



PLANNING APPLICATIONS WEEKLY LIST NO.1657
Week Ending 17th March 2023

NOTE:

- (i). Decision Notices will be issued in accordance with the following recommendations unless **ANY MEMBER** wishes to refer any application to the Development Committee on the 18.04.2023

- (ii). Notification of any application that is to be referred must be received no later than 1:00pm on Wednesday **22nd March 2023** this needs to include the application number, address and the planning reasons for the referral via email to the Corporate Services Officers Corporate.Services@rochford.gov.uk .If an application is referred close to the 1.00pm deadline it may be prudent for a Member to telephone Corporate Services to ensure that the referral has been received prior to the deadline.

- (iii) Any request for further information regarding applications must be sent to Corporate Services via email.

Note

Do ensure that, if you request a proposal to go before Committee rather than be determined through officer delegation following a Weekly List report, you discuss your planning reasons with Phil Drane, Director of Place. A planning officer will then set out these planning reasons in the report to the Committee.

Index of planning applications: -

1. 23/00034/FUL - Burtons Farm Barling Road Barling Magna pages 2-23
2. 22/01198/FUL - Arterial Park Chelmsford Road Rayleigh pages 24 - 31

Application No :	23/00034/FUL Zoning : MGB
Case Officer	Mr Richard Kilbourne
Parish :	Barling Magna Parish Council
Ward :	Roche South
Location :	Burtons Farm Barling Road Barling Magna
Proposal :	Demolish existing Burtons farm dwelling and Burtons farm lodge and erect detached dwelling house. Resubmission of 22/00378/FUL.

SITE AND PROPOSAL

1. The application site is located to the south-eastern side of Barling Road and is set outside the settlement limits of Great Wakering and within the Green Belt. The host property is located within a substantial plot, orientated to the east and is accessed via a long driveway with a large garden space to the rear of the property. There is also a building to the south known as Burtons Farm Lodge.
2. The site is relatively secluded with limited views into the site from Barling Road contained by vegetation along the north and western boundaries. The property also includes adjacent neighbours of Burtons Barn to the south and Splett Butchers to the south-east of the property. Burtons Farm and Burtons Farm Lodge share similar architectural styles and designs with a tile and felted roof and pale, rendered walls and the gabled walls have tile cladding. As documented by the extensive planning history and visible street scene there is evidence of alterations and extensions to the existing dwelling and surrounding properties.
3. The proposal is for the demolition of existing Burtons farm dwelling and Burtons farm lodge and the erection of a detached 4 bed dwelling house.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4. There is an extensive planning history at the application site: -

Planning Application	Proposal	Decision
88/1009/ROC	First floor side extension and detached garage	Refused
90/201/ROC	Continue use of farm shop and ancillary use	Refused – Allowed following appeal
93/177/ROC	Change of use of redundant building to restaurant with layout	Refuse

	parking	
93/569/ROC	Change of use of redundant building to restaurant with layout parking	Refuse
96/00186/COU	Change of use of redundant agricultural barn to restaurant with associated car parking	Permitted
98/00205/LDC	Occupation of dwelling without compliance of No,3 75/3/ROC Agricultural tie	Permitted
00/00244/FUL	Convert Farm building in single dwelling	Refused
00/00729/FUL	Change of use of existing farm building to dwelling erected detached double garage	Refused
01/00259/FUL	Change of use of existing farm building to dwelling with integral garage	Permitted
02/00172/FUL	Change of use of existing farm building to dwelling	Permitted
04/00735/COU	Change of use of existing butcher shop with ancillary use and first floor accommodation for residential use	Refused
07/0009/COU	Remodel the existing building to create two business units, and reposition existing shop an include existing first floor residential to create one shop	Permitted
17/00658/LDC	Existing use LDC for erection of sheds, greenhouse, raised planting bed, layout paving and use of land as domestic garden	Permitted
20/01081/LDC	Proposed single storey rear extension and side extension half the width of the host dwelling	Grant Lawful Development Certificate
20/01089/DPDP1	Householder prior approval for single storey rear extension, projecting 8m from original rear wall, eaves height 2.4m, maximum height 4m.	Prior Approval Granted
21/00337/FUL	Demolish existing outbuilding bungalow and	Permitted

	erect front, side and rear extensions	
21/01153/FUL	Demolish existing outbuilding bungalow and erect single storey, front, side and rear extensions	Approved
22/00378/FUL	Demolish existing Burtons farm dwelling and Burtons farm lodge and erect detached 4 bed dwelling house	Approved

Background Information

- As previously stated, this is a resubmission of planning application 22/00378/FUL which was approved on the 31st August 2022. The applicant is proposing to make some relatively minor alterations to the approved plans, which include the introduction of a portico on the front elevation, a 2m high boundary wall and the insertion of additional fenestration. All of these matters will be discussed in further detail below.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- The proposed development must be assessed against relevant planning policy and with regard to any other material planning considerations. In determining this application regard must be had to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- The relevant parts of the adopted Development Plan are the Rochford District Core Strategy (2011), the Allocations Plan (2014) and the Development Management Plan (2014).

Principle of Development

- The latest version of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') was revised on the 20th of July 2021. Like earlier versions it emphasises that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, through three overarching objectives – economic, social and environmental. It makes it plain that planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area. The revision increased the focus on design quality, not only for sites individually but for places as a whole.

