

UTT/19/0904/OP (TAKELEY)

(Call-in request by Cllr Bagnell if approval recommendation).

Reason: 1. Access issues, 2. Significantly harmful to character and appearance of the area (CPZ), 3. Over-development of the site.

PROPOSAL: Outline planning application with all matters reserved except for access for erection of three detached dwellings (Self-Build).

LOCATION: Land West of The White House, Dunmow Road, Takeley.

APPLICANT: Mr Ian Boyes.

AGENT: Mr Fahim Farooqui.

EXPIRY DATE: 25 April 2019 (Extension of time agreed until 16 September 2020).

CASE OFFICER: Clive Theobald

1. NOTATION

- 1.1 Outside Developments / Within Countryside Protection Zone (part only) / TPO's listed for site (site boundaries).

2. DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 2.1 The site lies on the north side of the B1256 Dunmow Road to the immediate east of Gorefield and to the immediate west of The White House, a grade II listed building, and contains an overgrown and undeveloped rectangular and level parcel of land containing a pond in the south-east corner adjacent to the road. The site contains mature trees along its boundaries. Commercial units lie opposite the site. An unused 5 bar gate stands along the site frontage.

3. PROPOSAL

- 3.1 This outline application proposal relates to the erection three detached dwellings with all matters reserved except access. It is stated in the application that the dwellings would be constructed as self-build/custom build.
- 3.2 Revised indicative drawings were received by the Council in April 2020 showing a layout re-configuration of the dwellings for the site (drawings 001A and 002A). The dwellings would be served by a shared service road leading off Dunmow Road. No indicative elevations have been submitted for the proposed dwellings given the outline nature of the application.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 The proposal amounts to "Schedule 2" development (10. Infrastructure Projects - (b) Urban development projects...) for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Regulations) 2017. However, as the development proposal by reason of its nature, size or location (i) does not exceed 1 hectare of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development; (ii) does not exceed 150 dwellings and (iii) the overall area of the development does not exceed 5

hectares, the proposal is not EIA development and an environmental assessment is not required to assess the environmental impacts of the development whereby the site does not fall within a “sensitive area”.

5. APPLICANT’S CASE

5.1 The applicant’s submitted planning statement states the following in support of the planning proposal:

- The site lies just outside development limits, although this situation should not preclude planning permission from being granted in principle subject to other relevant planning criteria being met;
- Although the site lies partially within the CPZ, the site is not considered through the submitted LVIA to be a valued landscape, and is enclosed to its boundaries;
- The site lies within a low risk flood area (Flood Zone 1);
- The submitted preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) has demonstrated that the proposal would cause minimum risk to protected and priority species;
- The dwellings would be self-build/custom build meaning that there would be increased choice for the housing market where the government is encouraging this form of housing;
- The Council does not have a 5YHLS, which is a material consideration;
- Given the lack of a 5YHLS, the tilted planning balance is engaged;
- There would be a presumption in favour of sustainable development in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF.

5.2 The planning statement concludes as follows:

“In terms of the overall planning balance, the social, economic and environmental benefits of the proposed scheme are sufficient to outweigh any perceived adverse impacts by virtue of the site being outside development limits and within the Countryside Protection Zone”.

5.3 The application is also accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Leeming Associates Ltd, April 2019) and a Preliminary Ecology Appraisal (Applied Ecology Ltd, Oct 2018).

6. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

6.1 There have been various planning applications refused and dismissed at appeal for the residential development of this undeveloped site on Countryside Protection Grounds (Policy S8), the last application being refused in 2016 under ref; UTT/15/3264/FUL for the erection of 6 dwellings, when the planning inspector for the subsequent appeal remarked that;

“Although viewed in the context of the built development on the edge of Takeley, the appeal site is also viewed as being part of Smith’s Green and its semi-rural, loose knit and verdant setting. The appeal site therefore contributes to the gap in the street scene provided by Smith’s Green, which marks the transitions between the core of Takeley and Little Canfield. As such, I find that the open and undeveloped character of the site is important to the character and appearance of the area and its designation as part of the CPZ”.

The Inspector added,

“The development would significantly change the character of the site from an open, undeveloped and verdant parcel of land to one of terraced residential development, spanning much of the width of the site with associated hard landscaping. This would urbanise the site, harmfully undermining the site’s contribution to the CPZ designation”...”Thus the development of this site would harmfully erode the positive contribution the site currently makes to the character and appearance of the area”...”Nor would it retain the importance of the gap between the core of Takeley and the development in Little Canfield, which the appeal site is an important contributor to”.

