

Agenda Item No: 4

**Title: MATTER REFERRED FROM DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
SUB-COMMITTEE**

Author: John Grayson (01799) 510455

Summary

- 1 This report deals with an application referred for decision by the Sub-Committee at their meeting on 21 May 2001 relating to the proposed erection of a dwelling at Gt Easton by the District Council. It is contrary to Development Plan Policies and the agreed delegation scheme prevents the Sub-Committee from refusing District Council applications. The Sub-Committee agreed with the Officers' recommendation that the application be refused.

Background

- 2 House, garage and access on land between 4 & 5 School Villas, Gt Easton for Mr D Demery, Uttlesford District Council (UTT/0156/01/DC).
- 3 A copy of the report to the Sub-Committee is attached for Members' information. It details the proposal and sets out the material planning considerations.
- 4 No supporting arguments have been submitted to justify a departure from the Development Plan in this case.

RECOMMENDED that planning permission be refused for the reasons listed in the attached report.

Background Papers: Application file 0156/01/DC.

(District Council Proposal)

Outline application for erection of house and detached garage. Creation of new access. Land between 4 & 5 School Villas, Great Easton. GR: 611-256. Mr D Demery. Uttlesford District Council.

Case Officer: Michael Ovenden on (01799) 510476

Expiry Date: 30 March

NOTATION: Outside Development Limit

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL: The site lies on the east side of the main Thaxted-Dunmow Road (B184) at the northern end of the village approximately equidistant between the P&A Wood garage and the primary school, almost opposite the junction of the road to Mill End Green. The site is set back from the road behind a wide verge and footway, which is wide enough to be used by vehicles. This and adjacent sites are raised above the level of the highway.

This site measures 19m at the frontage, narrowing to 14m at the rear, is just over 30m deep, and forms part of the gardens to two Council houses. The gap between the dwellings to each side is approximately 27m. The dwellings to each side are a pair of modest C20th semi-detached rendered and slate roofed dwellings. This application is made at outline with all matters reserved, although an indicative site plan has been submitted showing a dwelling with a footprint of 6 x 10m and a double garage sited forward of the house measuring 5msq. Whilst access is a reserved matter, apart from its precise location, the point of access is largely determined by the site boundaries and the location of the public highway.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Application for dwelling on a narrower site (15.5 m frontage) refused 1986 on grounds of suburbanisation.

CONSULTATIONS: ECC Transportation: No objections subject to provision of turning facilities.

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: The Parish Council would like to support the tenants who are living in these dwellings and oppose the application on grounds of infill and possible dangerous access for an increase in vehicles on a sweeping bend. As well as the obvious

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: (continued)

fact that these people do not want to give up their gardens which they have enjoyed for so many years.

REPRESENTATIONS: 3 letters received. Notification period expired 15 March. Object. It would interrupt the visual flow along one string of these houses. It would also 'crowd' the ribbon. It would destroy the amenity represented by two well-tended gardens. Traffic accidents. Consequently this objection is on highway grounds. Great Easton Village Inset para. 5.3 declares the area "*along the B184 main road to the East*" as generally inappropriate for further consolidation of the existing loose scatter of development. Traffic still goes very fast both ways. Dangerous to pull in and out. Problems with sewerage system. Gt Easton school has a lot of coaches and parents cars and it is about to grow in size, which will increase traffic even more.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issues are whether

- 1) the site can be considered to be an acceptable infill plot under DP Policy H6 [ESP Policy BE1] and if so,

2) whether it could be satisfactorily developed without prejudice to the existing character and appearance, other environmental issues and road safety or convenience (DP Policy T1) [ESP Policy T4].

1) At 19m in width, the site would be larger than the land which would be retained by 5 or 4 School Villas, significantly so in the case of the latter. The gap between existing dwellings is 28m. For these reasons it is considered that this site is not an acceptable infill plot.

2) The erection of a dwelling and garage as shown on the block plan would be out of character with adjacent dwellings and consolidate the grain of development. This would result in a change in the character of the area. If permission was to be granted in this case future proposals for dwellings between no. 2 & 3 School Villas and to the south of no. 1 could be difficult to refuse, further compounding the suburbanisation of this rural area.

Although the ECC Transportation do not object, it is considered that the proposal would raise highway dangers on the inside of this bend, opposite to the turn to Lindsell.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposal fails to comply with Policies H6 and T1.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL REASONS TO P & D COMMITTEE

1. R.6. Contrary to Policy H6: Unsuitable site for infill development. Consolidation of loosely-knit rural character. Precedent.
2. R.17. Contrary to Policy T1: Highway dangers.

Agenda Item No: 6

Title: 2000/01 PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT

Author: Adrienne Dellow (01799) 510311

Summary

- 1 This budget monitoring report considers the provisional outturn for 2000/01 against the 2000/01 Revised Budget, based on financial information as at 9 May 2001 before closing the accounts. A further updated report on the overall position will be presented to the Policy and Resources Committee on 19 June 2001. Work to close the accounts will continue through the summer and the statement of accounts will be presented to the meeting of the Resources Committee on 20 September 2001.

Basis of the Report

- 2 The report is based on data within the Council's Financial Management System to 9 May 2001. Directors and Heads of Service have been asked if they are aware of any significant variations, including any that may not be in the figures produced to date.
- 3 The table in the attached Appendix 1 to this report shows the following data;
 - 2000/01 Revised Budget (adjusted for previously approved virements)
 - 2000/01 Profiled Budget (adjusted for year end postings)
 - 2000/01 Expenditure to the 9 May 2001 including accruals to date
 - 2000/01 Expenditure expressed as a % of the 2000/01 Profiled Budget
 - Notes to explain any apparent discrepancies

Analysis of Variations

- 4 The figures represent a provisional picture of the 2000/01 expenditure before all year-end adjustments and checks have been completed. The details in the table attached show a number of small variations from the revised estimate. The most significant of these is on Development Control where there is an overspend, mainly relating to the cost of appeals, of £11,000, with fee income slightly down, at £8,000 below the revised estimate. Members will recall that the estimate for Development Control Fee income had been increased from £260,000 to £360,000 to reflect the marked growth in income from the previous year.
- 5 However, the final position for Building Control and the Industrial Estate, coupled with reduced expenditure relating to the production of the District Plan, produces a net result, which is relatively neutral. Although year-end adjustments are still being made, this Committee's direct budgets are not expected to be significantly under or overspent overall.