9. To ensure that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the Framework. Paragraph 11 of the Framework explains that for decision-taking this means, firstly, approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay. If there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, then planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the Framework (rather than those in development plans) that protect areas (which includes habitat sites and/or land designated as Green Belt) or assets of particular importance, provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Green Belt considerations

10. Within Rochford District Council's adopted Core Strategy, it is explained that the term 'Green Belt' refers to a planning designation and is not necessarily a description of the quality of the land and therefore land which is allocated as Green Belt can include both previously developed land and brownfield sites. It is detailed within Policy GB1 of the Core Strategy that the Council will direct development away from the Green Belt as far as practicable but where proposed development would encroach upon the Green Belt the protection of land would be prioritised based on how well the land helps achieve the purposes of the Green Belt, as mentioned above.
11. Policy GB2 of the Core Strategy however, states that the Council will maintain a restrictive approach to development within the Green Belt, but that this view would be relaxed in relation to proposals relating to rural diversification. Within this Policy it is deemed that retail and residential development are not considered acceptable forms of rural diversification within the Green Belt. This is largely due to the issues of sustainability of such uses within rural locations, which are relatively cut off from required surrounding facilities.
12. This is supported by the NPPF, in which it is stated that when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channeling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the greater Green Belt Boundary.

13. It is stated within Rochford District Council's Development Management Plan that redevelopment of previously developed land in the Green Belt to residential, retail or other uses which are more appropriately located in town centres (e.g. office, commercial, leisure and community uses) are not generally supported. Residential development should primarily be directed towards the District's defined residential settlements; sporadic development that is poorly related to existing development, services and facilities can negatively impact upon sustainability.
14. As previously stated, both policies GB1 and GB2 of the Core Strategy seek to direct development away from the Green Belt as far as practicable and prioritise the protection of the Green Belt based on how well the land helps achieve the purposes of the Green Belt, whilst allowing rural diversification in appropriate circumstances. Both policies pre-date the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) but can still attract weight in proportion to their consistency with the NPPF. These policies reflect the aims of those parts of the NPPF which seek to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development. However, they do not reflect the exceptions listed within the NPPF which would also be a material consideration.
15. Consequently, the main issues are:
- o Whether the proposed development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the Framework and the Development Plan;
 - o The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt; and
 - o If the proposal is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances needed to justify it.
16. As previously stated, the application site is located wholly within the Metropolitan Green Belt and according to para 137 of the NPPF states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Para. 138 repeats the five purposes of the Green Belt, which include:
- i) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
 - ii) To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
 - iii) To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
 - iv) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;
- and

- v) To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

17. Paragraph 148 goes on to explain that when considering any planning application, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt, and that “very special circumstances” will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

18. Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that “A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- a) Buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) The provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c) The extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) Limited infilling in villages;
- f) Limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including for rural exception sites) and;
- g) Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- Not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
- Not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

19. By virtue of paragraph 149 of the NPPF the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, subject to certain exceptions. These exceptions include allowance, subject where appropriate to certain criteria being satisfied, for new buildings, limited infilling in villages, and limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (PDL). As previously stated, the proposal involves the demolition of the Burtons

farm dwelling and Burton's farm lodge and the erection of a detached 4 bedroomed dwelling house. Consequently, the proposal will be assessed against exceptions (d) and (g) of para 149 of the NPPF. It is considered that the remaining exceptions a) to c) and e) and f) do not apply in this instance.

20. Paragraph 150 of the NPPF also lists certain other forms of development which are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. It is considered that the proposed development would not fall under any of these exceptions listed.
21. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The applicant must therefore demonstrate that very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm to Green Belt openness and any other harm for the Council to be able to grant planning permission for the proposal. In making those judgments, it is relevant to assess both the extent of harm caused, and then the nature of the very special circumstances that exist to outweigh that harm. It is well-established that very special circumstances may arise by reason of cumulative factors, even if those factors are not "very special circumstances" in their own right.
22. These very special circumstances are dealt with in detail in the applicants Planning Statement and include the following:
- o The 'permitted development' (PD) fallback position. PD extensions to the existing dwelling have been granted through a Lawful Development Certificate (ref: 20/01081/LDC) and a prior approval determination (ref: 20/01089/DPDP1). Additionally, extensions approved under 21/01153/FUL, which was for the demolition of the existing outbuilding bungalow and to erect single storey, front, side and rear extensions. Furthermore, the principle of the erection of a new dwellinghouse at this site has already been approved under application 22/00378/FUL there is no substantive increase in footprint/volume.

Assessment against Exception (d)

23. The proposed development will be assessed against exception (d) of para. 149 of the NPPF, which states that "*The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces*". According to the submitted plans/supporting documents the proposal is to demolish the existing farmhouse and erect a larger residential property in its place. It is considered that the proposal complies with the first limb of the

exception – *“The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use”*.

24. However, in relation in the second limb of exception (d) which states *“and not materially larger than the one it replaces”* the existing house has a footprint of approximately 103m², and the first-floor area measures 70m², which taken cumulatively equates to 173m². According to the submitted plans the current proposal has a total floor area of 322m². Therefore, it is considered that the proposed dwellinghouse will be materially larger than the property which it is replacing. Consequently, given the factors cited above, it is considered that the proposal does not accord with criterion (d) of paragraph 149 of the NPPF.

Exception (g)

25. There is no definition of ‘limited infilling’ within the NPPF, but infilling is commonly understood to mean development within a built-up frontage. The proposed site is currently occupied in part by the existing farmhouse which has an elongated footprint, and the side elevation of this property faces Barling Road. There is a distance of approximately 8.5m separating the road from the side elevation. Located directly to the south of the Farmhouse is the bungalow (known as ‘Burtons Lodge’), which is also the subject of this application. To the east of both of these dwellinghouses is an extensive area of hardstanding, with private amenity located towards the rear.

