



PLANNING APPLICATIONS WEEKLY LIST NO. 1771
Week Ending 22nd August 2025

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 25th September 2025.
- (ii). Notification of any application that is to be referred must be received no later than 1:00pm on Wednesday **27th August 2025** this needs to include the application number, address and the planning reasons for the referral via email to the PBC Technical Support team pbctechnicalsupport@rochford.gov.uk. If an application is referred close to the 1.00pm deadline it may be prudent for a Member to telephone PBC Technical Support 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 Emma Goodings Director of Place. A planning officer will then set out these planning reasons in the report to the Committee.

Glossary of suffix's:-

Outline application (OUT), Full planning permission (FUL), Approval of Reserved Matters (REM), S106 legal obligation modification (OBL), Planning in Principle (PRINCI), Advertisement Consent (ADV), Listed Building Consent (LBC).

Index of planning applications: -

- 1. Recommended Refuse - 25/00429/FUL - Land Adjacent Dormers Lower Road Hockley PAGES 2 - 19
- 2. Recommend Refuse – 25/00220/FUL – Little Stambridge Hall Little Stambridge Hall Lane Stambridge PAGES 20 – 43
- 3. Recommend Approve – 25/00221/LBC - Little Stambridge Hall Little Stambridge Hall Lane Stambridge PAGES 44 - 58

Application No :	25/00429/FUL Zoning : MGB
Case Officer	Mr Thomas Byford
Parish :	Ashingdon Parish Council
Ward :	Hockley And Ashingdon
Location :	Land Adjacent Dormers Lower Road Hockley
Proposal :	Sub-divide the plot and construct a new self-build 4 bedroom detached chalet bungalow with 2 private car parking spaces.

SITE AND PROPOSAL

1. The application site forms part of the curtilage of an existing detached dwelling known as “Dormers” located on the northern side of Lower Road, outside the defined settlement boundary of Hockley. The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt and forms part of a row of large, sporadic, individually designed detached properties within generous plots but also a nearby garden centre and commercial uses to former farm buildings.
2. The proposed plot is currently garden land and is visually contained by existing residential boundaries. The proposal seeks to sub-divide the plot and construct a new chalet bungalow with accommodation across two floors with the use of dormers. The layout includes a private driveway from Lower Road, two off-street parking spaces, and a large rear garden.
3. The proposed 4 bedroom dwelling would be of chalet form, with a modest hipped roof design.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4. No relevant planning history on this specific land.

RELEVANT RECENT APPEALS

5. Two recent appeal decisions in the local area highlight concerns around the sustainability of new homes in similar Green Belt settings. In APP/B1550/W/25/3361926 (appeal decision date 23rd July 2025) (LPA ref: 23/00906/FUL), a proposal for a new dwelling at land adjacent to “Fairdene” Church Road, Hockley was dismissed because future residents would have to walk along a narrow, unlit road with no pavement to reach the nearest bus stop. The Inspector found this

unsafe, especially for children or in poor visibility, and concluded that residents would be heavily reliant on cars. A similar outcome occurred in APP/B1550/W/24/3357529 (appeal decision date 13th June 2025) (LPA ref: 23/01064/FUL) for five new homes at “Marsh View” Lower Road, Hockley.

That site also lacked pavements or safe walking routes to local services, and the roads were described as busy and unsuitable for walking or cycling. In both cases, the Inspectors concluded the developments failed to meet paragraph 155(c) of the NPPF, which requires new homes in the Green Belt to be in sustainable locations. As a result, the ‘tilted balance’ in favour of housing delivery did not apply.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6. 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.
7. 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).
8. The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (as amended) (NPPF) advises that planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Whilst the development of under-utilised land and buildings is encouraged, this must be balanced against the visual and other impacts of development.

Impact on Green Belt

National Planning Policy Framework

9. The application site is located within the designated Metropolitan Green Belt, as identified in the Council’s adopted Allocations Plan (2014), therefore the proposed development needs to be assessed against local Green Belt policies and in relation to the NPPF. There is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt and development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Policies GB1 and GB2 of the Council’s 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. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) indicates that when assessing the impact of a development on the openness of the Green Belt, the

duration of the development and the degree of activity it would be likely to generate, are matters to take into consideration.

10. Paragraph 153 of the revised NPPF states that when considering proposals affecting the Green Belt, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by way of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Development in the Green Belt is considered inappropriate unless one of the exceptions identified in paragraphs 154 or 155 of the NPPF applies.
11. In this case, only exceptions (e) and (g) of paragraph 154 of the NPPF require consideration, as the other exceptions clearly do not apply. The land is currently part of a residential garden and does not meet the definition of previously developed land set out in the NPPF, as there is no evidence of structures or buildings on this specific land.
12. Exception (e) relates to limited infilling in villages. However, the site lies outside the defined settlement boundary of Hockley and within a semi-rural ribbon of development. The area is not classified as a village in planning terms, and the site does not sit within a built-up cluster that would constitute infill. As such, exception (e) is not met.
13. The Rochford Council Core Strategy looks at the Town Centres around the District, specifically in Policy RTC6 where it looks at an Area Action Plan for Hockley Town Centre. In this Hockley is identified as being a town not a village in terms of hierarchy.
14. The Rochford Council Core Strategy states the below:

2.67 - Within the District there are four tiers of settlement. The first tier comprises Rayleigh, Rochford and Hockley. These are all settlements with a range of services and facilities as well as some access to public transport.

2.68 - Of the first-tier settlements, Rayleigh has the best access to services within the District. Rochford and Hockley contain local town centres catering for local need. Management Horizons Europe's (MHE) UK Shopping Index (2008) ranks the top 7,000 retail venues within the UK (including town centres, stand-alone malls, retail warehouse parks and factory outlets) based on current retail provision. This index ranks Rayleigh as a minor district centre, Rochford as a local centre, and Hockley as a minor local.

15. Exception (g) allows for the limited infilling or redevelopment of previously developed land (PDL), provided it would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. However, the land proposed for development comprises part of the front residential garden of “Dormers” and does not contain any existing buildings. Under the NPPF definition, garden land in non-urban areas is not classed as PDL. Furthermore, the proposal does not involve redevelopment but rather the introduction of new built form on undeveloped land. While the proposed footprint of the dwelling is modest and would not cause severe visual harm, the development would nonetheless reduce openness by introducing a new structure where none currently exists.
16. As the proposal fails to meet the requirements of either exception (e) or (g), and no very special circumstances have been put forward to justify development in the Green Belt, the scheme is regarded as inappropriate development in national policy terms. In the absence of very special circumstances which clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and loss of openness, the proposal conflicts with both local and national Green Belt policy. Accordingly, the development may instead be considered under paragraph 155 of the NPPF, which deals with the potential for development on land that may be classified as grey belt.
17. The revised NPPF has also introduced a new exception under paragraph 154, (h) but this would not be relevant to the proposal.
18. Paragraph 155 of the NPPF introduces a new category of development considered to constitute appropriate development in the green belt and it is considered that the proposed development could meet the requirements of paragraph 155 for the reasons set out below.
19. Paragraph 155 requires that all of the following would apply:
 - a. The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.
 - b. There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.
 - c. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework; and
 - d. Where applicable the development proposed meets the ‘Golden Rules’ requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157.

20. Paragraph 155 of the NPPF introduces a category of development considered appropriate in the Green Belt if it meets all the following criteria, including that the development utilises grey belt land. Grey belt land is defined in the NPPF (Footnote 62) as:

“land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of the purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143.”

21. These purposes include:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

22. Accordingly, to qualify as grey belt, a site must fail to strongly contribute to all of these purposes.

23. The application site lies to the side of “Dormers” and forms part of a loose ribbon of detached residential properties and commercial premises set within a predominantly semi-rural context. The site does not directly adjoin the defined settlement boundary of Hockley, which lies some distance to the west. Although the property sits alongside other dwellings, it is physically separated from the built-up area and retains a strong character, with open land to the rear (north) and limited infrastructure typical of countryside locations

24. Although the site lies alongside other properties on Lower Road, it is physically and functionally separate from the main built-up area of Hockley. It forms part of a linear pattern of sporadic development that does not connect well with the defined settlement and retains a semi-rural character. While the site contributes to preventing the outward spread of Hockley by maintaining a buffer of undeveloped land to the east, this contribution is not particularly strong. The site is partly enclosed and sits in close proximity to existing dwellings, which limits its overall role in preventing sprawl under Green Belt purpose (a).

25. For Green Belt purpose (b), the site is not located within a strategic gap between settlements. Hockley lies to the west and Hullbridge is situated further to the north-east, with extensive areas of open countryside separating them. The proposal would not lead to or contribute towards any physical or perceived merging of these towns. As such, the site does not make a strong contribution to this Green Belt purpose.

26. Similarly, the site is not located within or near the setting of any historic town or heritage asset and therefore does not contribute to purpose (d).

27. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Green Belt (Paragraph 008, Reference ID: 64-008-20231215) clarifies that when assessing the suitability of land for release as grey belt, authorities must consider:

“whether the release or development of Green Belt land would affect the ability of all the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan from serving all five of the Green Belt purposes in a meaningful way.”

28. This means that even if a site does not strongly perform against the purposes, if it still contributes to any of them in a meaningful or functional way, it should not be considered grey belt.

29. While the site is physically separated from the main built-up area of Hockley and forms part of a loose ribbon of rural properties, it is modest in scale and does not play a significant role in the wider Green Belt. Its contribution to the key Green Belt purposes is limited, as it neither actively prevents urban sprawl nor forms part of a strategic gap between settlements. In this context, its role in preserving openness and rural character is considered to be minor and does not amount to a meaningful contribution to the Green Belt purposes set out in the NPPF and clarified in national Planning Practice Guidance.

30. Accordingly, while the site may provide some limited Green Belt functions at a local scale, it is not considered to meet the threshold of “meaningful contribution” necessary to exclude it from the grey belt classification under paragraph 155 of the NPPF. Given this, the site can reasonably be regarded as grey belt land, and the tests set out in paragraph 155 should be applied when considering the acceptability of the proposed development.

31. Where development may seek to utilise grey belt land, paragraph 155 of the 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that it must not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the Green Belt when taken as a whole. The remaining purposes of the Green Belt not already considered above include safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

32. The proposed development would introduce new built form onto land that is currently open and does not contain any permanent structures. Although the site sits alongside existing dwellings on Lower Road, it is still adjoined by open land to the east and rear. As such, the proposal would result in some encroachment into the countryside where there is presently no built development. However, as the scheme involves a single dwelling only and occupies a relatively modest area within the wider Green Belt, it is not considered that the proposal would significantly harm this Green Belt purpose.