- 6.2 It should be noted for that appeal that the Inspector commented that he was in receipt of documents that demonstrated on the available evidence that the Council could demonstrate a supply of housing covering more than five years, albeit that “the position may be border line” and therefore in the absence of substantive evidence from the appellant to the contrary that he had no reason to disagree with the Council’s most recent conclusion on the issue and that the significant weight he had afforded to the CPZ designation remained unaltered (paragraph 19).

7. POLICIES

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Uttlesford Local Plan (2005)

ULP Policy S7 – The Countryside
ULP Policy S8 – The Countryside Protection Zone
ULP Policy H1 – Housing Development
ULP Policy H10 – Housing Mix
ULP Policy ENV2 – Development affecting Listed Buildings
ULP Policy ENV3 – Open Spaces and Trees
ULP Policy GEN1 – Access
ULP Policy GEN2 – Design
ULP Policy GEN3 – Flood Protection
ULP Policy GEN7 – Nature Conservation
ULP Policy GEN8 – Vehicle Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance

SPD “Accessible Homes and Playspace”

Other Material Considerations

Essex Design Guide
ECC Parking Standards – “Design and Good Practice” (September 2009)
UDC Parking Standards (adopted February 2013)

8. PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS

- 8.1 (Revised comments dated 7 April 2020):

Takeley Parish Council do not have further comment, but would like to reiterate

what has already been submitted:

Takeley Parish Council object to this application for the following reasons:

1) There have been several planning applications made to develop the land to the west of the White House nearby along the Dunmow Road. These include:

UTT/14/0585/FUL

Land west of the White House, Dunmow Road
Erection of 4 no. 2 bed and 2 no. 3 bed terraced houses and 2 detached garages.

UTT/15/3264/FUL

Land to the west of the White House, Dunmow Road.
Erection of 6 no. dwellings.

These two applications were refused by Uttlesford District Council and subsequently rejected by the Planning Inspectorate: (APP/C1570/A/14/2225350) and (APP/C1570/W/16/3144380).

The following statements made by the Planning Inspector in the most recent appeal are worth noting:

‘The proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area resulting in a conflict with the development plan. The benefits that I have identified as material considerations are not sufficient to outweigh this conflict. As such, the development is not a sustainable development for which the Framework carries a presumption in favour.’

2) The Countryside Protection Zone

The Countryside Protection Zone (CPZ) surrounds Stansted Airport and has its origins in the 1984 report by Sir Graham Eyre QC who chaired the ‘Airport Inquiries’ (1981-83). In recommending approval for the airport, Eyre acknowledged the importance of the site’s open, countryside setting and described it as an ‘airport in the countryside’.

Based on Eyre’s vision, UDC consequently developed the CPZ planning policy to limit the physical size of the airport and to maintain it in the open countryside around the airport, reinforcing normal planning controls on development in the countryside. This policy was first adopted in the 1995 Local Plan.

The UDC Local Plan (adopted January 2005) made reference to the CPZ as follows:

‘The priority within this zone is to maintain a local belt of countryside around the airport that will not be eroded by coalescing settlements’.

The policy was referred to again in the withdrawn 2014 Draft Local Plan.

It is an essential part of the UDC Section 19 Draft Local Plan 2017 as Policy S8. The current extent of the CPZ relevant to this application is shown as Appendix 1.

In 2016 UDC commissioned Landscape Consultants Ltd, (LUC) to undertake an assessment of the CPZ, the aim of which was to assess the extent to which the land within it is meeting its purposes, as set out in Policy S8 of the UDC Local

Plan

(2005). This area of the CPZ is called Parcel 5 Smiths Green (Appendix 2) in their report and it should be noted that the application site is highlighted at the southern edge of the CPZ.

The LUC report stated:

‘that this area of the CPZ plays an essential role in preventing the merging of the narrow gap between the villages of Takeley and Little Canfield, and protecting the rural settlement pattern of Smith’s Green.’

On the evidence above the demonstrable harm that will be done by the development outweighs any benefits.

3) Access – There is no suitable access to the land and the development encroaches on a walk to school route, crossing a ditch system.

9. CONSULTATIONS

Essex County Council Highways

- 9.1 The impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority from a highway and transportation perspective subject to appropriate highway conditions.

Place Services Ecology

- 9.2 No objections subject to securing biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures.

Summary:

I have reviewed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (Applied Ecology Ltd., Oct 2018) supplied by the applicant relating to the likely impacts of development on Protected & Priority habitats and species, particularly Grass snakes. The report states that a small population of Grass snake are present on the development site; the mitigation has not yet been outlined. A Reptile Mitigation Strategy will need to be submitted in line with the governments standing advice on reptiles: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/reptiles-protection-surveys-and-licences>

I am satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination.