26. The site could not be said to lie in a built-up area but is rather a small enclave of properties. There is a small residential estate located approximately 75m to the west and other dwellings are sporadically located along Barling Road. The application site (apart from the properties immediately to the south) is flanked on all sides by open fields, which is intersected by Barling Road.

27. Consequently, it is considered that the positioning of the proposed dwelling would leave substantial tracts of undeveloped frontage to both the east and west of the application site. As such the proposal cannot be said to be ‘limited infilling’ and the proposal fails to comply with exception g).

Very Special Circumstances

28. Policy DM21 of the Development Management Plan states that replacement or rebuild of existing dwellings in the Green Belt will be permitted, taking into consideration:

- (i) The total size of the dwelling should result in no more than a 25% increase in floorspace of the original dwelling;
- (ii) The condition of the original dwelling (derelict or abandoned properties are not considered part of the housing stock, and therefore permission will not be granted for their redevelopment for housing);
- (iii) The visual mass and bulk of the new dwelling should not be significantly larger than that of the existing dwelling (taking into consideration any additional mass allowed for in respect of criterion (i) above). The overall height of the replacement dwelling should not exceed that of the existing dwelling, unless a modest increase in height can be justified on design or visual amenity grounds. Where the existing dwelling is a bungalow, it should be replaced by a bungalow; and
- (iv) The proposed siting of the replacement dwelling. A replacement dwelling should be sited in the same location within the plot as the original dwelling, unless an alternative siting is proposed where it can be demonstrated that it would be a more appropriate siting in the Green Belt in terms of the impact on openness or amenity.

29. Previously it has been accepted that planning permission has recently been granted for various extensions to the existing farmhouse and the demolition of Burton's Lodge under 21/01153/FUL which was to; *"Demolish existing outbuilding bungalow and erect single storey, front, side and rear extensions"*.

30. In relation to this permission (21/01153/FUL) the applicant was granted consent to utilize the existing floor area and possible extensions which could be constructed under PD rights for Burtons Lodge. The applicant proposed to retain the existing farmhouse and using the Burtons Lodge PD allowances and floor area in addition possible extensions which could be constructed under PD rights (for the farmhouse), resulted in a dwelling measuring 312m² in floor area.

31. The current proposal is to demolish both Burtons Lodge and the Farmhouse and erect a new property on a similar footprint (albeit larger) of the existing farmhouse. The proposed dwellinghouse is slightly larger than the one permitted under the previous application and has a total floor area of 322m². The applicant is putting forward the same argument about utilizing the existing floor areas of both properties. Additionally, they are stating that as Permitted Development rights have not been removed for both properties, these should also be taken in consideration (this principle was accepted under the previous application 21/01153/FUL).

32. The 'permitted development' fallback position could be considered to represent a very special circumstance here if the extensions shown within the permitted development scenario are in logical positions on the dwelling and have realistic prospect of being constructed. It is important that such fallback does not generate any greater harm to the openness of the Green Belt. As previously stated, PD extensions to the existing dwelling have been granted through a Lawful Development Certificate (ref: 20/01081/LDC) and a prior approval determination (ref: 20/01089/DPDP1).

Permitted Development Fallback Scenarios

33. The proposal includes the demolition of an existing building within the curtilage of the existing dwelling. The argument being presented as part of this application is to include this lost floorspace within the calculation for the new dwelling. This existing building is a bungalow known as 'Burtons Lodge'. In 1975 (ref: ROC/3/75) it was granted planning permission to be converted for use as a separate dwelling for an agricultural worker and then in 1998 a Lawful Development Certificate was issued confirming use of this building without compliance with an agricultural occupancy condition had occurred for a period in excess of 10 years (ref: 97/00649/LDC). So, this building is a separate self-contained dwelling in its own right with its own ability to extend via Classes of the GPDO. Currently, the floor area of this building equates to 55m². However, according to the submitted plans this property under the current PD legislation could be extended up to 116m². As previously stated, the existing farmhouse could also be extended under the current PD legislation to 273m². Therefore, cumulatively the gross area of the 'lodge' and the farmhouse is 389m², which is larger than the proposed dwellinghouse, which measures 322m².

Planning Balance

34. It was previously acknowledged that this case is considered relatively unique as it includes demolition of an existing lawful dwelling with use of the floorspace within another dwelling. It is highly conceivable that both of the properties could be extended under PD rights, which would far exceed the floor area of the current proposal. Consequently, it is considered that this very special circumstance here would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt otherwise inherent to the proposal. Furthermore, the proposal would see a net reduction in the number of properties at the locality, which in both a spatial and visual dimension would undoubtedly have a beneficial impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

35. Notwithstanding the above, it is considered appropriate to attach conditions preventing further extensions and as such a condition removing PD rights will be attached to the decision notice. Furthermore, another condition requiring the demolition and removal of 'The Lodge' within one month of the occupation of the new dwelling will also be attached to the decision notice.

36. For brevity the table below gives a summary of the various scenarios: -

	Farmhouse	Burttons Lodge	Total
Existing Floor Area	173m2	55m2	228m2
Possible Permitted Development	273m2	116m2	389m2
Previously Approved Scheme (21/01153/FUL)	-	-	312m2
Previously Approved Scheme (22/00378/FUL)	-	-	322m2
This current application (23/00034/FUL)	-	-	Also 322m2

Layout, Scale and Appearance

37. Policy CP1 of the Council's Core Strategy and policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Plan are applicable to the consideration of design and layout. The NPPF encourages the effective use of land in meeting the need for homes whilst maintaining the desirability of preserving an area's prevailing character and setting taking into account matters including architectural style, layout, materials, visual impact and height, scale and bulk. It also states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning and the proposals should contribute positively to making places better for people (para 126).