33. In terms of supporting urban regeneration, the proposal does not involve previously developed (brownfield) or urban land and therefore does not offer any direct benefit under this Green Belt purpose. However, given that the scheme is limited in scale and would not conflict with any identified regeneration priorities or allocated sites, it is also not considered to undermine the broader objective of encouraging development within existing built-up areas.
34. Paragraph 155 also requires that there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed. Rochford District Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land (4.53 years) and therefore a shortfall exists. While this proposal would only contribute a single additional unit, it would make some contribution to addressing housing need and some weight is given in favour of the proposal on this basis.
35. In addition, part (c) of Paragraph 155 also requires that proposals are located in sustainable locations, with reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF.
36. Paragraph 110 of the NPPF states:
- ‘Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.’*
37. In this case, while services such as shops, schools and Hockley train station do exist within the wider area, they are not located within safe or convenient walking distance of the site. The site is situated along a stretch of Lower Road that lacks any footpath provision or street lighting and is subject to higher speed limits. There are no pedestrian facilities or public transport stops in the immediate vicinity. As such, future occupiers would be heavily reliant on private car use to access everyday services, and the location cannot be considered sustainable in the context of paragraph 110 of the NPPF.
38. Paragraph 115 (b) of the NPPF states:
- ‘Development should ensure that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.’*
39. In this case, the proposed dwelling would be accessed directly from Lower Road, a rural route with no footpaths, no street lighting, and vehicles travelling at higher speeds. There is no safe or separated space for pedestrians, cyclists, or other vulnerable users. Unlike quieter backland locations or private tracks with low vehicle speeds, this section of Lower Road accommodates through-traffic, and the conditions do not support safe pedestrian movement.

40. These site-specific concerns reflect the conclusions reached in the recent appeal decisions at Fairdene and Marsh View as outlined in paragraph 5 of this report, where the Inspectors found that similar lack of pavements, lighting, and safe access to services rendered those locations unsustainable. In both cases, it was held that the inability to walk safely to nearby facilities or public transport meant future residents would be overly reliant on private cars. The same constraints apply here, and the proposal similarly fails to demonstrate that the site would offer safe and suitable access for all users, contrary to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF.
41. As such, the proposal fails to demonstrate that safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users, particularly those on foot, and especially for children, the elderly or disabled individuals. This conflicts with the expectations of paragraph 115(b) of the NPPF and weighs significantly against the proposal.
42. The development would also not trigger the “Golden Rules” threshold at paragraph 155(d) of the NPPF, as it relates to a single dwelling on a site smaller than 0.5 hectares.
43. Overall, the proposal would make a limited contribution to local housing supply through the provision of a single self-build dwelling. However, the site does not represent a sustainable or accessible location for new residential development. The absence of footpaths, the high-speed nature of Lower Road, and the lack of safe pedestrian routes to services mean the scheme fails to comply with the aims of paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF, which require development to be inclusive, well-connected, and safely accessible for all users. As a result, the proposal does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 155(c) and therefore cannot be considered appropriate development in the Green Belt under the grey belt provisions.
44. Although the site may fall within land that can reasonably be considered grey belt, the proposal does not meet all of the requirements of paragraph 155 of the NPPF. In particular, it fails to demonstrate that the site is in a sustainable location or that safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users, as required by part (c). As such, the proposal does not qualify as appropriate development in the Green Belt and is therefore considered inappropriate development, contrary to national and local Green Belt policy.
45. While the proposal is recommended for refusal on Green Belt policy grounds, for completeness a brief assessment is provided below against local design, layout and amenity policies, specifically Core Strategy Policy CP1 and Development Management Plan Policies DM1 and DM3. These policies seek to ensure that new development respects local character, delivers high quality design, and provides suitable residential standards.

Policy DM3 – Infilling and Residential Intensification

46. Proposals for infilling, residential intensification or 'backland' development must demonstrate that the following have been carefully considered and positively addressed.

- (i) *The design of the proposed development in relation to the existing street pattern and density of the locality;*

Lower Road is characterised by detached dwellings set within large plots, with significant spacing between buildings. Although development is dispersed, the proposal would not appear out of place in this linear pattern. The proposed chalet-style dwelling is set back from the road in line with the general building line and reflects the scale and form of nearby dwellings. The dwelling would not be visually dominant or cause demonstrable harm to the pattern of development.

- (ii) *whether the number and type of dwellings being proposed are appropriate to the locality having regard to existing character;*

The area features a mix of detached bungalows and chalet-style dwellings. The proposed chalet bungalow would be consistent with the surrounding residential character. The scale and design are appropriate to the local context.

- (iii) *the contribution to housing need, taking into account the advice and guidance from the Council, based on the most up-to-date evidence available;*

Rochford District Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land (4.53 years). While the proposal is for a single dwelling, it would make a limited contribution toward meeting housing need. This is noted, but given the small scale of the proposal amounting to a single unit, the contribution carries limited weight.

- (iv) *an assessment of the proposal's impact on residential amenity*

The proposed dwelling would be single storey, with a low eaves height and a generous set-back from the highway. Given the distance to Dormers and the orientation of both buildings, it is not considered that the proposal would result in significant overlooking or loss of privacy. The proposed relationship is acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

- (v) *avoiding a detrimental impact on landscape character or the historic environment;*

The proposal would not affect any designated landscape or heritage assets. The site sits within a ribbon of sporadic existing housing and would not introduce built form into an otherwise open landscape. The visual impact on the wider rural character would be limited.

- (vi) *avoiding the loss of important open space which provides a community benefit and/or visual focus in the street scene;*

The site is not of community benefit or of visual focus.

- (vii) *the adequate provision of private amenity space for the proposed dwelling as set out in Supplementary Planning Document 2: Housing Design;*

The Council's supplementary planning policy document 2 requires that all new dwellings are provided with a garden of at least 100 square metres. The site can comfortably accommodate a suitable amenity space for the dwelling exceeding 100 sqm.

- (viii) *the availability of sufficient access to the site and adequate parking provision; and*

The proposed layout of the site can accommodate two parking spaces meeting the 5.5m x 2.9m requirement as per the Essex Design Guidance (2024)

- (ix) *avoiding a tandem relationship between dwellings, unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that overlooking, privacy and amenity issues can be overcome as set out in Supplementary Planning Document 2: Housing Design.*

The proposed dwelling would sit alongside Dormers rather than directly behind it, albeit closer to the highway, avoiding a typical tandem arrangement. Given the single storey form, separation distance, and side by side relationship, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to significant issues of overlooking or loss of privacy. The relationship is considered acceptable in this regard.

Design

47. Chapter 12 of the NPPF emphasises the importance of high-quality, well-designed and sustainable places. Paragraph 130 requires that developments are visually attractive, function well over time, and respond to local character and setting. Paragraph 134 further advises that poorly designed development should be refused, particularly where it fails to reflect local design policies or guidance, while significant weight should be given to proposals that demonstrate good design, sustainability, or design innovation that respects its context.

48. These principles are supported at the local level by the Council's Core Strategy Policy CP1 and Development Management Plan Policy DM1, which both require development to respect local character, scale and form. Policy DM30 further seeks to ensure that development in rural areas protects landscape character. Supplementary Planning Document 2: Housing Design (SPD2) also provides guidance on appropriate rural design and site layout.
49. The dwelling would be modest in height, featuring a gabled roof with a large cat slide dormer to the rear and two pitched roofed dormers to the front roof slope. The design presents a modern touch while keeping a simple, muted look that suits the semi-rural area. The overall size, shape, and materials are modest and fit well within the surrounding area.
50. The layout reflects the semi-rural character of this part of Lower Road, with generous spacing between dwellings and large garden areas typical of the locality. The proposed dwelling would maintain separation from neighbouring properties, and its set-back position would be consistent with the general layout of homes along this stretch. However, boundary treatments and landscaping remain an important area for further consideration. No detailed landscaping plan has been provided. Given the rural setting, any fencing or planting will need to be carefully designed to avoid a suburban appearance, if approved to ensure it sits comfortably within the surrounding countryside.

Residential Amenity

51. Paragraph 135 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.
52. In this case, the proposed dwelling would be positioned to the front and side of the host property, Dormers. While the relationship is somewhat unusual compared to the more typical frontage alignments along Lower Road, the separation distance and orientation mean it is unlikely to result in significant harm. The new dwelling would have first floor rear dormer windows, however the dwelling would have a separation distance to the front elevation of Dormers of some 38m, and in excess of the 25m depth guidance outlined within the Essex Design Guide.
53. The proposal would therefore not result in significant direct overlooking or overshadowing of neighbouring dwellings.

54. While the use of the land for residential purposes would introduce additional vehicle movements associated with a new household, these are expected to be minimal. Access would be taken directly from Lower Road, and the proposal is only for a single dwelling. As such, the increase in movements would be low and is not considered to cause unacceptable disturbance to Dormers or any other nearby properties.

Refuse and Waste Storage

55. The Council operates a 3-bin system per dwelling consisting of a 240l bin for recycle (1100mm high, 740mm deep and 580mm wide), 140l for green and kitchen waste (1100mm high, 555mm deep and 505mm wide) and 180l for residual waste (1100mm high, 755mm deep and 505mm wide).
56. According to the submitted plans there is sufficient space within the applicant's curtilage/garage to accommodate the three refuse bins.

Technical Housing Standards

57. The Ministerial Statement of the 25th March 2015 announced changes to the government's policy relating to technical housing standards. The changes sought to rationalise 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.
58. 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.
59. 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.
60. The proposed dwelling is shown by the applicant as a 4 bedroomed, 8 person dwelling. Each bedroom is a double bedroom.
61. A dwelling of this size would need a gross internal area of 124m², with 3m of built in storage to meet the above standards. The proposed dwelling would exceed the GIA required with 2.5m of built in storage.

Garden Area

62. Rochford District Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2 (SPD2): Housing Design requires that dwellings with three bedrooms or more should be provided with private garden areas of at least 100m². The proposed dwelling would have a garden in excess of this.

Landscaping

63. No detailed landscaping has been submitted with the application. Given the site's rural setting, the use of native planting and paddock-style or post-and-rail fencing would be more appropriate than suburban forms of enclosure such as close-boarded fencing, which should be avoided, particularly along boundaries visible from shared access routes or the open countryside. A condition will be imposed on any granting of planning consent, were this application to be approved, for a suitable landscaping plan to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority, with the agreed details implemented and maintained for a minimum period of 5 years.

Highway Safety

64. The Council has recently adopted the Essex Parking Guidance (2024) which now supersedes the previous 2009 guidance for Rochford.
65. This dwelling is considered to be in an area of low connectivity.
66. The proposal includes parking for the new dwelling. The hardstanding proposed is sufficient for the parking of two cars each with bay sizes which would both meet the above standards of 5.5m x 2.9m.
67. The Highway Authority have been consulted on the application and have confirmed the proposal is acceptable in highway safety terms subject to conditions.
68. It is not considered that the proposal would give rise to highway safety impacts.

Ecology and Trees

Ecology regarding development within the zone of influence (ZoI) for the Essex Coast RAMS (Recreational Disturbance Avoidance Mitigation Strategy)

69. The application site falls within the 'Zone of Influence' for one or more of the European designated sites scoped into the emerging Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMs). This means that residential developments could potentially have a significant effect on the sensitive interest features of these coastal European designated sites, through increased recreational pressures.

