be unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties as a result of the distances which exist between the site and those properties.

10.14 The garden areas indicated on the layout plans would range in size from approximately 95m<sup>2</sup> to approximately 360m<sup>2</sup>. It is unfortunate that some of the garden sizes are disproportionately large compared to some of the smaller gardens, however the Essex Design Guide specifies that that a garden size of 100m<sup>2</sup> is acceptable and on this basis the proposed layout broadly meets that specification. The gardens which fall short of the 100m<sup>2</sup> are not sufficiently small to warrant refusal of this application.

10.15 The Supplementary Planning Document - "Accessible Homes and Playspace" requires new dwellings to be constructed to meet Lifetime Homes Standards. As this is an outline application, it is not possible to assess whether the proposal would comply with those requirements however if the proposal were to be recommended for approval, compliance with the SPD could be conditioned. In addition, residential developments of between 12 and 20 units are required to have one unit that is fully wheelchair accessible. In common with the requirement to meet Lifetime Home Standards, the requirement for a wheelchair accessible unit could be conditioned if the scheme was recommended for approval.

D Infrastructure provision to support the development

10.16 ECC Schools service has indicated that the ward that this site falls within has no full Day Care of Nursery and the Pre-School is at 100% capacity. Although there should be sufficient Primary and Secondary school places at a local school serving this development, action will be required to provide the additional Early Years and Childcare

and the development will add to that need. Therefore a request has been made for a contribution of £15,822 from the developers to meet the need generated by the proposal. Subject to the developer entering into a S106 obligation to provide the above contribution, the proposal would comply with the requirements of ULP Policy GEN6.

E Whether there would a detrimental impact on nature conservation

- 10.17 An ecological assessment of the site has been undertaken and submitted with the application. This information has been considered by the ECC Ecologists who have not raised any concerns regarding protected species on the site and recommend that the ecologist's recommendations in sections 8 and 9 of the report are carried out. The proposal would therefore comply with the requirements of ULP Policy GEN7.

F The provision of car parking for the development

- 10.18 The layout drawings and the design and access statement indicate that parking areas within the site could accommodate at least 2 per vehicles per dwelling and 10 spaces along the boundary wall of plot 14. Due to the scale of the plans, it is not possible to assess whether the spaces would meet the required dimensions of 2.9m x 5.5m. However, notwithstanding this, the detailed parking provision requirements could be conditioned so that they would be incorporated into the reserved matters should the application be recommended for approval. The parking provision is therefore acceptable.

G The provision of affordable housing

- 10.19 The proposal has no affordable housing provision and all of the dwellings are indicated to be market housing. The site covers an area exceeding 0.5ha and therefore there is a requirement for 40% affordable housing as part of the development. In the absence of any affordable housing provision, the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of ULP Policy H9.

H The proposed mix of units within the development

- 10.20 No floor plans have been submitted for consideration as part of this proposal however the supporting information indicates that a mix of 3, 4, 5 and one x 6 bedroom dwellings would be provided. There is a requirement for small 2 and 3 bedroom properties to be provided to ensure that there is a mix of units including smaller properties provided for market housing. Although the dwellings on plots 4-9 are indicated to be 3 bedrooms, they have been designed to enable the roof space to be converted to provide an additional 2 bedrooms and a bathroom in the roof. The dwellings indicated on Drawing No. 2001 Rev F shows these properties after the conversion of the roof space and the design and access statement states that they would have a floor area of 150m<sup>2</sup>.
- 10.21 The scale of these properties would not result in them being "small properties" as required by ULP policy H10 and the despite the application form indicating that there would be 3, 4, 5 and one x 6 bedroom dwellings on the site, the design and access statement indicates that all of the 3 or 4 bedroom properties would provide 5 bedroom accommodation with little or no conversion works required; the properties as converted are shown on the application drawings. The scale of the proposal therefore fails to comply with the requirements of ULP Policy H10.

## **11.0 CONCLUSION**

The following is a summary of the main reasons for the recommendation:

- A The proposal would not constitute sustainable development and would not be beneficial to the village and the wider area, it would therefore have a detrimental impact on the open and rural character of the surrounding countryside.
- B The proposal would fail to encourage movement by means other than driving a car.

- C The proposals would result in a standalone development which would have little relationship to the existing dwellings in the village, either through its form and layout or its physical location away from existing dwellings.
- D Subject to the developer entering into a S106 obligation to provide a financial contribution towards Early Years and Childcare provision, the proposal would comply with the requirements of ULP Policy GEN6. However if the application is refused, the failure to make adequate provision for Early Years and Childcare must be given as a reason for refusal.
- E The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on protected species.
- F The parking provision for the development would be acceptable.
- G No affordable housing provision is proposed as part of the application.
- H The proposal fails to include any small market housing.

## **RECOMMENDATION – REFUSAL**

1. The proposed development, in isolation, of only a small section of the SHLAA site known as QUE5 would not constitute sustainable development and would prejudice the ability to develop the remainder of the site in the future. The proposal would not provide any benefit to the village and wider area and there are no material considerations which would outweigh the policy objection to development in the countryside. The proposal is contrary to the NPPF and ULP Policy S7.
2. The proposed development would be located in an area with limited public transport options which would result in the occupiers of the dwellings having a reliance on the use of private cars contrary to the requirement of Criteria e) of ULP Policy GEN1.
3. The proposed development would be a standalone development which would have little relationship to the existing dwellings in the village, either through its form and layout or its physical location away from existing dwellings contrary to ULP Policy GEN2.
4. There is insufficient provision for Early Years and Childcare in the ward and this development would add to the need for this provision. The application provides no mechanism for addressing or mitigating the shortfall in the provision in the locality. It therefore fails to comply with Policy GEN6 of the Uttlesford Local Plan and the Essex Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions (Adopted as County Supplementary Guidance).
5. The proposal does not include the provision of any affordable housing contrary to ULP Policy H9.
6. The scale and form of the proposed dwellings has been designed to enable the 3 bedroom properties to be converted with little or no works to be 5 bedroom properties. This, in addition to the large floor area proposed for these properties, results in the proposal failing to provide any small market properties as required by ULP Policy H10.

## **11. PLANS**

The following plans are the subject of the recommendation above: 1001; 1002; 2001 Rev F; 2003