

SITE PLAN ATTACHED

**HUTTON GARDEN CENTRE NORTH DRIVE HUTTON BRENTWOOD CM13 1SH
CONSTRUCTION OF 6 DETACHED HOUSES**

APPLICATION NO: 21/00262/FUL

WARD Hutton East **8/13 WEEK DATE** 28 April 2021

CASE OFFICER Mr Mike Ovenden **Extension of time** 2 July 2021

Drawing no(s) relevant to this decision: 18-057/01/B; 19-057/03 REV B; 19-057/01 REV C; 19-057/05 REV C;

This application has been referred to committee at the request of Councillor Hossack for the following reasons:

- North Drive has a history of Brown Field sites in the GB passing for residential development. The site immediately opposite the garden centre site being a case in point. In all cases including this one, there has been a nuisance factor where the commercial use of sites has impacted on neighbouring residents. In the case of this site where EH have been involved re burning of waste etc.
- The long term solution is appropriate residential development that whilst delivering in the need for housing on redundant land has the additional benefit of eliminating problems brought about by commercial activity in residential areas.
- The applicant has engaged previously with residents and the local resident group and there was broad support for this scheme. The scheme had also been adjusted by the applicant have taken on board feedback from residents particularly around parking provision.
- Whilst as in the case, with all other developments in North Drive, it is acknowledged the land is designated GB, the reality of the situation, upon inspection, is that this site, whilst surrounded by development on all sides, will have no impact on GB openness and the residential envelope will not be extended into open GB, unlike like other sites in North Drive that have passed for approval without issue. The site represents an ideal opportunity for infill to meet demand for housing in the borough.

1. Proposals

This application relates to the residential redevelopment of the former garden centre site. The proposal would remove the remaining buildings and erect six detached dwellings. Access to the site would remain from North Drive. As originally submitted, the proposal would also have involved the replacement of a single dwelling along the Rayleigh Road frontage with two dwellings, though that part of the scheme was omitted at the applicant's request.

The proposed site layout indicates a staggered row of four detached dwellings at the rear, each dwelling just over a metre from its neighbour, with a gap of less than a metre between Plot 3 and the north boundary and approximately half that between Plot 6 and the south boundary. The staggered arrangement gives varying distances between the rear of the dwellings on Plot 6 to Plot 3 from 11.8 to 22 metres respectively. Plots 1 and 2 at the front of the site would be side on to North Drive and be of a chalet style with dormers. Each dwelling would be provided with two parking spaces sited at the front of each plot, with a further two visitor spaces near the site entrance. A 5.6 m wide shared surface highway provides vehicular access from North Drive to all plots.

2. Policy Context

Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005

- Policy CP1 General Development Criteria
- Policy GB1 New Development
- Policy GB2 Development Criteria
- Policy PC1 Land Contaminated by Hazardous Substances

Emerging Local Development Plan (LDP) to 2033:

The Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 remains the Development Plan and its policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF - the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given.

The emerging Local Development Plan went through Pre-Submission (Publication Draft) Stage (Regulation 19) consultation early in 2019 with a further focused consultation, following revisions to the detailed wording of some of the proposed housing allocations, later in the year. The plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in February 2020. The Examination in Public hearing sessions opened in December 2020, concentrating on strategic matters, with hearings on more detailed matters held in February and March 2021, as set out in draft timetabling by the Secretary of State. The Inspector has asked for more information on some issues with further hearing sessions expected to

take place in July 2021. Provided the Inspector finds the plan to be sound, it is projected that it could be adopted by the Council towards the end of 2021.

As the emerging plan advances and objections become resolved, more weight can be applied to the policies within it. At this stage there are outstanding objections to be resolved, nevertheless, the Plan provides a good indication of the direction of travel in terms of aspirations for growth in the Borough and where development is likely to come forward through draft housing and employment allocations. While the examination is a further step in progress towards adoption, because the plan has yet to complete its progress through the Examination in Public it is still considered that it currently has limited weight in the decision making process.