70. The development for one dwelling falls below the scale at which bespoke advice is given from Natural England. To accord with NE's requirements and standard advice, the Essex Coastal Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMs) Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) record has been completed to assess if the development would constitute a 'Likely Significant Effect' (LSE) to a European Site in terms of increased recreational disturbance. The findings from HRA Stage 1: Screening Assessment are listed below:

HRA Stage 1: Screening Assessment – Test 1 – the significant test

Is the development within the zone of influence (Zol) for the Essex Cost RAMS?

- Yes

Does the planning application fall within the following development types?

- Yes. The proposal is for one additional dwelling.

Proceed to HRA Stage 2: Appropriate Assessment - *Test 2 – the integrity test*

Is the proposal for 100 houses + (or equivalent)?

- No

Is the proposal within or directly adjacent to one of the above European designated sites?

- No

71. The current proposal has been considered in respect of the Habitat Regulations, taking account of advice submitted by Natural England and the Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) developed by Essex County Council which seeks to address impacts (including cumulative impacts) arising from increased recreational activity. The Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted by Rochford District Council on the 20 October 2020. Advice from Natural England in August 2018 has been followed and the HRA record template completed.

72. The conclusion of the HRA is that, subject to securing appropriate mitigation, the proposed development would not likely result in significant adverse effects on the integrity of the European site along the Essex coastline.
73. The applicant has paid the required financial contribution to contribute towards longer term monitoring and mitigation along the coastline, to mitigate adverse impact from the proposed development on the European designated sites by way of increased recreational disturbance.
74. Policy DM25 (Trees and Woodlands) of the of the Council's Development Management Plan indicates that development should seek to conserve and enhance existing trees and woodlands, particularly Ancient Woodland. Development which would adversely affect, directly or indirectly, existing trees and/or woodlands will only be permitted if it can be proven that the reasons for the development outweigh the need to retain the feature and that mitigating measures can be provided for, which would reinstate the nature conservation value of the features. No trees are proposed to be removed, nor are there close by trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) that would be affected by the proposal. It is therefore concluded that there would not be any trees adversely affected by the proposal.
75. Although there are no trees subject to TPO on the site, the site does present numerous trees, many of which are mature. These are considered to generally be in good condition. Some small chestnut saplings are proposed to be removed, however this is not objectionable.
76. With many trees as outlined in the submitted report proposed to remain, the Council's Arboricultural Officer has stated that a Tree Protection Plan should be conditioned in accordance with BS 5837 if the application were to be approved.

Flood Risk

77. The Environment Agency flooding maps show the site within flood zone 1, the area least at risk from flooding and to where development should be directed and with the proposal not therefore presenting a significant risk of surface water flooding.

Foul Drainage

78. Development on sites such as this must ensure that the foul drainage on the site is dealt with safely and effectively and in a way that would not lead to contamination. The submitted foul drainage form states that the use of a package treatment plant is proposed.

79. In this case and due to the nature of the proposal which includes a new dwelling – it is considered that there is capability of the site to dispose the foul drainage and the method for this would be covered and agreed during the application for Building Regulations that would be required for the proposal.

Biodiversity Net Gain

80. Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is a way of creating and improving biodiversity by requiring development to have a positive impact ('net gain') on biodiversity. A minimum 10 percent BNG is now mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) subject to some exceptions.
81. The applicant has indicated that they consider that the development proposed would not be subject to the statutory biodiversity net gain requirement because one of the exemptions would apply. Following a site visit and assessment of on-site habitat and consideration of the nature of the development proposed, officers agree that the proposal would be exempt from the statutory biodiversity gain condition because the development meets one of the exemption criteria, with the development stated on the planning application form being a custom/self-build development.
82. The applicant has not therefore been required to provide any BNG information.
83. As the proposal is for development to which the statutory biodiversity gain condition would not apply, an informative would advise any future developer that they would not have to discharge the statutory gain condition prior to the commencement of development is recommended.
84. It is however recommended that a condition be imposed on any granting of planning consent to secure the discharging of the statutory gain condition if the development and resultant dwelling no longer meets the custom/self-build exemption.

Paragraph 11(d) – National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

85. Rochford District Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land. As such, paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) is engaged, which states that planning permission should be granted unless:

“(i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development; or

(ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.”

86. The site is located in an area that lacks safe pedestrian access, is not well connected to local services, and does not offer a genuine choice of transport modes. Recent appeals on Lower Road and other similar locations have confirmed that this location fails to meet the requirements for safe and suitable access for all users, as set out in paragraph 115 of the NPPF. These conclusions are material considerations.

87. Therefore, although the proposal would make a very small contribution to housing supply, it is considered that the site's unsustainable location undermines the policy intent of grey belt development. This weighs significantly against the proposal in the planning balance, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development is disengaged. As a result, the proposal does not meet the tests of paragraph 11(d) and is not supported.

Equalities and Diversity Implications

88. The Public Sector Equality Duty applies to the Council when it makes a decision. The duty requires us to have regard to the need:

- To eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, and victimisation.
- To advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- To foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

89. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender, race, sexual orientation, religion, gender reassignment, marriage/civil partnerships, and pregnancy/maternity.

90. Taking account of the nature of the proposed development and representations received, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any impacts (either positive or negative) on protected groups as defined under the Equality Act 2010.

CONCLUSION

91. REFUSE.

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS (summary of responses):

Hockley Parish Council : No comments received.

Neighbour representations: No comments received.

Essex County Council Highway Authority: No objections.

Essex County Council Place Services Ecology: No comments received.

Relevant Development Plan Policies:

- National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (as amended).
- Core Strategy Adopted Version (December 2011) - CP1, H1, T1, T8.
- Development Management Plan (December 2014) – DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, DM25, DM27, DM30.
- Essex Parking Guidance (2024).
- Supplementary Planning Document 2 (January 2007) – Housing Design.
- The Essex Design Guide.
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

REASON FOR REFUSAL:

The proposed development is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt and would fail to comply with paragraph 155(c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (as amended) (NPPF) which requires that development in grey belt locations be situated in sustainable locations with reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF. The site is not well related to local services, lacks safe and suitable pedestrian access, and offers no genuine choice of transport modes. Future occupiers would be heavily reliant on private car use for daily needs. As a result, the proposal does not meet the tests for appropriate development in grey belt land and is therefore considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to paragraphs 153-155 of the NPPF. In the absence of very special circumstances to clearly outweigh the harm, the development is unacceptable. Accordingly, the proposal also fails to engage the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF.

The local Ward Members for the above application are Cllr. M. R. Carter, Cllr. Mrs. D. L. Belton and Cllr. R. P. Constable.

Application No:	25/00220/FUL Zoning: MGB and Listed Building
Case Officer	Mr Richard Kilbourne
Parish:	Stambridge Parish Council
Ward:	Roche North And Rural
Location:	Little Stambridge Hall Little Stambridge Hall Lane Stambridge
Proposal:	Renovate/ repair existing grade II listed house, replace ancillary accommodation and construct a new single-storey building and the installation of a swimming pool, hot tub, and associated landscaping and change the use of the site from use as a dwellinghouse (Class C3) to use within Use Class C1 (hotel) for use as rental accommodation and a yoga retreat.

SITE AND PROPOSAL

1. The application site consists of a Grade II Listed residential dwelling and ancillary buildings located to the west of Little Stambridge Hall Lane. The application dwelling is a four-storey dwelling constructed of red facing brick with a predominantly hipped roof.
2. Little Stambridge Hall is a Grade II Listed Building (entry 1112574) first entered onto the register in 1951. Within the immediate curtilage of the application site is a cart lodge and a retaining wall, both are Grade II Listed also with entry numbers 1397034 and 1112575 respectively, both entered onto the register in 1988. It is understood that the Cart Lodge and other ancillary Lodge Buildings do not form part of this application which relates only to Little Stambridge Hall itself.
3. It is understood that Little Stambridge Hall was constructed sometime around the C16th century, however it has been extended and altered throughout its history, with additions added to the dwelling through the C18th and C20th centuries. Notwithstanding, despite these additions, the dwelling retains its historic and traditional form, comprised of a left cross wing, shaft moulded capping, large chimney stacks, and 2:5 windows with vertically sliding sashes.
4. The application site is located entirely within the Metropolitan Green Belt as defined by the Council's adopted Allocations Plan (2014).
5. The application proposes renovations and repairs to the existing building and change of use from residential (Use Class C3) to yoga retreat and temporary accommodation (Use Class C1). The application is submitted in tandem with an application for listed building consent, LPA ref. 25/00221/LBC.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

6. Application No. 25/00221/LBC – Renovate/repair existing grade II listed house, replace ancillary accommodation and construct a swimming pool for use as rental accommodation and a yoga retreat. Pending Consideration
7. Application No. 22/00760/DOC - Discharge of condition No. 6 (Submission of Surface Water Drainage Details and Implementation) of application reference 20/01103/FUL
8. Application No. 22/00651/DOC - Discharge of Condition no. 3 (Submission of External Finishes) Planning Consent Ref. 20/01103/FUL.
9. Application No. 22/00381/NMA - Nonmaterial amendments to planning consent reference 20/01103/FUL. Application Refused 19/09/2023
10. Application No. 20/01103/FUL - Demolition of existing commercial units and erection of 3 purpose built commercial units with ancillary parking and landscaping. Application Permitted 30/03/2021
11. Application No. 19/009026/FUL - Demolition of existing commercial units and erection of 3 purpose built commercial units for Use within the B8 (Storage and Distribution) and B1(C) (Light Industrial) Use Classes with ancillary parking and landscaping. Application Refused 09/09/2020
12. Application No. 18/00953/FUL – Redevelopment of existing commercial warehouses to provide purpose-built warehouse units with associated parking. Application Withdrawn
13. Application No. 18/00673/FUL – Demolition of two sheds and construction of a single storey extension to listed building. Refused 03/12/2018
14. Application No. 18/00622/LBC – Demolition of two sheds and construction of a single storey extension to listed building. Refused Listed Building Consent 03/12/2018
15. Application No. 18/00388/FUL – Change of use of existing agricultural buildings to a flexible business use. Application Permitted 27/06/2018
16. Application No. 18/00195/DOC – Discharge of condition no 3 of planning permission REF: 17/00589/FUL dated 2nd November 2017
17. Application No. 18/00182/DOC – Discharge of condition no 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 of planning permission REF: 17/00590/LBC dated 2nd November 2017.

