

KMBC-Planning

1st Floor Suite, Pretloves Building, Station Road,
Great Chesterford, Essex. CB10 1NY.

Tele 01799-530097 Fax 01799-530980

email: katherine@km-bc.co.uk

Mr C. Theobald
Planning dept.,
Uttlesford D.C.,
Council Offices,
London Road,
Saffron Walden,
Essex.
CB11 4ER.

Your ref: UTT/12/6006/OP

23rd January 2013

Dear Clive

Outline application for two dwellings with all matters reserved apart from means of access at Land to rear of 'Geldards', High Street, Great Chesterford

Please see our comments in response to the local objections.

1. The reference to '*backland*' development by the Parish Council is misleading as this term is generally used to describe a development for which the only access to the highway is between existing buildings, however this proposal seeks access via Rose Lane not between existing buildings from the High Street.
2. LPA must assess every application they receive against national and local policies. Without a five year land supply the LPA must assess the application in accordance with the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' policy. The site is in a sustainable location, being close to Great Chesterford's services, it is not in open countryside. The development site is part of the garden of 'Geldards', and is screened on all boundaries, the accompanying Landscape Strategy, by an independent specialist, clearly states '*This development will have minimal impact on the local character, and will be visually read as part of the existing development of dwellings*' and therefore is not considered to erode the character of Great Chesterford.
3. The assertion by Parish Council that '*access relying on third party land is not acceptable and creates unsatisfactory living arrangements...*' is incorrect. Discussions have taken place between land owners and we can confirm the correct

notice has been served on the adjacent land owner. Tellingly the land owner has not objected to the application.

4. The Parish Council suggest the development is '*inefficient use of land*' however the proposal takes account of the local constraints, including the access, loss of residential amenity and landscape features on-site. The density of 6dph ensures the development is in keeping and is compatible with surrounding properties and reduces any possible adverse impacts. Significantly, a lower density than proposed on this site was considered acceptable on the adjacent site.
5. In terms of the site technically being outside development limits, it is adjacent to the boundary, not in 'open countryside' and there are a number of planning precedents for permission given to smaller schemes for 1 or 2 dwellings adjacent to development limits similar to this scheme including The Delles (UTT/1615/12/FL), Rose Lane (UTT/0742/12/OP) and Pigots Mill (UTT/1353/11/FL).
6. Significantly there are no policies, either locally or nationally, that state how much the proposal should contribute to the supply, each application should be considered on its own merits in accordance with the NPPF.
7. We agreed with the parish council that additional housing should be fairly assessed. It was considered by both the planning officer and planning committee that the development on the adjacent site was considered acceptable, to be assessed fairly the same reasoning should be applied to the determination of this proposal.
8. Significantly, there are no highway objections to the development.
9. The proposed access was considered acceptable in the determination of UTT/0742/12/OP, there has been no change to the material planning considerations since this determination.
10. Anticipated the development would lead to an additional 6 cars accessing Rose Lane, equating to 12 vehicular movements daily, which does not materially increase traffic movements on Rose Lane.
11. We note the residents' concerns regarding construction traffic and we are happy for similar conditions to those applied on UTT/0742/12/OP to be included.

Yours Sincerely

Katherine Munro BSc MSc MRTPI