38. The NPPF also advises that planning decisions for proposed housing development should ensure that developments do not undermine quality of life and are visually attractive with appropriate landscaping and requires that permission should be refused for development that is not well-designed (para 134).

39. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

40. Furthermore, paragraph 134 of the NPPF states Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:

- a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or
- b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.

41. The proposed new dwelling will be constructed out of facing brick under a concrete tile roof. The first floor will be rendered. The proposed dwelling will incorporate a projecting gable element on the front elevation and the roof of the main property, will be hipped, which helps to break down the scale and massing of the proposal. On the front elevation are two balconies, located on either side of the projecting gable element. On the rear elevation will be several single storey outriggers which incorporate large glazed elements and there will be another balcony. It is noted that specialist colleagues in Essex County Council Place Services have been consulted and states the following *“Upon review of the submitted documents, the proposals are not*

considered to result in harm to a designated or non-designated heritage asset. However, the proposed replacement dwelling features balconies including upon the principal elevation which is not considered sympathetic to local character and distinctiveness". Whilst the concerns of the Conservation Officer are acknowledged it is important to stress that the same balcony configuration was approved on 22/00378/FUL, and the case officer does not consider that there is sufficient justification to warrant a refusal and substantiate it any future Appeal.

42. As previously stated, the applicant is proposing to erect a portico on the front elevation of the host property. It is considered that the portico is relatively simple in design terms and not overly ornate and as such will not appear to be a discordant or alien feature within the streetscene. Furthermore, the applicant is proposing to install some additional windows as part of the proposal. It is considered that the additional apertures would help to break up the scale and mass of the building and no objections are raised.
43. In terms of the boundary wall, the applicant is proposing to erect a 2m high boundary wall which will be constructed out of facing brick. It is considered that the proposed boundary wall will form part of a walled garden and given its location will not be overtly visible from the public realm. It is considered soft landscaping will help to assimilate the proposal into the wider environ and this will be controlled by the imposition of an appropriately worded planning condition.
44. It is considered the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the locality. Furthermore, the proposal will help to coalesce the built form and will improve the openness of the locality by the removal of one dwelling. It is considered that the proposal conforms with the guidance advocated within the Local Development Management Plan and the NPPF.

Impact on Residential Amenity

45. Paragraph 130 (f) of the NPPF seeks to create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. This is reflected in Policy DM1, which seeks to ensure that new developments avoid overlooking, ensuring privacy and promoting visual amenity, and create a positive relationship with existing and nearby buildings. Policy DM3 also requires an assessment of the proposal's impact on residential amenity.
46. It is considered that the development of the site for housing is unlikely to result in noise, air or water pollution. A principal consideration in

determining this application is its effect upon the residential amenity of adjacent properties.

47. The host dwelling is set approx. 18m from the nearest habitable neighbour to the south. By virtue of separation distance, orientation and boundary enclosures it is regarded that the proposal would not result in any negative overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impact and would not breach the 45-degree rule of the nearest rear facing habitable window of the adjacent neighbour. As such, the proposed works would not be considered to create any adverse neighbouring amenity impacts.
48. The proposal, by reason of its scale, depth, height, bulk and siting is considered acceptable. The proposed dwellinghouse is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers in terms of overlooking, overshadowing and over-dominance. The proposal is compliant with policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan 2014.

Living Conditions for Future Occupiers

Garden Sizes

49. Policy DM3 of the Development Management Plan requires the provision of adequate and usable private amenity space. In addition, the Council's adopted Housing Design SPD advises a suitable garden size for each type of dwellinghouse. Paragraph 130 criterion (f) of the NPPF seeks the creation of places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
50. The SPD2 requires a minimum 100m² garden area for all new dwellings. An exception to this requirement will be single storey patio housing or one- and two-bedroomed dwellings which shall have an area of 50m² minimum.
51. The layout submitted shows that the proposed dwelling could be provided with a rear private amenity space of approximately 1233m², which is well in excess of 100m². The proposed dwelling, therefore, could satisfy the outdoor amenity space requirements set out in the SPD2.

Sustainability

52. The Ministerial Statement of the 25th March 2015 announced changes to the government's policy relating to technical housing standards. The changes sought to rationalize the many differing existing standards into

a simpler, streamlined system and introduce new additional optional Building Regulations on water and access, and a new national space standard.

53. Rochford District Council has existing policies relating to all of the above, namely access (Policy H6 of the Core Strategy), internal space (Policy DM4 of the Development Management Plan) and water efficiency (Policy ENV9 of the Core Strategy) and can therefore require compliance with the new national technical standards, as advised by the Ministerial Statement.

54. Until such a time as existing Policy DM4 is revised, this policy must be applied in light of the Ministerial Statement. All new dwellings are therefore required to comply with the new national space standard as set out in the DCLG Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard March 2015.

55. A two-storey dwelling which would comprise of four bedrooms accommodating either five or six people would require a minimum Gross Internal Floor Area (GIA) of 97m² or 106m², respectively. Additionally, the dwelling must have a minimum of 3m² of built-in storage. The proposed dwelling is a four-bedroom two storey property. The standards above stipulate that single bedrooms must equate to a minimum 7.5m² internal floor space while double bedrooms must equate to a minimum of 11.5m², with the main bedroom being at least 2.75m wide and every other double room should have a width of at least 2.55 metres. A built-in wardrobe counts towards the Gross Internal Area and bedroom floor area requirements but should not reduce the effective width of the room below the minimum widths indicated. According to the submitted plans the Gross Internal Floor area of the proposed dwelling will measure approximately 242m².