18. Application No. 17/00869/DPDP3M – Prior notification for a proposed change of use of an agricultural building to a flexible business use. Prior approval required; Approved 01/11/2017
19. Application No. 17/00590/LBC – Convert cart lodge to residential accommodation, incorporating alterations to roof to include front and rear pitched roof dormers, roof lights and additional windows and door and internal alterations. Approved 02/11/2017
20. Application No. 17/00589/FUL – Convert cart lodge to residential accommodation, incorporating alterations to rood to include front and rear pitched roof dormers, roof lights, and additional windows and door. Application Permitted 02/11/2017
21. Application No. 16/01064/COU - Change of use of redundant farm buildings to commercial uses B1 (Business) B2 (General industry) B8 (Storage or distribution and equestrian uses). Application Permitted 05/01/2017
22. Application No. 12/00776/FUL – Construction of Grain Store. Application Permitted 06/03/2012
23. Application No. 11/00625/FUL – Construct Agricultural Building with Solar Panels. Application Permitted 07/02/2012
24. Application No. 11/00527/DPDP6 – Agricultural Storage Building. Prior Approval Required; Approved 27/09/2011
25. Application No. 00/0008/LBC – First floor extension over existing single storey extension. Application Refused 15/03/2000
26. Application No. 00/0007/FUL – First floor extension over existing single storey extension. Application Permitted 15/03/2000
27. Application No. 95/00291/FUL – Erect Grain Drier and Store. Application Permitted 19/07/1995
28. Application No. 85/00179/LBC – Single storey side extension. Application Permitted 15/07/1985
29. Application No. 85/00152/FUL – Single storey side extension. Application Permitted 15/07/1985
30. Application No. 84/00357/FUL – Erect Barn. Application Permitted 27/07/1984

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

31. 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.
32. 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

33. The application site is located entirely within the Metropolitan Green Belt and is also a Grade II Listed Building. Paragraph 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024, as amended; henceforth 'the Framework') states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by very definition, harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and should be resisted unless there is demonstrably very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness.
34. Paragraph 154 of the Framework goes to list certain types of development which should not be considered inappropriate development within the Green Belt. At Paragraph 154(h)(v) of the Framework states that material changes of use of land should not be regarded as inappropriate development within the Green Belt, however 154(h)(v) makes clear that this is in connection with activities such as sport and recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds. In respect of the application, it is proposed to change the use of the land from Use Class C3 to Use Class C1. Therefore, the specific change of use in this instance would not meet this criterion and is therefore inappropriate development within the Green Belt which should be resisted unless very special circumstances indicate otherwise.
35. Policy DM12 of the Development Management Plan is supportive of rural diversification on the condition that:
 - (i) *the need to ensure that the proposed use would not have an undue impact on the openness of the Green Belt, character of the countryside, nature conservation interests, the historic environment, visual amenity or residential amenity;*

- (ii) *the need to ensure that the proposed use would not introduce additional activity or traffic movements likely to materially and adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt or character of the countryside, or place unacceptable pressures on the surrounding highway network;*
- (iii) *the sensitivity of the landscape character area to the proposed development;*
- (iv) *the impact of the proposal on the agricultural value of the land;*
- (v) *where rural diversification for employment opportunities is proposed, the area should have good links to the highway network particularly taking account of highway safety; and*
- (vi) *where the conversion of nationally or locally listed agricultural and rural buildings is proposed it should:*
 - (a) not negatively impact on the quality of the listed structure; and*
 - (b) not affect the integrity of the existing structure. A structural engineers report should accompany any application for conversion of a Listed Building. Any development which is permitted should be of a scale, design and siting such that the character of the countryside is not harmed and nature conservation interests are protected.*

36. These matters are discussed more generally throughout the report and in application ref. 25/00221/LBC which is submitted in tandem with this application and should be read in conjunction with this report. In summary, however, it is considered that Policy DM12 of the Development Management Plan is largely supportive of rural diversification of this kind, subject to impacts on the listed building being considered below.

37. As stated, the application building is a Grade II Listed Building. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that when taking into account the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to conservation of the asset; the greater the significance, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether the harm is substantial, less than substantial, or a total loss.

38. Paragraphs 214 and 215 of the Framework go on to state that any harm to a designated heritage asset (whether this is substantial, less than substantial, or a total loss) should require clear and convincing justification and should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

39. It is understood from the submitted heritage statement (which is discussed further below, and also in application ref. 25/00221/LBC) and the planning statement that the existing structure is compromised and is no longer habitable as a residential dwelling in its current form. Several parts of the building are being supported by scaffolding, and there is no central heating. This has been supported by a structural report carried out by a qualified Structural Engineer, and the Council does not dispute that the building is in a poor condition; this condition in itself is harmful to the significance of the listed building.
40. Having regard to the above, it is acknowledged that the proposal seeks to repair and renovate the existing building and bring it back into use – albeit it is acknowledged that this would not be a residential use. These works would safeguard the future of the listed building – a designated heritage asset – and ensure that it can be enjoyed for years to come. The Framework makes clear that any justification for approving inappropriate development within the Green Belt should be clear and convincing. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that when considering whether to grant permission for a development, a Local Planning Authority should have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it may possess. In this instance, it is considered that the safeguarding of a designated heritage asset is a significant material consideration which amounts to very special circumstances which would outweigh the harm that the development would cause to the openness of the Green Belt (discussed below). As such, there is no in-principle objection to the proposed Change of Use.
41. In regard to the proposal's impact on the openness of the Green Belt, it is acknowledged that this has both spatial and visual characteristics. The application site is such that it is largely screened by vegetation to the southern and northeastern application site boundaries. Furthermore, most of the development would be restorative in nature and would therefore not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing circumstance. In regard to the demolition and reconstruction of the ancillary buildings, it is acknowledged that these would be constructed behind the retaining wall and would therefore, the combination of this wall and the vegetation would provide heavy screening which would reduce visual intrusion. Furthermore, the application submission indicates that overall, there would be a net reduction in built footprint across the application site. Having regard to this, it is not considered in this instance that the proposal would be significantly harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. In any case, the combination of the retaining wall and the vegetation to the application site boundaries are such that the developments are unlikely to be seen outside of the curtilage of the existing dwelling.

42. It is acknowledged in this instance that the Change of Use would result in the loss of a residential dwelling. Rochford District Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites as required by the Framework. Consequently, the loss of a dwelling is a relevant material consideration which must be weighed against the benefits of the proposal. The fact that the dwelling is currently uninhabitable is also of relevance as despite its use class status it is not currently providing residential accommodation to the benefit of any occupier.
43. As discussed previously, the existing dwelling is in poor condition, and the proposal would provide much needed repairs and renovations to secure the future of the building – a Grade II Listed Building. This is considered significant and, in this instance, outweighs the harm caused by the loss of a singular residential dwelling. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the loss would amount to 1 No. dwelling only and is therefore unlikely to have a significant impact on the Council's 5-year housing land supply.
44. The Rochford District Culture and Visitor Economy Strategy aims to grow and expand the visitor economy in the wider District in a bid to grow the local economy through making the district a more attractive place to visit and diversifying the offerings. Priority 4 of the Strategy aims to increase the range and quality of accommodation offerings throughout the district to maximise economic benefit.
45. Section 6 of the Framework emphasises that planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand, and adapt. Paragraph 85 of the Framework states that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity.
46. The proposed development has the potential to provide increased job opportunities and also to attract visitors to the district. This would provide a boost to the local economy and as such the proposal aligns with both the aims of the Framework and the District's Culture and Visitor Economy Strategy. It is further acknowledged that the district has a short supply of serviced accommodation. The proposal would directly benefit the district in this regard.

Design and Appearance

47. Policy DM1 of the Council's adopted Development Management Plan requires that proposals promote visual amenity and have a positive relationship with nearby buildings and are of a scale and form appropriate to the locality. The policy also notes that specific points of consideration must be addressed through design and layout, including impact on the historic environment including Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings, archaeological sites, and the wider historic landscape.

48. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering whether to grant permission for a development which impacts a listed building, or its setting, a Local Planning Authority should have specific regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it may possess.
49. Little Stambridge Hall (and the associated retaining wall) which are the subject of this application are, as discussed, Grade II Listed Buildings with special architectural character which date back to the C16th century; as such, the main consideration in the determination of this application is whether the proposed change of use and extensions/alterations would preserve the character and appearance of the building(s) and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that such possess.
50. As discussed earlier, this application is submitted in tandem with an application for listed building consent (LPA ref. 25/00221/LBC). The Officer report for that application discusses the heritage impacts of the proposed development in more detail, whilst this report gives a general overview of the impacts of the Change of Use and the alterations which is the recognised and correct approach under the considerations to be placed on such given the different parts of the Planning Acts which apply.
51. Included within the proposed works are several repairs to the internal structure of the building, including roof and floor investigations, repointing, and basement tanking. It is proposed to fully re-wire the building to bring it to modern standards, install a heat pump, repairs to drainage, fire safety improvements including the installation of a sprinkler system, and the replacement of timber floors and kitchen.
52. Externally, it is proposed to repair the roof and chimney – it is understood from the Structural Engineer's report that the existing chimney is in a poor state of repair and is currently being supported by scaffolding to prevent collapse. Insulation is proposed at rafter level, and it is proposed to remove the existing conservatory and construct a new orangery. Installation of new timber windows and stone portico is proposed, and repairs/reconstruction of the existing Grade II listed wall is proposed with reclaimed bricks.
53. It is also proposed to demolish the non-significant outbuildings and sheds, construct a new single-storey yoga building and timber framed pool building, and the installation of a swimming pool, hot tub, and associated landscaping.

54. It is acknowledged that the Society for Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) have commented on the proposal and note that there is insufficient information to assess the impact of the proposal on the significance of the Listed Building and that more details should be sought before approval of any works. This is acknowledged and is discussed more in application ref. 25/00221/LBC as relates to the character, significance, and heritage of the building.

55. The Historic Building Officer was consulted on the proposal and states

“The proposal is supported in principle as it secures the viable use and long-term maintenance of Little Stambridge Hall. Subject to the submission of a detailed specification of works, material selection and relevant reports, the proposal is considered to cause no harm to the significance of the listed building or its setting in terms of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2024). Therefore, the proposal would preserve the special interest of the listed buildings in accordance with Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.”

56. Having regard to the above, there is no in-principle objection to the proposed development, and the development is considered to safeguard and secure the future of the Listed Building. The proposal is not considered significantly harmful or detrimental to the significance of the listed building. It is acknowledged that detailed specifications are recommended prior to commencement of any works, and these will be secured by way of condition. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan, Section 16 of the Framework, and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Impact on Residential Amenity

57. Paragraph 135(f) of the Framework seeks to create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and wellbeing, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. This is reflected in Policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan which seeks to ensure that new development avoid overlooking, ensuring privacy and promoting visual amenity, and creating a positive relationship with existing and nearby buildings.

58. Amenity is defined as a set of conditions that one ought to reasonably expect to enjoy on an everyday basis. When considering any development subject to a planning application a Local Planning Authority must give due regard to any significant and demonstratable impacts which would arise as a consequence of the implementation of a development proposal. This impact can be in terms of overlooking, loss of light, or creating a degree of overbearing enclosure (often referred to as the tunnelling effect) affecting the amenity of adjacent properties.
59. Paragraph 180 of the Framework states that Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment criterion (e) stipulates:
- “Preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution”.*
60. Furthermore, para. 191 states Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:
- *mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impact resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life; and*
 - *identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.*
61. The proposed extensions and alterations in this instance are not considered to appear significantly overbearing or overshadowing for any neighbouring dwelling.
62. It is acknowledged that there have been several representations received regarding traffic along Little Stambridge Hall Lane which is impacting on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings. The comments make reference to speeding vehicles and pollution caused by vehicles.
63. In respect of speeding vehicles, this is discussed below in the highways section. In respect of pollution and emissions from vehicles, this is acknowledged. Notwithstanding, it is not considered in this instance that the proposed Change of Use would generate significantly more additional traffic which would cause pollution, particularly given its close proximity to nearby industrial uses towards the north of the application site

64. Having regard to the above, the proposed development is not considered significantly detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring dwellings in this instance and is considered to accord with Policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan and the relevant provisions of the Framework.