National Policy

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

3. Relevant History

- 11/01095/FUL: Demolition of existing buildings and replacement with new building with retained use as Garden Centre. -Application Permitted (expired)
- 16/00338/FUL: Demolition of Existing buildings and Replacement with new building used as Garden Centre -Application Permitted
- 16/00338/COND/1: Discharge of conditions 6 (Scheme of hard and soft landscaping), 7 (Samples of materials), 9 (Design, layout and location of cycle facilities), 10 (Design, layout and location of motor cycle facilities) (conditions 1 and 5 are statements) of application 16/00338/FUL (Demolition of Existing buildings and Replacement with new building used as Garden Centre). -Application Permitted
- 19/00976/S192: Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for a proposed use or development for the demolition of existing buildings and clearance of site. Formation of new entrance ready for development all constituting a meaningful start on site under Approval 16/00338/FUL (Demolition of Existing buildings and Replacement with new building used as Garden Centre) -Lawful

4. Neighbour Responses

Where applications are subject to public consultation those comments are summarised below. The full version of each neighbour response can be viewed on the Council's website via Public Access at the following link:

<http://publicaccess.brentwood.gov.uk/online-applications/>

- We object for all reasons given below but primarily as its green belt and is such a dense development that would destroy the charm of Haverings Grove.
- Plot 3 seems to block the green lane at the rear
- Plots 6 and 7 should have a condition for no further windows facing 634

- Parking needs to be at least one per bedroom – 30 bedrooms proposed
- If a resident has a van, where will they park?
- We won't authorise alterations along the boundaries unless we feel we benefit
- Fences should be 1.8 m plus gravel boards
- Request care near residents wall and damage repaired at developers costs
- Request condition that lights don't shine into our property
- Application says no trees on site; there is a large conifer we would like removed
- Request no trees planted within six feet of our boundary
- Development is too dense for Haverings Grove
- To retain the feeling of our village it should be limited to four dwellings, not eight
- Dwellings will be visible from our house and garden; the garden centre the building was tucked behind the games room
- It is green belt and therefore needs to retain feeling of openness
- All the properties would be very close to each other and destroy any sense of openness
- Given the potential number of cars it could look like a run down estate very quickly
- Documentation is inconsistent in the number of dwellings proposed
- A telephone line crosses the site and will need to be relocated
- Bin store – unnecessary and could attract rats
- Site raised in the past due to deposition of rubble – should be removed
- Various concerns about works near boundary
- Objection to replacement of Rayleigh Road dwelling with two; should be a separate proposal considered in the context of the street scene
- Garden centre site is green belt but brown field

5. **Consultation Responses**

Detailed below is a summary of the consultation responses, if any received. The full version of each consultation response can be viewed on the Council's website via Public Access at the following link: <http://publicaccess.brentwood.gov.uk/online-applications/>

- **Arboriculturalist -**

The site comprises predominantly hardstanding and with little vegetation present. There are short sections of hedge and small trees on the boundaries in third-party ownership; however it is clear that the proposed development could take place without any adverse effects on these if the arboricultural method statement is followed. No details of proposed hard and soft landscaping or boundary treatments have been provided with the application. I am happy for these to be dealt with by condition. I have no objection to the proposed scheme on landscape or ecology grounds.

- **Highway Authority – none received**

- **Environmental Health & Enforcement Manager-**

Suggest the following conditions:

Where the site is adjacent to residential or business premises, heavy plant, noisy equipment or operations and deliveries, should not take place outside the hours of;

Monday-Friday.....08.00-18.00

Saturday.....08.00-13.00.

No noisy activities on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Particularly noisy equipment such as Pile Drivers/Angle Cutters/Pneumatic Drills/Cement Mixers etc. should be used approximately one hour after the beginning hours mentioned above and one hour before the said end times.