56. The table below shows the Gross Internal Floor area for each of the bedrooms.

Bedroom no. 1	30.82m ²
Bedroom no. 2	20.72m ²
Bedroom no. 3	22.46m ²
Bedroom no. 4	35.34m ²

57. According to the submitted plans all the bedrooms comply with aforementioned policies and exceeds the Internal Floor area. Furthermore, it was noted that the storage area was in excess of 3m² for the proposed plot, which is compliant with the standards advocated within the Technical Housing Standards 2015 document.

58. Until such a time as existing Policy ENV9 is revised, this policy must be applied in light of the Ministerial Statement (2015) which introduced a new technical housing standard relating to water efficiency. However, all new dwellings are separately required to comply with the national water efficiency standard as set out in part G of the Building Regulations (2010) as amended.
59. In light of the Ministerial Statement which advises that planning permissions should not be granted subject to any technical housing standards other than those relating to internal space, water efficiency and access, the requirement in Policy ENV9 that a specific Code for Sustainable Homes level be achieved and the requirement in Policy H6 that the Lifetime Homes standard be met are now no longer sought.

Impact on Highway Safety

60. Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Plan require sufficient car parking whereas Policy DM30 of the Development Management Plan aims to create and maintain an accessible environment, requiring development proposals to provide sufficient parking facilities having regard to the Council's adopted parking standards.
61. The Parking Standards Design and Good Practice guide (2010) states that for dwellings with two-bedrooms or more, two off-street car parking spaces are required with dimensions of 5.5m x 2.9m. Garage spaces should measure 7m x 3m to be considered usable spaces.
62. In accordance with paragraph 111 of the NPPF, it must be noted that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
63. The proposed layout plans (Plan References 1944 66 and 1944 28A) indicate that the proposed dwelling will result in a shared access arrangement with the property directly to the south (Burtons Barn) onto Barling Road, which is a B road, but is quite heavily trafficked. Furthermore, the plans show that a minimum of three parking spaces can be accommodated at the front of the proposed dwellinghouse. The plans indicate that there is sufficient space within the curtilage, so that vehicles will be able to maneuver on site so that they can access/egress the site in a forward gear.
64. Colleagues in Essex County Council Highway Department have been consulted and state "*The proposal will utilise the existing shared*

vehicle access and includes adequate off-street parking spaces for a minimum of two vehicles within the curtilage” and as such raise no objection to the proposal. There is no reason for the Local Planning Authority to take a different view.

65. Overall, it is considered there is sufficient car parking arrangements and appropriate access to serve the proposed dwelling. Overall, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and would not have an adverse impact upon highway safety. The proposed development therefore accords with the Parking Standards and policies DM1, DM3, DM9 and DM30 of the Development Management Plan and the NPPF.

Archaeological considerations

66. The applicant as part of their application submitted a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), which was forwarded on to the County Councils Historic Advisor and who states that “Early OS maps show that the proposed development is within an area of potential archaeological interest. The maps show that the area was occupied by former farm buildings. It is likely that features will survive in this area. A Written Scheme of Investigation for the archaeological work has been submitted and approved”. Therefore, they have no objection subject to the imposition of a condition relating to the completion of the programme of archaeological investigation identified in the WSI, which will be conditioned accordingly, in the event that planning permission is approved.

Flooding considerations

67. According to the Environment Agency’s Flood Risk Map the application site is located entirely in Flood Zone 1, where there is the lowest probability of flooding from rivers and the sea and to where development should be directed. As such the development is compatible with the advice advocated within the NPPF.

Drainage considerations

68. Development on sites such as this can generally reduce the permeability of at least part of the site and changes the site’s response to rainfall. Advice advocated within the NPPF states that in order to satisfactorily manage flood risk in new developments, appropriate surface water drainage arrangements are required. The guidance also states that surface water arising from a developed site should, as far as possible, be managed in a sustainable manner to mimic the surface water flows arising from the site prior to the proposed development. Therefore, in the event that planning permission is approved, it is

considered reasonable to attach a condition to the Decision Notice requiring the submission of a satisfactory drainage scheme in order to ensure that any surface water runoff from the site is sufficiently discharged.

Refuse and Waste Storage

69. The Council operate a 3-bin refuse and recycling system. According to the submitted plans there is sufficient space within the applicant's curtilage to accommodate the refuse bins.

Trees

70. Policy DM25 of the Development Management Plan seeks to protect existing trees particularly those with high amenity value. Overall, it is considered that the proposal will not result in the loss of any trees of high amenity value and as such the proposal complies with policy DM25.

Ecology

71. To accompany their planning application the applicant has submitted a bat survey which was produced by Essex Mammal Survey and is dated March 2022. The survey concludes that "*There is no vegetation affected by the project that has crevices, loose bark or woodpecker holes that might be colonised by bats*". The report goes on to state that there is "*no evidence of their presence was found at this site [bats]. The lack of potential roosting places and absence of any evidence of the presence of bats means that no further surveys are required for these buildings*". The case officer agrees with the conclusions of the ecologist that the proposal will not have a significant impact on flora/fauna in the immediate locality. However, the case officer considers it prudent to attach a condition relating nesting birds.

72. As there will be a net decrease in properties and the replacement of another dwelling at this locality there will not be a requirement for a RAMs payment to be made to the LPA to mitigate off site ecology provisions.

CONCLUSION

73. Approve.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS (summary of responses):

Baring Magna Parish Council – No response received.

Essex County Council Place Services Historic Buildings and Conservation Advice:

This application affects an unlisted building, the application site as viewed upon historic maps contained several buildings and the existing building is potentially of earlier origins however it is not considered to meet the requirements as a non-designated heritage asset. Additionally, the recently consented application, 22/00378/FUL, established the principle and forms the baseline from which to assess this application.