Impact on Highway Safety

65. Paragraph 116 of the Framework states that development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would, after mitigation, be an unacceptable impact on the safety of the highway network, or the cumulative impacts on the highway network would be severe.

66. The application site is currently accessed from Little Stambridge Hall Lane. The application does not propose any alterations to the access and this would remain as is. Essex County Council (henceforth ECC) as Local Highways Authority were consulted on the proposal and do not wish to restrict the grant of planning. ECC raise no concerns over safety of the highway network as a result of the proposal.

67. It is acknowledged that there have been several representations received in relation to the impact of the development on the wider highway network – specifically due to speeding vehicles down Little Stambridge Hall Lane and the potential for collisions between children and vehicles. Whilst this is acknowledged, the Local Planning Authority has no statutory powers to deal with speeding vehicles – this should be reported to the Police who have the relevant powers to enforce speed limits. In respect of collisions between vehicles and pedestrians/children, ECC as Highways Authority raise no concerns over the proposal and do not indicate that the proposal would give rise to an increased potential for collisions.

68. Having regard to this, and in accordance with Paragraph 116 of the Framework, it is not considered that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the safety of the highway network to justify refusing the proposal in this instance.

69. Policy DM1 and DM3 of the Council's adopted Development Management Plan require adequate parking for a development. Policy DM30 seeks to create and maintain an accessible environment, requiring development proposals to provide sufficient parking provision.

70. The Council adopted the Essex Parking Guidance (2024) in January 2025, and this is the standard to which parking provision is assessed against. The Essex Parking Guidance requires development type in Use Class C1 to provide 1No. off-street parking space per room, for a total requirement of 7No. spaces.

71. There is a large hardstanding driveway to the front elevation of the dwelling with sufficient parking space to accommodate 7No. vehicles. As such, the requirements of the Essex Parking Guidance are considered to be met and the proposal is in accordance with Policy DM30.
72. It is acknowledged that associated vehicular parking in this location would have some impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Notwithstanding, it is acknowledged that much of the application site is screened by vegetation in the form of mature trees. As such, the vehicular parking is unlikely to be seen from public viewpoints to a degree which would be significantly detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt.

Landscaping

73. The application site is lined to all boundaries by mature vegetative screening and trees. The application submission includes a Tree Constraints Plan, which has been subsequently reviewed by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. The Officer notes that no method statement has been provided, or information on how trees will be protected during the course of the development. Whilst this is acknowledged, none of the trees within the site that would be affected by the proposal are protected by way of Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and the application site is not located in a Conservation Area and is not landscape sensitive.
74. As such, the application would not need prior written approval from the Local Planning Authority to remove these trees prior to the commencement of development. As such, it would be unreasonable for the Local Planning Authority to seek a method statement or any further information regarding the protection of trees during construction given that they are not protected. Notwithstanding, the submitted Design and Access Statement indicates that the location of the ancillary buildings has been carefully considered to minimise the impact of development on the root protection areas of these trees.

Flooding

75. 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. As such, the development would be compatible with the advice advocated within the Framework.

Drainage

76. The application is for a Change of Use to an existing dwelling which already benefits from drainage. No changes are proposed in relation to drainage or connection to the main sewer.

Archaeology

77. Colleagues in Essex County Council Historic Environment have been consulted on the proposal and stated the following:

“The buildings have the potential to contain fixtures, fittings or fabric that relate to its previous uses, origin, evolution and development, and other evidence such as re-used timbers or other structural elements, potentially linked to the former church. Given the programme of renovation and repair proposed to the structures, a Historic Building Recording (HBR) should be carried out prior to the proposed works at the Little Stambridge Hall. As part of the HBR a trained professional should be present during the renovation and repair works to record the exposed heritage assets.”

78. As stated above, the archaeologist has no objection to the proposal subject to imposition of conditions relating to historic building monitoring records being completed prior to the commencement of any above ground works. These can be secured by way of condition in the event that the application is approved.

Biodiversity Net Gain

79. Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is a way of creating and improving biodiversity by requiring a development to have a positive impact (the ‘net gain’) on biodiversity. A minimum of 10% BNG is now mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) subject to some exceptions.
80. The Biodiversity Net Gain Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out how mandatory biodiversity net gains should be applied through the planning process and Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 74-011-20240214 sets out what information should be submitted as part of a planning application if the statutory biodiversity gain condition applies.

The consulted Essex County Council Place Services Ecology regarding the proposal and it stated that *“As a result, we have reviewed Biodiversity Assessment (ACJ Ecology, March 2025) and Statutory Biodiversity Net Gain – Calculation tool (March 2025) and are not satisfied that appropriate information has been provided prior to determination. This is because of the reasons set out below:*

- *No photographs have been included within the Biodiversity Assessment report, and there is no mention of when the site visit was conducted. There is no detail on any plant species, including the grassland, scrub and trees. The condition assessment notes of the habitats are vague and appear to be related to how to improve the condition rather than why they are that condition. Therefore, we do not have confidence that the baseline habitat have been correctly inputted, and further information on the baseline habitats is required.*
- *Justification is required on why the majority of the site has been recorded as other neutral grassland instead of vegetated garden.*
- *The trees have been given medium strategic significance, yet no justification on this has been given. As the Essex LNRS is soon to be adopted, it is recommended that these will need to be recorded as low strategic significance.*

As mandatory biodiversity net gains applies, the planning authority will be required to secure a biodiversity gain condition as a pre-commencement requirement. The biodiversity gain condition has its own separate statutory basis, as a planning condition under paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and should be included as an informative within the decision notice. The biodiversity gain condition should secure the provision of a Biodiversity Gain Plan, as well as the following information:

- a) The completed metric calculation tool showing the calculations of the pre-development and post-intervention biodiversity values.*
- b) Pre and post development habitat plans.*
- c) Legal agreement(s)*
- d) Biodiversity Gain Site Register reference numbers (if using off-site units).*
- e) Proof of purchase (if buying statutory biodiversity credits at a last resort).*

In addition, a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) should be secured for all significant on-site enhancements. However, we note that the post-intervention values have been provided and that no significant on-site enhancements are proposed in the proposals. As a result, we are satisfied that HMMP is not likely to be required by legal obligation or a condition of any consent for a period of up to 30 years”.

81. In conclusion, the submitted Biodiversity Assessment and Statutory Biodiversity Net Gain – Calculation Tool do not currently provide sufficient or robust information to support determination of the application. Key deficiencies include the absence of photographic evidence, lack of detail on site survey timing and species present, unclear and unsupported habitat condition assessments, and insufficient justification for habitat classifications and strategic significance ratings. As such, further clarification and evidence on baseline habitats, habitat classifications, and tree significance are required.
82. Given that mandatory biodiversity net gain applies, it will be necessary for the planning authority to secure a biodiversity gain condition as a pre-commencement requirement, supported by a Biodiversity Gain Plan containing all statutory information outlined above. While no significant on-site enhancements are proposed and an HMMP is therefore not anticipated to be required, compliance with statutory biodiversity gain obligations remains essential prior to consent.

On-Site Ecology

83. Paragraph 180 of the Framework indicates the importance of avoiding impacts on protected species and their habitat. Where impact is considered to occur, appropriate mitigation to offset the identified harm is required. Policy DM27 of the Development Management Plan requires consideration of the impact of development on the natural landscape, including protected habitats and species. National planning policy also requires that the planning system contribute to, and enhance, the natural environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains where possible. In addition to the UK Biodiversity Action Plan, proposals for development should have regard to Local Biodiversity Action Plans – including those produced at District and County Level.
84. Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006) places a duty on public authorities to have regard for the purpose of conserving biodiversity. PAS 2010 aims to reduce the varied applications of this obligation, ensuring that all parties have a clearer understanding of information required at the planning stage. Section 41 of the NERC Act (2006) identifies habitats and species which are of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. There are 56 habitats and 943 Species of Principal Importance in England (SPIE), and most of the UK's protected species are listed under Section 41. Whilst the possible presence of a protected species is accompanied by legal obligations and will remain the first consideration of planning departments, the total biodiversity value of a site must now be considered.

85. The application submission includes a Bat Survey produced by John Dobson (Essex Mammal Surveys), dated December 2024. It reaches the following conclusions:
- a. Three attic spaces were inspected; the roof has been insulated under the grant scheme in 2011.
 - b. There is no evidence of bats within the loft spaces inspected, or along the eaves of the dwelling.
 - c. Externally, there are no cavities which may be used by roosting bats.
 - d. The outbuildings are in poor condition and some are collapsed, therefore are unsuitable for roosting bats.
 - e. There is no vegetation affected by the proposal that has crevices, woodpecker holes, or loose bark that would be utilised by roosting bats.
 - f. Overall, there is negligible potential for roosting bats at the application site.
86. The officer acknowledges the conclusions of the bat survey. It is unlikely that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on roosting bats as there is negligible potential for roosting bats. Notwithstanding in the event that permission is granted, the applicant is reminded that if roosting bats, or evidence of such, are found during development, that all work should cease and a qualified ecologist should be consulted.

Planning Balance

87. It is acknowledged that the application site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt, where there is a presumption against inappropriate development. As discussed above, it is acknowledged that on first consideration the proposed development would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Notwithstanding, it is also acknowledged that there are very special circumstances in this instance that outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt by virtue of its inappropriateness. These include the necessary renovations and repairs to a Grade II Listed Building, a designated heritage asset which it is in the public interest to preserve and support an alternative viable use. As such, the proposal is recommended for approval.

Equalities and Diversity Implications

88. The Public Sector Equality Duty applies to the Council when it makes a decision. The duty requires us to have regard to the need:
- To eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, and victimisation.
 - To advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

- To foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

89. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender, race, sexual orientation, religion, gender reassignment, marriage/civil partnerships, and pregnancy/maternity.

90. Taking account of the nature of the proposed development and representations received, it considered that the proposed development would not result in any impacts (either positive or negative) on protected groups as defined under the Equality Act 2010.

CONCLUSION

91. Refuse

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS (summary of responses):

Stambridge Parish Council : No representations received

Rochford District Council Economic Growth Team

The Economic Growth team supports this application for the following reasons:

- Potential increase to local economy with new job opportunities
- Potential increase to local visitor economy with overnight visitors
- Increase to very limited stock of serviced accommodation in district

This application is in line with the Destination Development priorities (priority 4 Develop accommodation) within the Rochford District Culture & Visitor Economy Strategy.

Essex County Council (Local Highways Authority)

The information that was submitted in association with the application has been fully considered by the Highway Authority. The proposal retains the existing access and extensive car parking facilities, therefore:

From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority subject to the following condition:

“Areas within the curtilage of the site for the purpose of the reception and storage of building materials shall be identified clear of the highway.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate loading / unloading facilities are available to ensure that the highway is not obstructed during the construction period in the interest of highway safety in accordance with policy DM1”.