- o All plant and equipment should be suitably chosen, sited, operated and serviced so as to minimise noise, vibration, fumes and dust. Best practical means should be employed to minimise potential nuisance to neighbouring properties. All plant should be turned off when not in use.
- o Pneumatic tools should be fitted with an integral silencer and/or purpose made muffler, which is maintained in good repair.
- o Where the site is adjacent to residential or business premises, bonfires should be avoided, and all waste materials should be removed from site and suitably disposed of. At no time should any material that is likely to produce dark/black smoke be burnt (eg. Plastics, rubber, treated wood, bitumen etc.)
- o Neighbouring residential premises should be advised of any unavoidable late night or early morning working which may cause disturbance. Any such works should be notified to the Environmental Health Department prior to commencement.

- **Design Officer** – none received. The proposal is not a Major development and raises no heritage issues.

- **ECC SUDS-**

Initial holding objection. Following submission of further information, the recommendation has been amended to no objections subject to conditions covering the following:

- Submission and approval of detailed surface water drainage scheme. The scheme should include but not be limited to:
 - o Limiting discharge rates to 1l/s for all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% allowance for climate change storm event. All relevant permissions to discharge from the site into any outfall should be agreed.
 - o SuDS Maintenance plan indicating who is responsible for different elements of the surface water drainage system.

6. Summary of Issues

Procedural matter

In accordance with national and local advice to operate in ways that protect public health due to coronavirus (COVID-19) consideration was given to whether and how to visit the site. However, the site was visited as it can be viewed without going into enclosed spaces.

Consideration

The starting point when determining a planning application is the development plan, in this case the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005. Planning legislation states that applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Relevant material considerations for determining this application are the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). Although individual policies in the Local Plan should not be read in isolation, the plan contains policies of particular relevance to this proposal which are listed in section 4 above. In the event that this proposal is not policy compliant, the planning history may be relevant, notably the permission for the redevelopment of the garden centres, permitted under reference 16/00338/FUL.

Green Belt

The site is in the greenbelt which washes over the locality, to a significant distance in each direction. This is shown on the map that accompanies the local plan. There is no proposal to remove it from the emerging LDP. The committee will be aware that the government attaches great importance to the greenbelt. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Greenbelt is a spatial designation not a qualitative one, therefore the requirement to protect openness applies just as much to less attractive countryside as to attractive areas of greenbelt. The committee will be aware that the terms *green belt* and *'brownfield'* (meaning previously developed land) are not mutually exclusive and a site can be both green belt and 'brownfield'. The application site, a former garden centre, is considered to be both brownfield, i.e. previously developed, and green belt.

Policies GB1 and GB2 aim to control development but support a limited range of development, subject to being appropriate to the greenbelt and protecting its openness. These policies are broadly consistent with the NPPF, but where there is a difference between it and the Development Plan, the NPPF, which is newer than the development plan, takes preference. The later document is a more up to date and concise statement of greenbelt policy.

The NPPF stipulates that new buildings are inappropriate development in the greenbelt, unless one of a short list of quoted exceptions in paragraph 145. The applicant has indicated that the proposal should be considered under 145(g):

(g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

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

There is no indication that the proposal relates to affordable housing and therefore the last bullet point can be discounted.

In other words, the NPPF is more supportive of developing brownfield green belt sites, than non previously developed green belt sites, though its support is limited to those proposals which do not have a greater impact on openness than existing development.

The site is currently open with a rundown appearance of rough grass, hardstanding, piles of timber, waste and hard core with some low rise utilitarian buildings primarily in the south east corner with some low building and scaffolding racks extending part way along the east boundary.

The proposed dwellings at the front (Plots 1 and 2) would measure 10.3 metres wide, 10.3 in length, 6.8m tall with an eaves height of 3.15m. The typology has a gable and two dormers at the front and three dormers at the rear. The dwellings to the rear (Plots 3 to 6) would measure 7.4 metres wide, 10.3 in length, 8.75 m tall with an eaves height of 5m. Given the minimal development currently on site, the proposal through its form and layout, would have a very substantial effect on openness of the site. On that basis the proposal is inappropriate development in the greenbelt.

“143. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

144. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”

The last sentence is particularly worthy of note. Even were there to be very special circumstances they would need to *clearly out weigh* the potential harm to the Green Belt

by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, which is a much higher threshold than an on balance judgement.