Upon review of the submitted documents, the proposals are not considered to result in harm to a designated or non-designated heritage asset. However, the proposed replacement dwelling features balconies including upon the principal elevation which is not considered sympathetic to local character and distinctiveness. Therefore, the proposals are considered contrary to Paragraph 197.c.

Essex County Council Place Services Specialist Archaeological Advice:
No objections subject to a condition relating completion of the programme of archaeological investigation identified in the WSI.

Essex County Council Highways: No objections to raise.

Cadent: No objection subject to the imposition of the following informative

“Cadent Gas Ltd own and operate the gas infrastructure within the area of your development. There may be a legal interest (easements and other rights) in the land that restrict activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The applicant must ensure that the proposed works do not infringe on legal rights of access and or restrictive covenants that exist.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the apparatus the development may only take place following diversion of the apparatus. The applicant should apply online to have apparatus diverted in advance of any works, by visiting cadentgas.com/diversions

Prior to carrying out works, including the construction of access points, please register on www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk to submit details of the planned works for review, ensuring requirements are adhered to”.

Neighbour representations: None received.

Relevant Development Plan Policies:

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Core Strategy Adopted Version (December 2011) - H1, CP1, GB1, GB2, T8

Development Management Plan (December 2014) - DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, DM25, DM30

Parking Standards: Design and Good Practice Supplementary Planning Document (December 2010)

Supplementary Planning Document 2 (January 2007) – Housing Design

The Essex Design Guide (2018)

Natural England Standing Advice

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the plan references 1944 27D, 1944 28A, 1944 29A, 1944 30A, 1944 31A, 1944 56A, 1944 57A, 1944 64A and Burtons Farm Areas Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 18th January 2023 and plan reference 1944 66 received by the Local Planning Authority on the 24th January 2023.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is completed out in accordance with details considered as part of the application.

3. No development involving the use of any facing or roofing materials shall take place until details of all such materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details as may be agreed unless any variation is agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the external appearance of the building/structure is acceptable having regard to Policy DM1 of the Council's Local Development Framework's Development Management Plan.

4. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site shall be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way. The NPPG clearly outlines the hierarchy to be investigated by the developer when considering a surface water drainage strategy. The developer shall consider the following drainage options in the following order of priority:
 1. into the ground (infiltration);
 2. to a surface water body;
 3. to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;
 4. to a combined sewer.

REASON: To secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order), no development by way of further extensions alterations to the roof or outbuildings (as defined by Section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) as may otherwise be permitted by virtue of Class(es) A, B, C and E of Part 1 Schedule 2 of the Order shall be carried out.

REASON: To ensure continued control over the extent of further built form on the site in future, in the interests of maintaining the open character of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

6. Prior to the first occupation of the development a scheme of landscaping for the site indicating inter alia the positions of all existing trees and hedgerows within and around the site, indications of any to be retained together with measures for their protection during the course of development, also the number, species, heights on planting and positions of all additional trees, shrubs and bushes to be planted shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and shall be carried out in the first planting season following the commencement of the development,. Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species

unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

REASON: To secure a high standard of landscaping in the interests of the appearance of the development in the locality.

7. Prior to the removal of any vegetation or the demolition of buildings between 1st March and 31st August in any year, a detailed survey shall be carried out to check for nesting birds. Where nests are found in any building, hedgerow, tree or scrub or other habitat to be removed (or demolished in the case of buildings), a 4m exclusion zone shall be left around the nest until breeding is complete. Completion of nesting shall be confirmed by a suitably qualified person and a report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any further works within the exclusion zone taking place.

REASON: To safeguard protected species especially nesting birds.

8. No development or preliminary groundworks of any kind shall take place until the completion of the programme of archaeological investigation identified in the Written Scheme of Investigation by messrs. KDK Archaeology Ltd. dated September 2022, submitted in support of the application has been completed.

REASON: To ensure that the archaeological interest of the site is investigated and recorded prior to potential loss as a result of the development approved.

The local Ward Members for the above application are Cllr. J. N. Gooding, Cllr. M. J. Steptoe and Cllr. A. L. Williams.

Application No:	22/01198/FUL	Zoning: NEL 1 and GT 1
Case Officer	Mike Stranks	
Parish:	Rayleigh Town Council	
Ward:	Wheatley	
Location:	Arterial Park, Chelmsford Road, Rayleigh. SS6 7NG	
Proposal:	The formation of landscape bunds, implementation of landscape planting scheme along with the installation of associated drainage infrastructure.	

SITE AND PROPOSAL

1. This application is to the site of the former Michelin's Farm located at the junction of the A127 with the A1245 and adjoining south of the London Liverpool Street Southend Victoria main line railway. The site was released from the Metropolitan Green Belt to provide a new employment area and Gypsy and Traveller Site in the Council's adopted allocations plan (2014). Outline planning permission including details of the first phase of commercial development was approved on 14th July 2020 under application 18/01022/OUT and is substantially complete with some units now occupied. The remainder of the allocated site and balance of the outline permission is overgrown and undeveloped. There is a new access into the site formed on to the A1245 Chelmsford Road north bound carriageway as part of phase one to what is now the Arterial Park.
2. The original application 18/01022/OUT provided access to the Gypsy and Traveller site from the A1245 through the adjoining commercial development now but did not include any plans for the GT 1 site provision and layout.
3. The reserved matters application 22/00186/REM approved a commercial layout for the remainder of the site yet to be commenced.
4. Policy GT 1 (paragraphs 3.298 pp82 and 3.311 pp84) to the Council's allocations plan identified the need for a substantial green buffer between the commercial and residential use to protect residents to the Gypsy and Traveller site from impacts from the adjoining commercial development. A total of 1ha of land is allocated to the purpose of GT1 to reflect the need for a minimum of 15 pitches requiring some 0.75ha of land with the balance to accommodate future need, ancillary facilities and the Green Buffer.
5. The reserved matters application for the yet to be built commercial development approved under application ref: 22/00186/REM reasoned that despite the tapering amenity strip to the south of Unit 11 having a

width of 6.2m reducing to 2.2m to the west and that to unit 10 to the east having a consistent gap of some 2.2m there was a further need for a substantial buffer to be met within both allocations.