The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB)

Thank you for notifying the SPAB of the above application affecting this 16th century Grade II listed building. We note that the application is not for Listed Building Consent, which is required for any alterations, extensions, or demolitions that affect the character of a listed building. However, in the absence of this, we are happy to comment on the Full Planning Application and offer the following observations and advice.

The Heritage statement was written in 2021 and therefore may need to be updated. The document contains a brief description of the building with some helpful dates concerning its evolution; however, it does not contain any assessment of the impact that the works would have on the building's special interest, or details to show how historic fabric would be protected.

Proposals include the demolition and replacement of outbuildings, but the age and significance of these have not been described. The structural engineer's report contains a number of recommendations; however, it is not clear if any of these have been included in the application.

Internal alterations, although stated to be reversible, have not been assessed in relation to the harm that would be caused to the historic plan form, or what impact they would have on internal mouldings and other architectural features.

The proposed new Georgian portico at the main entrance affects the character of the west elevation, but the impact of the proposal has not been assessed.

We would also expect to see a detailed specification for the works which explains in detail the full extent of the works to be carried out and the materials and methods that will be used. This should encompass any thermal upgrades, changes to doors and windows, and any works to the flooring, walls, and ceiling finishes. Service penetrations should also be carefully considered. The involvement of a conservation-accredited architect in compiling a specification is strongly recommended. In the absence of this information, it is not possible to understand how the work will impact the historic building's interest.

The Society therefore urges you to seek further detail from the applicant on the parts of the building affected by the proposals. The special interest of the listed building, and the impact of the proposals on it, must be understood before the local planning authority can grant consent or otherwise.

We would be happy to look at these proposals again once they have been revised. However, if this information is not forthcoming, we recommend that permission is refused.

Essex County Council Place Services Ecology

We have reviewed the documents supplied by the applicant, relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, protected & Priority species and habitats and identification of proportionate mitigation. We are not satisfied that appropriate information with regard to mandatory biodiversity net gains has been supplied for the application prior to determination.

Essex County Council Conservation and Historic Advice:

The principle of the proposed works is supported. The scheme seeks to secure the long-term use and maintenance of Little Stambridge Hall in a manner that respects its architectural and historic significance. Several elements of the proposal were discussed during the site visit, and it was concluded that:

Use of Concrete for Floor Replacement

The existing floorboards and parquet were confirmed to be of no historic significance, and their replacement is acceptable. However, concerns were raised regarding the proposed use of concrete to replace the joisted floor structure. This approach is not supported, and a more sympathetic method should be adopted.

Alterations to the Staircase

The staircase has an Arts and Crafts style and appears commensurate with the 1970s parquet flooring. Whilst the lower section holds some historic value as evidence of the building's evolution, its removal, although resulting in some loss of historic fabric, is considered justified under Paragraph 213 of the NPPF (December 2024). Demolition of Outbuildings and Conservatory These structures were confirmed to be of no historic or architectural significance. Their demolition is therefore acceptable.

New Openings for the Orangery and Loggia

The proposed new openings in the east elevation were discussed and, although they will result in some loss of historic fabric, the intervention is considered justified due to the removal of the existing unsympathetic conservatory which detracts from the architectural interest of the front elevation of Little Stambridge Hall.

Basement Tanking

The basement is subject to flooding. It is recommended that the source of water ingress be investigated thoroughly. Tanking should be considered only as a last resort. If necessary, the Delta membrane system, as recommended by Historic England, SPAB etc, is the preferred method.

All other works are considered acceptable in principle. However, a detailed specification of the proposed works will be required, clearly outlining the full scope of interventions, including the materials and methods to be used. The proposed works must be carefully designed to be appropriate and sympathetic to the historic character of the building. This should include any thermal upgrades, alterations to doors and windows, and works to floors, walls, and ceilings. The specification should be prepared by a conservation-accredited architect to ensure the approach is sensitive and preserves the building's significance. It is also recommended that a CARE-accredited structural engineer be appointed to assess and justify any structural interventions.

The proposal is supported in principle as it secures the viable use and long-term maintenance of Little Stambridge Hall. Subject to the submission of a detailed specification of works, material selection and relevant reports, the proposal is considered to cause no harm to the significance of the listed building or its setting in terms of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2024). Therefore, the proposal would preserve the special interest of the listed buildings in accordance with Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

No objection subject to the imposition of the following conditions

- Before the commencement of works, the detailed Schedule of Works, method statements and structural reports regarding all works to the historic core of the buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such.
- A schedule with clear photographs of the types and colour of the materials to be used in the external finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to their first use on site. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- Internal works shall not be commenced until a schedule of all new, internal surface materials including walls, ceilings and floors including insulations and a schedule of all internal and external joinery indicating the proposed finish and decoration to be used has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such.
- Details of proposed new windows, doors, rooflights, eaves, verges and cills to be used by section and elevation at scales between 1:20 and 1:1 as appropriate shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to their first installation or construction on site. Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such.
- Detailed section drawings of the build-up of walls/ floors/ ceilings in at, a scale between 1:20 and 1:1 as appropriate, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of internal works. Works shall be implemented in

accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such.

- Prior to installation, drawn details of all new electrical and plumbing service routes and ducting, including the proposed sprinklers, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and then shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Essex County Council Place Services (Archaeology):

“The application is for renovate/repair existing grade II listed house, replace ancillary accommodation and construct a swimming pool for use as rental accommodation and a yoga retreat.

The building proposed for renovation and repair is a Grade II listed building (List Entry 1112574) with origins dating back to at least the sixteenth century, as the site depicted on the Chapman and Andre map of 1777. The submitted Heritage Statement says the building was constructed in phases, gaining additions right through to the twentieth century. The Essex Historic Environment Record (EHER) shows that the buildings of Stambridge Hall are located within a medieval moated site (EHER 13607). Several of the structures associated with the hall located within the moated site are post medieval in date and listed, including the wall attached to little Stambridge Hall and enclosing garden to south (List Entry 1307034), Cartlodge attached to garden wall (List Entry 1112575), and the Lodge (List Entry 1168411). The moated site is also the location of the demolished medieval St Marys Church and graveyard (EHER 13606). The church can also be seen on the Chapman and Andre map of 1777 and is reported to have been in existence until 1923.

The buildings have the potential to contain fixtures, fittings or fabric that relate to its previous uses, origin, evolution and development, and other evidence such as re-used timbers or other structural elements, potentially linked to the former church. Given the programme of renovation and repair proposed to the structures, a Historic Building Recording (HBR) should be carried out prior to the proposed works at the Little Stambridge Hall. As part of the HBR a trained professional should be present during the renovation and repair works to record the exposed heritage assets.

With the above evidence considered, the following recommendation is made, with any approved application, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 218:

Recommendation 1: A Historic Building Recording:

1. No demolition, conversion or alterations shall commence until a programme of historic building recording has been secured in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to be submitted by the applicant for approval by the Local Planning Authority.

2. No demolition, conversion or alterations shall take place until the satisfactory completion of the recording in accordance with the WSI submitted.
3. The applicant will submit a report detailing the results of the recording programme to the Local Planning Authority for approval and confirm the deposition of the archive to an appropriate depository as identified and agreed in the WSI. This shall be done within 6 months of the date of completion of the archaeological fieldwork unless otherwise agreed in advance in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

A building-recording brief detailing the requirements will be produced from this office on request.

As noted in the Heritage Statement there is the potential for archaeological deposits relating to the infilled former moat and the demolished St Mary's Church and graveyard to survive within the proposed development site. The groundworks have the potential to impact these archaeological deposits, therefore a programme of archaeological trial-trenching and excavation is recommended.

The following recommendation is made in line with the National Planning Policy Framework:

Recommendation 2: A programme of archaeological trial-trenching and excavation:

1. No development or preliminary groundworks of any kind shall take place until a programme of archaeological investigation has been secured in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which has been submitted by the applicant, for approval by the Local Planning Authority.
2. No development or preliminary groundworks of any kind shall take place until the completion of the programme of archaeological investigation identified in the WSI defined in 1 above, and any subsequent mitigation has been agreed.
3. The applicant will submit a final archaeological report or (if appropriate) a Post Excavation Assessment report and/or an Updated Project Design for approval by the Local Planning Authority. This shall be submitted within 6 months of the date of completion of the archaeological fieldwork unless otherwise agreed in advance by the Local Planning Authority.

The work will comprise a programme of trial-trenching followed by detailed excavation of archaeological deposits identified. An archaeological brief detailing the requirements can be produced from this office on request.

Neighbours: 1 response has been received from the following address;

Little Stambridge Hall Lane: Amberley, Crawford, Camjay

- No objection to the proposal provided a new access road is provided well away from the existing lane and not within sight of Amberley
- The development of light industry and the farm has greatly increased traffic along a single-track lane
- Traffic on the single track access road is becoming dangerous and the development will worsen this problem
- Speeding is an issue on the lane which will worsen
- The Council should consider the imposition of conditions to protect the environment and to prevent speeding

Relevant Development Plan Policies:

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024 revised in February 2025).

Rochford District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Adopted Version (December 2011) – CP1, GB1, GB2

Rochford District Council Local Development Framework Development Management Plan (December 2014) – policies DM1, DM3, DM12, DM25, DM27, DM30.

The Essex Design Guide (2018)

Essex Planning Officers Association Parking Guidance Part1: Parking Standards Design and Good Practice (September 2024) (Adopted 16th January 2025).

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

1. The submitted Biodiversity Assessment (ACJ Ecology, March 2025) and Statutory Biodiversity Net Gain – Calculation Tool (March 2025) do not provide sufficient information to enable the Local Planning Authority to assess the biodiversity baseline and proposed biodiversity net gain in accordance with the Environment Act 2021, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and relevant local planning policies.

No photographs, survey dates, or detailed species lists have been provided, and the habitat condition assessments are vague and unsupported by evidence. The condition notes focus on how to improve the habitats rather than explaining their current state, which undermines confidence in the accuracy of the baseline data. Further clarification is also required to justify the classification of the majority of the site as “other neutral grassland” rather than “vegetated garden.”

In addition, the trees on site have been assigned a medium strategic significance without any justification. Given the imminent adoption of the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS), it is expected that these trees should be recorded as having low strategic significance.

Without adequate baseline evidence, justification for habitat classifications, or a complete Biodiversity Gain Plan containing all required statutory information—including completed metric calculations, pre- and post-development habitat plans, relevant legal agreements, and biodiversity credit evidence—the application fails to demonstrate how it will deliver the mandatory minimum 10% biodiversity net gains. The proposal therefore conflicts with the requirements of the Environment Act 2021, the National Planning Policy Framework, and relevant local development plan policies relating to biodiversity net gain, ecological enhancement, and sustainable development.

The local Ward Member(s) for the above application is/are Cllr S Wootton Cllr Phil Shaw Cllr Mrs L Shaw

Application No :	25/00221/LBC Zoning : Listed Building
Case Officer	Mr Richard Kilbourne
Parish :	Stambridge Parish Council
Ward :	Roche North And Rural
Location :	Little Stambridge Hall Little Stambridge Hall Lane Stambridge
Proposal :	Renovate/ repair existing grade II listed house, replace ancillary accommodation and construct a new single-storey building and the installation of a swimming pool, hot tub, and associated landscaping and change the use of the site from use as a dwellinghouse (Class C3) to use within Use Class C1 (hotel) for use as rental accommodation and a yoga retreat.