This provides certainty for the LPA of the likely impacts on Protected and Priority species and, with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable. I support the reasonable biodiversity enhancements that should also be secured by a condition on any consent.

This will enable the LPA to demonstrate its compliance with its statutory duties including its biodiversity duty under s40 NERC Act 2006.

The mitigation measures identified in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (Applied Ecology Ltd., Oct 2018) should be secured and implemented in full. This is necessary to conserve and enhance Protected and Priority Species.

Impacts will be minimised such that the proposal is acceptable subject to the conditions below based on BS42020:2013. In terms of biodiversity net gain, the enhancements proposed will contribute to this aim.

Submission for approval and implementation of the details should be a condition of any planning consent (as recommended).

NATS Safeguarding

- 9.3 The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with NATS safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.

MAG London Stansted Airport

- 9.4 The Safeguarding Authority for Stansted Airport has assessed this proposal and its potential to conflict aerodrome Safeguarding criteria. We have no aerodrome safeguarding objections to the proposal in principle subject to the following Conditions:

- No development to take place until details of SuDs and landscaping are submitted for approval to the LPA in consultation with the aerodrome Safeguarding Authority for Stansted Airport.

Reason: to ensure that no development takes place that will increase the risk of Birdstrike to aircraft using Stansted Airport.

- No development to take place until design details of the dwellings are submitted for approval to the LPA in consultation with the aerodrome Safeguarding Authority for Stansted Airport. The details must include the heights of the dwellings Above Ordnance Datum.

Reason: to ensure that the aerodrome protected surfaces of Stansted Airport are not compromised.

It is important that any conditions in this response are applied to a planning approval. Where a Planning Authority proposes to grant permission against the advice of Stansted Airport, or not attach conditions which Stansted Airport has advised, it shall notify Stansted Airport, and the Civil Aviation Authority as specified in the Town & Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosive Storage Areas) Direction 2002.

10. REPRESENTATIONS

- 10.1 12 representations received (2 Support, 10 Object). Neighbour notification period expires 16 April 2020 (revised notification, Advertisement expires 23 May 2019, site notice expires 6 June 2019).

- 10.2 Summary of representations received as follows:

Support:

- The land at present is an unkempt piece of land which has been the subject of fly-tipping and which serves no amenity purpose, nor has any

intrinsic value.

- Current proposal and layout is far more acceptable and in keeping with the character and built form of the surrounding area.

Object:

- Housing on this undeveloped site partly in the CPZ should not be supported in principle.
- Would lead to loss of one of Takeley's last remaining small green spaces.
- Would lead to loss of natural habitats and wildlife.
- New vehicular access into the site would present a danger to school-children crossing it along the footpath along the B1256.
- Impact on the setting of the adjacent listed building.
- Loss of neighbouring residential amenity
- Loss of rights to light
- Loss of property values
- Development would pose a security risk.

11. APPRAISAL

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

- A Principle of development having regard to sustainability principles, countryside protection (including CPZ), flood risk, heritage protection and the Council's lack of a 5YHLS (NPPF, ULP Policies S7, S8, GEN3, ENV2 and H1).
- B Whether access arrangements would be acceptable (ULP Policy GEN1).
- C Design (ULP Policies GEN2 and GEN8).
- D Impact on protected species (ULP Policy GEN7).
- E Impact on trees (ULP Policy ENV3).

A Principle of development having regard to sustainability principles, countryside protection (including CPZ), flood risk, heritage protection and the Council's lack of a 5YHLS (NPPF, ULP Policies S7, S8, GEN3, ENV2 and H1).

- 11.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the determination of an application for planning permission must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The relevant part of the Development Plan comprises the Uttlesford Local Plan, adopted in 2005.
- 11.2 Paragraph 11 of The NPPF states that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development, adding that for decision making purposes this means...(c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or (d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date granting permission unless (i) the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed, or (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.
- 11.3 The site lies on the outside edge of the defined development limits for Takeley along the northern side of Dunmow Road and is partially within the Countryside

Protection Zone as shown on the Proposals Map for the adopted Local Plan (approximately two thirds). A housing estate exists to the immediate north, with Gorefield running along its eastern flank boundary, whilst the residential properties Sunnyside and The White House frame the site to the immediate east before Smith's Green. Mature vegetation exists along the frontage boundary of the site whereby the interior of the site is heavily screened from Dunmow Road. ULP Policies S7 and S8 therefore apply to the proposal.

