

UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF REPRESENTATIONS

16 December 2015

Item 4.1 UTT/15/2632/DFO – Land South Of Stansted Road, Elsenham

Public Comments:

We continue to object to this development for the following reasons:

- Traffic – it is already very difficult at times to drive off our driveway and it can only get a lot worse. People drive too fast as it is a long straight road and have no consideration of driving through a village. Numerous HGV's come thundering past our house and the road is not designed to take it. We have serious concerns about highway safety
- Inappropriate site – it is too close to the airport, train line and M11
- The Stansted Airport Countryside Protection Zone
- There are enough new developments in place in Elsenham now; this will lead to overdevelopment of our village
- Transport inadequate; old unreliable trains and limited bus service
- Insufficient amenities locally
- One overstretched GP practice
- Lack of places for school children
- If this development has to go ahead there should be more consideration for the house already on Stansted Road that will be massively affected
- The impact on our landscape
- Whilst there is no 'right to a view' its loss is not irrelevant to planning. The enjoyment of a view could be an important part of the residential amenity of a neighbouring property. Loss of a view from a public viewpoint can have a wider impact on a neighbourhood, and ought to be taken into account
- The development looks ugly, over-bearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity

Agent Additional Plot Information:

Revised Unit Number	House Type	Bedrooms	Floor Area (sqft)	Garden Size (sqm)	Parking Spaces	Tenure
86	4.2	4	1,550	163	4	Private
87	2.2	2	810	105	2	Private
88	2.2	2	810	68	2	Private
89	3.3	3	1,230	132	2	Private
90	4.3	4	1,690	272	4	Private
91	4.2	4	1,550	243	4	Private
92	4.3	4	1,690	224	4	Private
93	4.3	4	1,690	163	4	Private
94	4.2	4	1,550	149	4	Private
95	4.3	4	1,690	242	4	Private
96	4.1	4	1,510	195	4	Private
97	4.3	4	1,690	242	4	Private
98	3.3	3	1,230	143	2	Private
99	3.1	3	1,010	119	2	Private
100	3.1	3	1,010	107	2	Private
101	3.1	3	1,010	100	2	Private
102	3.3	3	1,230	101	2	Private
103	3.0	3	920	107	2	Affordable
104	3.0	3	920	102	2	Affordable
105	B2	2	622	104	2	Affordable
106	1.0 (GF)	1	460	52	1	Affordable
107	1.0 (FF)	1	560	52	1	Affordable
108	2.0	2	770	56	2	Affordable
109	2.0	2	770	54	2	Affordable
110	2.0	2	770	50	2	Affordable
111	2.0	2	770	50	2	Affordable
112	2.0	2	770	61	2	Affordable
113	3.2	3	1,143	117	2	Private
114	2.2	2	810	50	3	Private
115	2.2	2	810	85	2	Private
116	3.2	3	1,143	104	2	Private
117	4.2	4	1,550	122	4	Private
118	4.3	4	1,690	112	4	Private
119	3.1	3	1,010	114	2	Private
120	3.1	3	1,010	101	2	Private
121	4.3	4	1,690	131	4	Private
122	3.2	3	1,143	113	2	Private
123	3.2	3	1,143	110	2	Private
124	3.1	3	1,010	100	2	Private
125	2.2	2	810	83	2	Private
126	2.0	2	770	50	2	Affordable
127	2.0	2	770	58	2	Affordable
128	1.0 (GF)	1	460	67	1	Affordable
129	1.0 (FF)	1	560	67	1	Affordable
130	1.0 (GF)	1	460	51	1	Affordable
131	1.0 (FF)	1	560	51	1	Affordable
132	2.0	2	770	50	2	Affordable
133	2.0	2	770	51	2	Affordable
134	2.0	2	770	50	2	Affordable
135	2.0	2	770	50	2	Affordable
136	3.2	3	1,143	107	2	Private
137	3.2	3	1,143	102	2	Private
138	3.3	3	1,230	138	2	Private

139	2.2	2	810	80	2	Private
140	2.2	2	810	59	2	Private
141	2.2	2	810	105	2	Private
142	2.2	2	810	95	2	Private
143	3.1	3	1,010	118	2	Private
144	3.1	3	1,010	144	2	Private
145	2.2	2	810	144	2	Private
146	2.2	2	810	130	2	Private
147	B3	3	1,350	128	3	Private
148	2.1	2	784	61	3	Private
149	2.1	2	784	78	2	Private
150	4.0	4	1194	154	3	Affordable
151	2.0	2	770	87	2	Affordable
152	2.0	2	770	50	2	Affordable
153	2.0	2	770	51	2	Affordable
154	2.0	2	770	51	2	Affordable
155	2.0	2	770	50	2	Affordable
156	1.0 (GF)	1	460	77	1	Affordable
157	1.0 (FF)	1	560	77	1	Affordable
158	3.0	3	920	109	2	Affordable
159	3.0	3	920	108	2	Affordable
160	3.2	3	1,143	135	2	Private
161	3.2	3	1,143	133	2	Private
162	4.1	4	1,510	127	4	Private
163	4.2	4	1,550	188	4	Private
164	4.2	4	1,550	152	4	Private
165	4.2	4	1,550	222	4	Private
					Visitor	
			175,753			