SITE AND PROPOSAL

92. The application site consists of a Grade II Listed residential dwelling and ancillary buildings located to the west of Little Stambridge Hall Lane. The application dwelling is a four-storey dwelling constructed of red facing brick with a predominantly hipped roof.

93. Little Stambridge Hall is a Grade II Listed Building (entry 1112574) first entered onto the register in 1951. Within the immediate curtilage of the application site is a cart lodge and a retaining wall, both are Grade II Listed also with entry numbers 1397034 and 1112575 respectively, both entered onto the register in 1988. It is understood that the Cart Lodge and other ancillary Lodge Buildings do not form part of this application which relates only to Little Stambridge Hall itself.

94. It is understood that Little Stambridge Hall was constructed sometime around the C16th century, however, has been extended and altered throughout its history, with additions added to the dwelling through the C18th and C20th centuries. Notwithstanding, despite these additions, the dwelling retains its historic and traditional form, comprised of a left cross wing, shaft moulded capping, large chimney stacks, and 2:5 windows with vertically sliding sashes.

95. The application site is located entirely within the Metropolitan Green Belt as defined by the Council's adopted Allocations Plan (2014).

96. This application is submitted concurrently with a planning application for planning permission reference 25/00220/FUL and although for completeness the description of this application is the same as that of the concurrent application this application for Listed Building consent is primarily concerned with the works which affects the fabric and historical and architectural interests of the grade II listed building rather than any element relating to a change of use or the design of a new building which is covered by the separate application for planning permission.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

97. Application No. 18/00622/LBC – Demolition of two sheds and construction of a single storey extension to listed building. Refused Listed Building Consent 03/12/2018
98. Application No. 17/00590/LBC – Convert cart lodge to residential accommodation, incorporating alterations to roof to include front and rear pitched roof dormers, roof lights and additional windows and door and internal alterations. Approved 02/11/2017
99. Application No. 00/0008/LBC – First floor extension over existing single storey extension. Application Refused 15/03/2000
100. Application No. 85/00179/LBC – Single storey side extension. Application Permitted 15/07/1985

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

101. 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.
102. 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).

Assessment

103. The application property is a Grade II Listed Building and this application for Listed Building Consent is made in respect of Section 10 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This legislation imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities in the determination of applications to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The application site is designated as the Metropolitan Green Belt in the Council's adopted Allocations Plan – this is discussed more broadly in LPA ref. 25/00220/FUL and is not relevant insofar as impacts on the listed building itself.
104. As a Grade II Listed Building, the host property is a designated heritage asset as defined within the National Planning Policy Framework (henceforth, 'the Framework'), and the Planning Practice Guidance (henceforth, PPG). It is acknowledged that the bulk of the application refers to the main dwelling, however it should be noted that the Cart Lodge (not the subject of this application) is also a Grade II Listed Building, as is the garden wall which surrounds the property. The main consideration in the determination of this application is whether the proposed extensions, alterations, and repairs would preserve the character, appearance, and significance of the listed building and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest to which it possesses.
105. As previously stated, the main bulk of the development relates to the existing dwellinghouse, Little Stambridge Hall which is a Grade II Listed Building. The list entry is 1112574 (entered 1951) and the description states:

*"STAMBRIDGE LITTLE STAMBRIDGE HALL TQ 89 SE ROAD
6/290 Little Stambridge Hall 4.12.51 GV II House. C16 or earlier
origin main range and west crosswing with later alterations and
additions. Red brick faced with some black headers. Red plain tiled
roofs, hipped to left crosswing. Original chimney stack to left (west)
of left crosswing, offset with attached shaft moulded capping, large
chimney stack to rear of main range and end stack to right of main
range, rear right wing stack. Eaves cornice. 2 storeys. 2:5 window
range of small paned vertically sliding sashes. Ground floor and
right return of crosswing, small paned French windows, semi-
circular fanlights with tracery. There is a pilaster between second
and third windows of main range. Doorway to right of pilaster, 6-
panel door, fluted surround, brackets to moulded and dentilled open
pediment. To right is a narrow parapeted extension. Right return
doorway, recessed 6 panelled door, moulded pilasters with capitals
and bases, moulded frieze and pediment. Various rear ranges.
Moated site. RCHM 2 (Little Stambridge)."*

106. Paragraph 210 of the Framework states that in determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities; and the desirability of new development making positive contributions to local character and distinctiveness.
107. The Framework, at Paragraph 212 onwards, provides guidance for considering the impact of development on a designated heritage asset. It states that when considering the impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This weight should be proportional to the significance of the asset; the greater the importance of the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether the harm caused by the development would be less than substantial, substantial, or a total loss.
108. Paragraph 206 of the Framework states that any harm to, or loss of, significance of a designated heritage asset, including through development within its setting, should require clear and convincing justification.
109. Paragraph 214 of the Framework deals with substantial harm to a designated heritage asset. Development causing substantial harm should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm – or total loss – is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit that outweigh the harm or loss. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm, the harm should be weighed against the public benefit arising from the development, including securing its optimal viable use.
110. Policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan requires that proposals should promote visual amenity and have a positive relationship with nearby buildings and a scale and form appropriate to the locality. The policy also notes that specific points of consideration must be addressed through design and layout, including impact on the historic environment including Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, archaeological sites, and the wider historic landscape.

Impact on the Listed Building

111. As previously stated, the separate 25/00220/FUL application is for the Change of Use from a dwelling (Use Class C3) to a yoga retreat/short stay accommodation (Use Class C1), associated repairs and renovations to the Listed Building, and demolition/reconstruction of some ancillary buildings within the curtilage of the site. Application 25/00220/FUL discusses the principle of the Change of Use – having regard to the application site's siting within the Metropolitan Green Belt and other planning related matters – whilst this application focuses on

the heritage impacts of the development and the developments impact on the significance of the Grade II Listed Building.

112. The Listed Building has a long history dating back to the C16th century, potentially earlier. Whilst it has been extended and altered previously over the years – throughout the C18th and C20th centuries – it retains much of the historic fabric of the times in which it was constructed. It is also understood that the dwelling is built on the site of the old St Marys Church, and therefore there are some concerns over impact on the archaeological remains of the Church; these are discussed in more detail below.
113. It is pertinent to note before discussing the heritage impacts of the development that the existing dwelling is in a poor state of repair. The application submission includes a Structural Report commissioned by a qualified structural engineer which details more of the issues with the dwelling. It is understood, however, in summary, that there is no central heating at the dwelling, the chimney is in poor state of repair and at risk of collapse (currently being supported by scaffolding), there are various points along the roof which are sagging, and the basement floods regularly. The dwelling is currently uninhabitable due to these issues.
114. The proposed development seeks to repair these deficiencies and issues and a detailed schedule of the work to be carried out has been provided in the application submission.
115. Internally, it is proposed to repair the structural problems existing within the dwelling, including investigations into the roof structure, floor investigations, repointing, tanking, and cosmetic repairs to cracks and deficiencies. A full re-wire is proposed, and the installation of a heat pump, and simplification of the drainage structure. The internal layout is proposed to be altered to provide seven bedrooms with en-suites, however it is noted that the application submission indicates that this will not alter the physical structure of the building and will be reversible if needed. The kitchen will be replaced along with the suspended ceiling, and the timber floors, beams and skirting will be replaced. It is also noted that the applicant is considering the installation of a sprinkler system for fire safety – this would also have a positive impact on protecting the fabric of the building in the event of a fire and therefore is a positive addition to safeguard the significance of the Grade II Listed Building.
116. Externally, it is proposed to repair the roof and chimney, and provide insulation at rafter level. The existing conservatory is proposed to be demolished and rebuilt with a new orangery, and new timber windows and stone portico will be provided. The garden wall will be rebuilt in some places where it has collapsed – the applicant presumes that this has occurred due to the roots of nearby trees undermining the wall.

117. Whilst these works are predominantly associated with the Grade II building, it is also proposed to demolish several ancillary structures/outbuildings/sheds. It is pertinent to note that several of these are already compromised and some have partially collapsed; whilst none of the proposed buildings to be demolished are integral to the significance of the dwelling itself nor are listed structures. A new single storey yoga/gym is proposed and a timber framed pool building, along with the installation of a swimming pool, hot tub, and associated landscaping.
118. Essex County Council Place Services were consulted on the proposal and overall support the proposal. The Historic Building Officer states that *“the scheme seeks to secure the long-term use and maintenance of Little Stambridge Hall in a manner that respects its architectural and historic significance.”*
119. It is acknowledged in relation to the demolition of the conservatory and outbuildings that concerns have been raised by both the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) and the Victorian Society in respect of loss of heritage and historic fabric. Whilst these concerns are acknowledged, the Historic Building Officer notes that *“these structures were confirmed to be of no historic or architectural significance. Their demolition is therefore acceptable.”* It should be noted that the conservatory is not original to the dwelling and was constructed sometime after the dwelling itself.
120. It is noted that the application proposes replacement of the existing floorboards and paraquet. Whilst these are of no significant historic significance – and there is no in-principle objection to their replacement – it is considered that the proposed replacement with concrete would not be sympathetic to the historic nature of the building and an alternative method should be considered. It is considered that this detail can be secured by way of condition relating to materials and method statement.
121. SPAB and the Victorian Society have raised concerns regarding the removal of the Edwardian Staircase to the inside of the dwelling. Whilst it is acknowledged that the removal of such staircase would result in some loss of historic fabric, the Historic Building Officer states that *“its removal, although resulting in some loss of historic fabric, is considered justified under Paragraph 213 of the NPPF”*.
122. It is acknowledged that the new openings to be created for the Orangery and Loggia into the east elevation of the building will result in some loss of historic fabric. On balance, however, this is considered justified due to the removal of the unsympathetic conservatory which overall detracts from the architectural significance of the front elevation of the building.

123. The existing building suffers from periodic basement flooding. The application submission proposes to rectify this issue by tanking the basement. The Historic Building Officer stated that *“tanking should be considered only as a last resort. If necessary, the delta membrane system, as recommended by Historic England, SPAB etc., is the preferred method”*. It is pertinent to note that the Historic Building Officer raises no objection overall towards tanking the basement if necessary, however other methods should be investigated and considered first before tanking.
124. Overall, it is not considered that the proposed development would harm the significance of the Grade II Listed Building or its setting. Whilst it is acknowledged that some historic fabric would be lost, this is considered justified given the proposal would safeguard the optimum viable use of the building for the future. Having regard to the above, the proposal is considered consistent with the aims of the Framework, and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It is acknowledged that the Historic Officer has recommended further submission of details prior to work commencing, and these can be secured by way of condition.