- 11.4 It is acknowledged that there has been a previous history of planning refusals for housing on this site, including appeal decisions, involving a higher number of dwellings than proposed for the current application whereby Inspectors have acknowledged the importance that the site contributes as a green undeveloped gap between the existing housing estate to the immediate north and west and Smiths Green to the west, the most recent appeal decision being made in 2016 for the erection of six dwellings shown as three linked pairs of semi-detached dwellings with extensive frontage hard surface parking (UTT/15/3264/FUL)
- 11.5 The proposed housing proposal the subject of the current application is in contrast a small housing scheme comprising just three dwellings, albeit that the size, scale and appearance of the dwellings are not shown given the application is submitted in outline form only whereby these matters would be able to be determined more properly at reserved matters stage, including ridge heights etc. A material planning consideration which did not exist at the time of the 2016 refused application is that the Council no longer has a five year housing land supply (2.68 years at last projectory calculation) whereby ULP Policy H1 is now out of date when set against the NPPF, and this is a relevant and material planning consideration for the planning merits of the current application.
- 11.6 The site lies within a sustainable position within walking distance to local services and amenities, including the frontage shops and Post Office towards The Four Ashes corner whereby this view was held by the 2016 appeals inspector for this site (paragraph 22). Whilst the comments from various previous appeal inspectors remain valid for the purposes of consideration of the protection of the CPZ, the lack of the Council's 5YHLS and the site's sustainable location means that the tilted planning balance is engaged and there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development for the purposes of paragraph 11d) of the NPPF where it is argued that the benefits of the proposal, including the supply of housing, outweigh the adverse impacts of allowing the development.
- 11.7 It is further argued that the harm to the openness of the CPZ at this enclosed road frontage location which is "bookended" on its eastern flank boundary by frontage residential properties would not be significant or demonstrable in the planning balance for the purposes of consideration and application of ULP Policy S8 to the proposal, or indeed for the purposes of ULP Policy S7, which is partially consistent with the provisions of the NPPF.
- 11.8 The site lies within the lowest risk of fluvial flooding for the purposes of flood protection, namely Flood Zone 1, and the proposed development is therefore unlikely to be vulnerable to flooding in this regard. No objections are therefore raised under ULP Policy GEN3.
- 11.9 The site lies within close proximity of The White House, which is a grade II listed building lying further along Dunmow Road to the east and which is described within the statutory list as:

TAKELEY SMITH'S GREEN 1. 5222 (west side) White Rouse TL 52 SE 9/55 II GV 2. C17 house, timber framed and plastered with red plain tile hipped roof. Two storeys. L-shaped plan. Two window range, C18 double hung vertical sliding sashes with glazing bars. East front has 3 window range, modern casements, and modern lean-to extension. C17 red brick chimney stack.

- 11.10 Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing the optimum viable use”. Due consideration therefore has to be given as to whether the proposal would be harmful to its setting.
- 11.11 The current proposal is submitted in outline form only, which shows three detached dwellings sited within good sized grounds. The eastern flank boundary of the site is vegetated, meaning that there is a reasonably strong visible and physical demarcation between the application site and The White House. It should be noted in this respect that the inspector commenting on the 2016 appeal decision for six dwellings at the site (UTT/15/3264/FUL) remarked that he shared the view of the applicant and the Council that the development would preserve the setting of the adjoining listed building (paragraph 23).
- 11.12 It is considered from the above assessment that no heritage objections can be reasonably raised in principle to the current outline proposal on heritage impact grounds, although it would be necessary at any reserved matters stage should planning permission be granted in principle for appropriate and sensitive treatment to be afforded to the design of the dwellings so that the setting of the listed building can be preserved.

B Whether access arrangements would be acceptable (ULP Policy GEN1).

- 11.13 The proposed housing scheme would be served by a shared access road which would lead off the B1256, which is a classified road. Sight lines along the B1256 outside the site in each direction are good given the straight alignment of the carriageway.
- 11.14 Access falls to be considered with this application in principle. The proposed access arrangements have been assessed by ECC Highways who have not raised any highway objections subject to the sight visibility splays taking into account, and being achievable, for pedestrians and cyclists using this section of public footpath in each direction from the access. No objections are therefore raised to the proposal under under ULP Policy GEN1.

C Design (ULP Policies GEN2 and GEN8).