Item 4.3 UTT/15/2764/FUL – Takeley Service Station, Dunmow Road, Takeley

Amendment to Officer Report:

The words “and forms half of” should be omitted from first line of paragraph 2.1

Paragraph 2.1 should read:

The site is brownfield land to the south of the B1256 (Dunmow Road) The site was formally occupied by the Little Chef and an Esso Petrol station. The site has been vacant for several years, the buildings demolished and the site has been enclosed by metal fencing to the frontage.

The site is within an area with a historic mixed residential and commercial use. To the rear of the site is the Flitch Way, a former railway line and now a bridle path which is now designated as a County Wildlife Site. The site has a green verge to the frontage. Two commercial width accesses are positioned in the northern boundary of the site opening onto the B1256 Dunmow Road.

Landscaping Officer Comments:

As part of the landscape scheme for the proposed development a native deciduous species hedge is sort to be provided along the Dunmow Road frontage of the site. The native species field maple, hawthorn, guelder rose, blackthorn, elder, and hazel can survive in relatively heavy partial shade. However, their successful establishment and their rate of growth will be reduced when planted against a north facing wall. Furthermore, the combination of a hedge

set in front of a 2m high wall is in itself somewhat incongruous. As previously advised I consider an appropriate secure enclosure of the site would be wire mesh paneled fencing and the planting of a double staggered row mix native species hedge to the outer side on the road frontage.

Note: If the hedge is planted on land forming part of the adopted highway a license to plant in the highway verge will be required from ECC.

Applicants Comments:

I would however like to point out that the comment from the Highway Authority that you quote is not relevant, since, as you agree, the proposed hedge, trees and brick wall are all located to the rear of the existing grass verge, and in no way encroach into it. Accordingly, there will be no enclosure of highway verge, no development on highway verge and no stopping up of highway verge. Accordingly there would be no removal of highway rights.

You explain that you will be recommending refusal of the application because we are proposing a front boundary wall (with planting), which you and the Landscape Officer consider to be out of character with the setting, (which is now a built up part of Takeley), and a "somewhat relentless feature". I would point out that with two vehicular openings, each of the 3 sections of the proposed wall would be about 25m 30m and 28m from east to west, not 90m in one unbroken frontage. You might also like to ponder the fact that both urban and rural roadside locations in the District do have a tradition of properties being enclosed by tall boundary walls. Firstly, you need only step outside the Council offices in Saffron Walden to see two such adjoining walls fronting the road, (with no mitigating landscaping), as I have shown in as the "Parking Wall" attachment below, which shows your own office car park behind a roadside screen wall, next to a tall boundary wall to the next property. Secondly, in a totally rural setting, as an example, is the boundary wall to Audley End Park, in the second attachment, which the following Listing description demonstrates to be 1120m long ! - clearly country estate boundary walls are considered important enough by Historic England to be designated as heritage assets, which presumably the Council would expect to see preserved, even though much longer than the wall we propose, which is of course at the request of the local community.

"S boundary wall to Audley End Park stretching along Audley End Road for 1120m from Lion Lodge (qv) to the edge of Saffron Walden. Early C17. Red brick with some yellow bricks, mainly English bond with some patches of garden wall bond. Inner face has a stretch of flint facing at W end. Height variable as it climbs the hill to the E. Plinth offset along the wall steps up to accommodate the hill but not always in phase with lifts at wall head. Central section up to approx 5.5m high but tapers down at E end and is stepped down at W. W end has brick-built, shaped coping with diagonal dentils, E end plain."

I would therefore ask you to consider, before reaching your conclusion on this application, whether you are really taking account of local traditions in the District of tall boundary walls, in urban, semi-urban or rural settings, (some of which are even designated heritage assets), when you reject the concept of a landscaped front wall in favour of an industrial style metal mesh fence that no-one local to the site actually wants. Furthermore, with the wall being proposed in a position 1m behind a deep verge, and to be screened by trees and a hedge, I would contend that it would be permitted development were there not a change of use / development application where the Council can require details of boundary treatment.

Finally, even if you are not persuaded by my argument, with local examples, I would ask you whether this is really a matter of such significance that officers should make a stand about it, against the local wishes that Weston Homes is seeking to accommodate, or if you consider

that it will be a good use of officer time to cause the submission of an appeal against the refusal, which as landowner we will pursue.