6. Condition 11 of this reserved matters consent sought the provision of a soft landscaped buffer 15m in depth along the northern and eastern edges of the land allocated by Policy GT 1.
7. This application seeks planning permission for the remodelling of land levels and the provision of two landscaped bunds to the northern and eastern parts the land area forming the GT 1 allocation owned by the applicants to compliment the retention of existing trees and hedging to the southern and western site boundaries and to provide the necessary screening. It is worth noting that the site identified in this application does not strictly follow that of the allocation and excludes a broadly rectangular area of some 0.08ha immediately behind the neighbouring existing industrial units adjoining “Anwood Lodge” to the south.
8. The larger northern bund would have an irregular shape of overall length of 123m and a width of some 16 – 17m for the most part but reducing down to about 9m at the eastern end and to 8m in width to the western end but stopping within the site in from the western boundary so as not to conflict with the existing hedging to the western boundary expected to be retained. The bund would have sloping sides to a gradient of 1:3 to a height 2.6m reducing down to a height of 1.78m to the bund ends.
9. The smaller eastern bund would have a more regular shape with an overall length of 40m and a width of some 17 – 18m for the most part but reducing down to about 15m at the southern end. The bund would have sloping sides to a gradient of 1:3 and to a height 3.2m reducing down over the gradient to the bund ends.
10. Both bunds would feature tree planting to the top of the bund with shrubbery lower down the bund slopes. Most of the bund would be sown with wildflower meadow species but with amenity grassland to the lower bund toes at ground level.
11. The proposal would take clean cut spoil from cut and fill operations to neighbouring phase 2 of the site to use in the land remodelling and bund formation.
12. The bunds will be drained by land drains placed around the bund perimeters to discharge into the nearby ditch via a flow control device at a maximum rate of 2 litres per second for all storms up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change critical storm event. A below ground attenuation tank would store water upstream of the flow control device which would discharge into an existing ditch located to the south west corner of the allocated site.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

13. Application No. 18/01022/OUT
Hybrid planning application: full planning permission for the erection of buildings for use within Classes B1(c), B2 and B8 with access and servicing arrangements, car parking, landscaping, drainage features and associated highway works (Phase 1); outline planning application for up to 33,500 square metres of employment uses (Classes B1(c), B2 and B8) including means of access with all other matters reserved (Phase 2).
Permission granted 14th July 2020.
14. Application No. 20/00694/NMA
Proposed non -material amendment to 18/01022/OUT relating to re – wording of conditions 2 and 25.
Approved 27th August 2020.
15. Application No. 20/01052/NMA
Non – material amendment to alter the triggers relating to conditions 25 and 29 (relating to highway works) following approval of application 18/01022/OUT. (summarised).
Approved 17th June 2021.
16. Application No. 20/01196/FUL
Proposed 1 No. building for use within Classes B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) with access and servicing arrangements, car parking, landscaping and new boundary fencing (including section of 5 metre high acoustic fence) gate housebuilding, drainage features and associated highway works.
Permission refused 4th November 2021 – for reason of loss of Gypsy and Traveller allocation Policy GT1 (summarised).
17. Application No. 21/00752/NMA
Non – material amendment to approved application Ref: 18/01022/OUT to include landscaping changes, highway / parking related alterations and revised plans.
Approved 17th December 2021.
18. Application No. 21/00809/FUL
Application for variation of condition 2 (list of approved plans) of planning permission 18/01022/OUT – to allow for material changes namely the removal of an attenuation pond and replacement with landscaping and for the provision of 3 substations (summarised).
Approved 17th February 2022
19. Application No. 22/00186/REM
Reserved matters application relating to appearance, landscaping, layout, access (within the site) and scale for Phase 2 relating to application 21/00809/FUL (summarised).
Approved 27th June 2022.

20. Application No. 22/01197/FUL

The formation of a landscape bund, implementation of landscape planting scheme along with the installation of associated drainage infrastructure, plus erection of 2.4m high paladin fencing.
Pending consideration.

21. Application No. 22/01200/FUL

Erection of 2.4m high paladin fencing and entry gates, plus establishment of secure yard area and change to parking layout.
Approved 8th March 2023

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

22. The proposed development must be assessed against relevant planning policy and with regard to any other material planning considerations. In determining this application regard must be had to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

23. The relevant parts of the adopted Development Plan are the Rochford District Core Strategy (2011), the Allocations Plan (2014) and the Development Management Plan (2014).

Principle of Development

24. The Council's allocations plan envisaged a land area requirement of some 0.75ha to realise the proposed 15 pitches to the GT1 site. As noted in this report (paragraph 7 above) the application site excludes part of the full extent of the land allocated by a reduction in the allocation of some 0.077ha. With the extent of the larger bund A at some 0.161ha and that of bund B at 0.072ha, the remaining area for development would be 0.667ha and below the 0.75ha envisaged.

25. Without a detailed layout for the number of pitches, it remains difficult to establish if the extent of the bunds now proposed would compromise the full delivery of the site. Nevertheless, it has been established that it is necessary for substantial landscaped bunds to screen the GT1 site from the adjoining commercial development. The proposal would satisfy this requirement. It would remain possible to modify the bunds in future as unlike permanent structures, it would not be difficult to reform these features slightly to enable the intended layout if necessary.