- 11.15 Matters relating to scale, layout, appearance and landscaping are reserved matters and do not therefore fall to be considered for the current outline application. However, the indicative drawings submitted with the application show that three dwellings could be sited comfortably within the site with good spacing distance between the dwellings, whilst each dwelling is shown with a good sized garden plot exceeding 100sqm and with four on-plot parking spaces. No design objections are therefore raised to the proposal under ULP Policies GEN2 and GEN8.

D Impact on protected species (ULP Policy GEN7).

- 11.16 The site comprises an overgrown parcel of land which contains scrub and other self-seeded vegetation within its interior. Place Services have reviewed the PEA submitted by the applicants and are satisfied that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on protected or priority species providing that a reptile survey is conducted for any reserved matters application so that the extent of reptile presence or absence at the site, including Grass snakes, can be properly identified and appropriately mitigated through conditions. No objections are therefore raised under ULP Policy GEN7.

E Impact on trees (ULP Policy ENV3).

- 11.17 The site perimeter would appear to contain some trees which are subject to a TPO. However, a detailed layout scheme for the site would be able to identify such trees, if they still exist, and for appropriate tree protection to be afforded (ULP Policy ENV3).

12. CONCLUSION

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

- A** The proposed development is considered acceptable in principle.
- B** Proposed access arrangements are considered acceptable.
- C** The indicative drawings show that three dwellings could be satisfactorily accommodated on the site in terms of design and layout.
- D** The proposal would not be harmful to nature conservation subject to appropriate mitigation conditions.
- E** Any impacts on any TPO trees can be addressed through a detailed layout scheme for the site.

RECOMMENDATION – APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

Conditions

1. Approval of the details of scale, layout, appearance and landscaping (hereafter called "the Reserved Matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before development commences and the development shall be carried out as approved.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Application for approval of the Reserved Matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be begun no later than the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the Reserved Matters to be approved.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

4. Prior to the first use of the vehicular access to the development, cycle visibility splays of 2m x 17m, as measured from and along the edge of the shared cycleway/footway, shall be provided. Such visibility splays shall thereafter be retained free of any obstruction at all times.

REASON: To provide adequate inter-visibility between the users of the access and cyclists in the adjoining highway in the interest of highway safety in accordance with ULP Policy GEN1 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (adopted 2005).

5. Prior to the occupation of any of the proposed dwellings, the proposed private drive shall be constructed to a width of 5.5 metres for at least the first 6 metres from the back of highway boundary and provided with an appropriate dropped kerb crossing of the footway/cycleway.

REASON: To ensure that vehicles can enter and leave the highway in a controlled manner and to ensure that opposing vehicles can pass clear of the limits of the highway in the interests of highway safety in accordance with ULP Policy GEN1 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (adopted 2005).

6. Any gates provided at the vehicular access shall be inward opening only and shall be set back a minimum of 6 metres from the back edge of the footway / cycleway.

REASON: To enable vehicles using the access to stand clear of the carriageway whilst gates are being opened and closed in the interest of highway safety in accordance with ULP Policy GEN1 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (adopted 2005).

7. All of the dwellings approved by this permission shall be built to Category 2: Accessible and adaptable dwellings M4(2) of the Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document M, Volume 1 2015 edition.

REASON: To ensure compliance with ULP Policy GEN2 (c) of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005 and the Council's adopted SPD "Accessible Homes and Playspace".

8. All ecological mitigation & enhancement measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (Applied Ecology Ltd., Oct 2018) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.

This includes due diligence regarding nesting birds, retention and enhancement of boundary trees/hedges, bat sensitive lighting and the installation of bat/bird boxes.

REASON: To conserve and enhance Protected and Priority species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the UK Habitats Regulations, the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as amended and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species) and s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998 in accordance with ULP Policy GEN7 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (adopted 2005).

9. A Reptile Mitigation Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the

local planning authority concurrent with any reserved matters application.
The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

REASON: To conserve and enhance Protected and Priority species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the UK Habitats Regulations, the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as amended and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species) and s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998 in accordance with ULP Policy GEN7 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (adopted 2005).

10. No development shall take place until details of SuDs and landscaping are submitted for approval to the LPA in consultation with the aerodrome Safeguarding Authority for Stansted Airport.

REASON: To ensure that no development takes place that will increase the risk of Birdstrike to aircraft using Stansted Airport in accordance with ULP Policy GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (adopted 2005).

11. No development shall take place until design details of the dwellings are submitted for approval to the LPA in consultation with the aerodrome Safeguarding Authority for Stansted Airport. The details must include the heights of the dwellings Above Ordnance Datum.

REASON: To ensure that the aerodrome protected surfaces of Stansted Airport are not compromised in accordance with ULP Policy GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (adopted 2005).