Archaeology

125. Colleagues in Essex County Council Historic Environment have been consulted on the proposal and stated the following:

“The buildings have the potential to contain fixtures, fittings or fabric that relate to its previous uses, origin, evolution and development, and other evidence such as re-used timbers or other structural elements, potentially linked to the former church. Given the programme of renovation and repair proposed to the structures, a Historic Building Recording (HBR) should be carried out prior to the proposed works at the Little Stambridge Hall. As part of the HBR a trained professional should be present during the renovation and repair works to record the exposed heritage assets.”

126. As stated above, the archaeologist has no objection to the proposal subject to imposition of conditions relating to historic building monitoring records being completed prior to the commencement of any above ground works. These can be secured by way of condition in the event that the application is approved.

Equalities and Diversity Implications

127. The Public Sector Equality Duty applies to the Council when it makes a decision. The duty requires us to have regard to the need:
- To eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, and victimisation.

- To advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- To foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

128. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender, race, sexual orientation, religion, gender reassignment, marriage/civil partnerships, and pregnancy/maternity.

129. Taking account of the nature of the proposed development and representations received, it considered that the proposed development would not result in any impacts (either positive or negative) on protected groups as defined under the Equality Act 2010.

CONCLUSION

130. Approve

CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS (summary of responses):

Stambridge Parish Council: No comments received

Essex County Council Conservation and Historic Advice:

The principle of the proposed works is supported. The scheme seeks to secure the long-term use and maintenance of Little Stambridge Hall in a manner that respects its architectural and historic significance. Several elements of the proposal were discussed during the site visit, and it was concluded that:

Use of Concrete for Floor Replacement

The existing floorboards and parquet were confirmed to be of no historic significance, and their replacement is acceptable. However, concerns were raised regarding the proposed use of concrete to replace the joisted floor structure. This approach is not supported, and a more sympathetic method should be adopted.

Alterations to the Staircase

The staircase has an Arts and Crafts style and appears commensurate with the 1970s parquet flooring. Whilst the lower section holds some historic value as evidence of the building's evolution, its removal, although resulting in some loss of historic fabric, is considered justified under Paragraph 213 of the NPPF (December 2024). Demolition of Outbuildings and Conservatory These structures were confirmed to be of no historic or architectural significance. Their demolition is therefore acceptable.

New Openings for the Orangery and Loggia

The proposed new openings in the east elevation were discussed and, although they will result in some loss of historic fabric, the intervention is considered justified due to the removal of the existing unsympathetic conservatory which detracts from the architectural interest of the front elevation of Little Stambridge Hall.

Basement Tanking

The basement is subject to flooding. It is recommended that the source of water ingress be investigated thoroughly. Tanking should be considered only as a last resort. If necessary, the Delta membrane system, as recommended by Historic England, SPAB etc, is the preferred method.

All other works are considered acceptable in principle. However, a detailed specification of the proposed works will be required, clearly outlining the full scope of interventions, including the materials and methods to be used. The proposed works must be carefully designed to be appropriate and sympathetic to the historic character of the building. This should include any thermal upgrades, alterations to doors and windows, and works to floors, walls, and ceilings. The specification should be prepared by a conservation-accredited architect to ensure the approach is sensitive and preserves the building's significance. It is also recommended that a CARE-accredited structural engineer be appointed to assess and justify any structural interventions.

The proposal is supported in principle as it secures the viable use and long-term maintenance of Little Stambridge Hall. Subject to the submission of a detailed specification of works, material selection and relevant reports, the proposal is considered to cause no harm to the significance of the listed building or its setting in terms of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2024). Therefore, the proposal would preserve the special interest of the listed buildings in accordance with Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

No objection subject to the imposition of the following conditions

- Before the commencement of works, the detailed Schedule of Works, method statements and structural reports regarding all works to the historic core of the buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such.
- A schedule with clear photographs of the types and colour of the materials to be used in the external finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to their first use on site. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

- Internal works shall not be commenced until a schedule of all new, internal surface materials including walls, ceilings and floors including insulations and a schedule of all internal and external joinery indicating the proposed finish and decoration to be used has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such.
- Details of proposed new windows, doors, rooflights, eaves, verges and cills to be used by section and elevation at scales between 1:20 and 1:1 as appropriate shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to their first installation or construction on site. Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such.

Essex County Council Place Services (Archaeology):

“The application is for renovate/repair existing grade II listed house, replace ancillary accommodation and construct a swimming pool for use as rental accommodation and a yoga retreat.

The building proposed for renovation and repair is a Grade II listed building (List Entry 1112574) with origins dating back to at least the sixteenth century, as the site depicted on the Chapman and Andre map of 1777. The submitted Heritage Statement says the building was constructed in phases, gaining additions right through to the twentieth century. The Essex Historic Environment Record (EHER) shows that the buildings of Stambridge Hall are located within a medieval moated site (EHER 13607). Several of the structures associated with the hall located within the moated site are post medieval in date and listed, including the wall attached to Little Stambridge Hall and enclosing garden to south (List Entry 1307034), Cartlodge attached to garden wall (List Entry 1112575), and the Lodge (List Entry 1168411). The moated site is also the location of the demolished medieval St Marys Church and graveyard (EHER 13606). The church can also be seen on the Chapman and Andre map of 1777 and is reported to have been in existence until 1923.

The buildings have the potential to contain fixtures, fittings or fabric that relate to its previous uses, origin, evolution and development, and other evidence such as re-used timbers or other structural elements, potentially linked to the former church. Given the programme of renovation and repair proposed to the structures, a Historic Building Recording (HBR) should be carried out prior to the proposed works at the Little Stambridge Hall. As part of the HBR a trained professional should be present during the renovation and repair works to record the exposed heritage assets.

With the above evidence considered, the following recommendation is made, with any approved application, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 218:

Recommendation 1: A Historic Building Recording:

4. No demolition, conversion or alterations shall commence until a programme of historic building recording has been secured in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to be submitted by the applicant for approval by the Local Planning Authority.
5. No demolition, conversion or alterations shall take place until the satisfactory completion of the recording in accordance with the WSI submitted.
6. The applicant will submit a report detailing the results of the recording programme to the Local Planning Authority for approval and confirm the deposition of the archive to an appropriate depository as identified and agreed in the WSI. This shall be done within 6 months of the date of completion of the archaeological fieldwork unless otherwise agreed in advance in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

A building-recording brief detailing the requirements will be produced from this office on request.

As noted in the Heritage Statement there is the potential for archaeological deposits relating to the infilled former moat and the demolished St Mary's Church and graveyard to survive within the proposed development site. The groundworks have the potential to impact these archaeological deposits, therefore a programme of archaeological trial-trenching and excavation is recommended.

The following recommendation is made in line with the National Planning Policy Framework:

Recommendation 2: A programme of archaeological trial-trenching and excavation:

4. No development or preliminary groundworks of any kind shall take place until a programme of archaeological investigation has been secured in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which has been submitted by the applicant, for approval by the Local Planning Authority.
5. No development or preliminary groundworks of any kind shall take place until the completion of the programme of archaeological investigation identified in the WSI defined in 1 above, and any subsequent mitigation has been agreed.
6. The applicant will submit a final archaeological report or (if appropriate) a Post Excavation Assessment report and/or an Updated Project Design for approval by the Local Planning Authority. This shall be submitted within 6 months of the date of completion of the archaeological fieldwork unless otherwise agreed in advance by the Local Planning Authority.

The work will comprise a programme of trial-trenching followed by detailed excavation of archaeological deposits identified. An archaeological brief detailing the requirements can be produced from this office on request.

Historic England:

Historic England provides advice when our engagement can add most value. In this case we are not offering advice.

Victorian Society:

In terms of comments, the SPAB have already more than adequately outlined concerns regarding changes to the partially Edwardian staircase. Clear and convincing justification for the proposed removal of the Edwardian Arts and Crafts phase has not been provided, and the Society would encourage that this element be rejected.

The other grounds for objection might be in relation to the outbuildings and conservatory. Having checked the Listing descriptions of the outbuildings - although by no means exhaustive - they appear to be listed as C17th and C18th respectively, so beyond the remit of the Society. However, the JCNAS portal identifies them as C19th. The Heritage Statement also seem to omit any comment on C19th fabric beyond infills and demolition occurring in that period.

As a result, I echo the comments also made by the SPAB that further clarification is needed regarding the outbuildings, which are largely proposed for demolition. As outlined in the SPAB objection: 'The age and significance of these structures should be assessed so that the impact of their loss can be properly understood. The impact of the proposed pool and associated building on the historic character of the site should also be assessed.' A phased development plan could help to clarify the dates of these ancillary structures. Presently, without this due consideration, the Society is not in an informed position to understand the level of harm to potential C19th fabric.

Neighbours: No responses received

Relevant Development Plan Policies:

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024 revised in February 2025).

Rochford District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy
Adopted Version (December 2011) – CP1

Rochford District Council Local Development Framework Development
Management Plan (December 2014) – policies DM1, DM3, DM12, DM25,
DM27, DM30.

The Essex Design Guide (2018)

Essex Planning Officers Association Parking Guidance Part1: Parking Standards Design and Good Practice (September 2024) (Adopted 16th January 2025).

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Conditions:

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

REASON: To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (As amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved plans: 3212/03, 3212/06 (Revision C), 3212/09, 3212/07 (Revision B), 3212/08 (Revision D), 3212/05 (Revision G)

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

3. A schedule with clear photographs of the types and colour of the materials to be used in the external finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to their first use on site. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure that the external appearance of the building/structure is acceptable in the interests of visual amenity in compliance with the councils Local Development Framework Development Management Plan policy DM1. To safeguard the significance of the Grade II Listed Building in accordance with Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

4. Internal works shall not be commenced until a schedule of all new, internal surface materials including walls, ceilings and floors including insulations and a schedule of all internal and external joinery indicating the proposed finish and decoration to be used has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such.

REASON: To ensure the development harmonises with the character and appearance of the existing building, in the interest of visual amenity and to preserve the significance of the building and its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest to which it possesses.

5. Details of proposed new windows, doors, rooflights, eaves, verges and cills to be used by section and elevation at scales between 1:20 and 1:1 as appropriate shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to their first installation or construction on site. Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such.

REASON: To ensure the development harmonises with the character and appearance of the existing building, in the interest of visual amenity and to preserve the significance of the building and its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest to which it possesses.

6. Detailed section drawings of the build-up of walls/ floors/ ceilings in at, a scale between 1:20 and 1:1 as appropriate, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of internal works. Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such.

REASON: To ensure the development harmonises with the character and appearance of the existing building, in the interest of visual amenity and to preserve the significance of the building and its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest to which it possesses.

7. Prior to installation, drawn details of all new electrical and plumbing service routes and ducting, including the proposed sprinklers, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and then shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure the development harmonises with the character and appearance of the existing building, in the interest of visual amenity and to preserve the significance of the building and its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest to which it possesses.

8. Details of all hard and soft -landscaping and boundary treatments must be approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of any landscaping works.

REASON: To ensure the development harmonises with the character and appearance of the existing building, in the interest of visual amenity and to preserve the significance of the building and its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest to which it possesses.

The local Ward Member(s) for the above application is/are Cllr S Wootton Cllr Phil Shaw Cllr Mrs L Shaw