Proposed landscaping details

26. The landscaping would provide three tree species.

27. A total of 7 No. *Prunus avium* "wild cherry" would be provided, two to the eastern bund B with the remainder irregularly spaced to the larger

- northern bund A. This species is native and deciduous having a white bloom with reddish bark that can reach a height of 20m.
28. A total of 3 No. *Acer Campestre* would be provided in one single and one pair to the northern bund A. This species is also deciduous but with gold and green foliage capable of 12m in height.
 29. A total of 5 No. *Sorbus torminalis*, one pair to the eastern bund B and three spaced unequally to bund A. This species is also deciduous capable of 15m – 20m height.
 30. Part way down from the top of the bund and beneath the tree canopies predominantly to the side of the bund slopes in to the site, would be provided shrubs in the foreground of the tree planting.
 31. These would comprise 6 No. *Viburnum opulus* “guelder rose” of green foliage that can reach 8m in height with a 4m spread. One would be planted to the smaller bund B with the remainder in groups to the larger bund A.
 32. The landscaping would feature 10 No. *Corylus avellana* “common hazel” that can grow to a height of 12m. One specimen would be provided to the smaller bund B to the east whereas this shrub would be planted in groups and singularly to the larger northern bund A.
 33. Lastly 10 No. *Cornus Sanguinea* “dogwood” “midwinter fire” capable of 3m in height with deep red foliage in winter months would be provided with three in a group to the eastern bund B and the remainder singularly and in groups to the larger northern bund A.
 34. The tree and shrub planting choices are each native and deciduous that can do well in most soils. The choices represent a healthy mix that would not allow disease common to one species to spread through the group easily providing some degree of resilience.
 35. The toe of the bund to the site level would be planted with amenity grassland to form a verge. The remainder of the bund areas would be sown with a wildflower meadow mix.
 36. The landscaping would repeat the approach approved to the site entrance landscaping and would provide an attractive setting with year round visual interest to the development with native species, generally good for supporting a variety of wildlife such as birds, insects and pollinators and would achieve a suitable setting and screen for the benefit of future residential occupiers of the GT1 site.
 37. With Unit 10 to the east of bund B having an eaves height of 14.8m and overall height of 16.7m, the bund height of over 3m and potential tree canopy 12 - 20m in height would soften the impact of these large structures upon the future adjoining Gypsy and Traveller site occupiers.

38. Similarly, Unit 11 at an eaves height of 14.3m and overall height at 15.5m, though with a slightly lower and varied bund ranging predominantly between 2.6m and 1.78m in height, with the same planting structure would off - set the impacts of these substantial neighbouring buildings anticipated for neighbouring future occupiers providing effective landscaping as required by paragraphs 130 b) and 131 to the National Planning Policy Framework and effective boundary treatment as required by part (iii) to Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management Plan.

Highway considerations

39. The bund areas would retain a site entrance to a width of 8.6m turning through a right angle into the site. This arrangement would not seem to frustrate future site access by oversize vehicles or with caravans being towed. However, should the access require improvement as part of the future layout of the Gypsy and Traveller site, the bund could easily be modified to suit. The proposed landscape bunds would not compromise any highway visibility or movement of vehicles or pedestrians to the site.

Contamination considerations

40. The possibility of contamination from the use of material on the site has been addressed by the requirements of identification and mitigation procedures under previous applications for the adjoining commercial development and there is no need for repetition in this minor application.

CONCLUSION

41. The proposed landscaping bunds would be of a substantial size to achieve the identified need for suitable screening of the approved commercial development to the future users of the neighbouring allocated Gypsy and Traveller site. The proposed species mix, irregular bund shape and haphazard arrangement of the planting would provide year round visual interest to the development with native species, generally good for supporting a variety of wildlife such as birds, insects and pollinators and would achieve an attractive design and setting to the future residential development of the site to the site achieving a desirable quality and character of place encouraged by national and local planning policies without any perceived failing for highway safety.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS (summary of responses):

Rayleigh Town Council: No comments received.

Neighbour representations: No neighbour representations received.

Relevant Development Plan Policies:

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Core Strategy Adopted Version (December 2011)

Development Management Plan (December 2014)

Parking Standards: Design and Good Practice Supplementary Planning Document (December 2010)

Supplementary Planning Document 2 (January 2007) – Housing Design

The Essex Design Guide (2018)

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

1. Commencement

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

RESON: Required to be imposed pursuant to section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. List of approved plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved plans:

Drg.No. 21037 P0024 Rev. B - Location Plan

Drg.No. 21037 P0100 Rev. J – Proposed site wide Masterplan

Drg.No. 21037 P0025 Rev. B – Proposed site plan

Drg.No. 21037 P0022 Rev. E - Proposed Bund Cross Sections

Drg. No. 124638/2301 Rev. A – GT 1 Site. Proposed levels and Bund drainage plan.

Drg. No. 11866_P08 Rev. A – gt1 Land proposed bund soft landscape proposals

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is completed out in accordance with the details considered as part of the planning application.

3.Landscaping and drainage implementation

All approved planting and site drainage shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and application details. Any tree or shrub including replacement plants being removed, uprooted, destroyed or be caused to die or become seriously damaged or defective within five years of planting shall be replaced by the developers or their successors in title with species of type and size and in positions to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority +- within the first available planting season following removal.

REASON: To ensure implementation of the landscaping scheme in the interests of visual amenity.

The local Ward Members for the above application are Cllr. A G. Cross, Cllr. J. L. Lawmon and Cllr. M. G. Wilkinson.