Therefore, the acceptability of the proposal is wholly reliant on very special circumstances meeting the threshold set out in paragraph 144 above i.e. *the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.*

This will be assessed later in the report once it has been established whether the proposal is acceptable/unacceptable with regard to other planning matters.

Design, character, and amenity

Policy CP1 is supportive of development proposals provided they protect the character and appearance of the surrounding area, protect the amenities of neighbours, are of a high standard of design and have satisfactory access and parking and can be accommodated by local highway infrastructure.

The character of the local area is partly derived from being in the green belt, the openness and spaciousness of sites along North Drive. As explained above the development would erode openness and therefore detract from the character of the area. The forward position, the side on orientation is not in character with this part of North Drive. The proposed buildings at the rear of the site, would visually appear as one mass, with little space between, no variation and very close to the north and south boundaries. The development in this part of the site would extend much closer to the north/south boundary (16/00338/FUL permitted scheme - 6.6/9.6m to the north boundary and 5 to 5.4m to the south boundary); current proposal under a metre (north) and approximately 50cm (south boundary) and be (2.1m) taller than approved as part of the garden centre redevelopment. These represent a significant change in built form from that previously on the site, its current condition or the implemented redevelopment. In that respect it would be contrary to policy CP1.

The designs are generic, the layout appears to have been driven by achieving numbers rather than any analysis and reinforcement of local character. The front two plots (1 and 2) would sit forward of the approved garden centre building and the church next door and present side elevations and back gardens to North Drive and adjacent Church site. The rear plots are closely packed to each other and the north and south boundaries and the scale of all the dwellings means they would be clearly visible from adjacent land. The layout is highway and parking dominated and suburban in character.

The dwellings would have no first floor windows on their side elevations and therefore would not give rise to side ways overlooking. The rear dwellings would in part be closer than 15 m (the standard given in Appendix 1 of the Development Plan from rear window to boundary distance) to the rear boundary and therefore potentially give rise to overlooking of land to the east. However there appears to be an access outside the site along the east boundary and therefore a distance of greater than 15 metres would be

achieved between the rear windows of the proposed dwelling and land susceptible to loss of privacy, e.g. private gardens etc. The proposal would not be overbearing on adjacent properties, though were permission to be granted details of finished site levels would have been imposed to control such a relationship.

The applicant says that sustainable features would be incorporated into the design, refers to air source heat pumps, rainwater harvesting (often a garden water butt), high levels of insulation and use of sustainable materials but provides no details to demonstrate or test these claims. The applicant makes a general statement that “sustainable with the benefit of Photovoltaic panels on the roof” but none are shown on the drawings. The applicant makes a general statement about compliance with Lifetime Homes although it appears no dwelling proposed would be more than partly compliant.

Highways and parking

A response has not been received from Highways. However as North Drive is a private road the Highways authority is unlikely to have an objection to this scale of proposal. Further residential use following redevelopment of a former commercial site, though a long time dormant/under used site in this case, is likely to result in fewer vehicle movements than an operational garden centre.

The proposal would provide two spaces per dwelling plus two visitor spaces, which meets adopted standards and, while below the level of provision suggested in a representation, is acceptable. On that basis the proposal would comply with the part of CP1 requiring satisfactory access, parking and the ability of local highway infrastructure to accommodate the development.

Land contamination

The application contains a contamination report, identifying various pollutants on the site. In the event of permission being granted a condition(s) would have been imposed to require suitable remediation. Potentially subject to such a condition(s) the proposal could be compliant with Policy PC1.

Housing land supply and delivery

The Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply against its local housing need and the rate of delivering new dwellings is low. On that basis government policy is that the Council’s planning policies relating to housing supply cannot be considered to be up to date. National planning policy states that the balance (in the decision making process) should, as a result, be tilted in favour of sustainable development and planning permission should be granted except where any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

However, the NPPF lists specified protected areas, such as greenbelt, where this permissive approach does not apply as protection of the greenbelt provides a strong reason for restricting development. Therefore the 'tilted balance' does not operate with regard to this development.

Drainage

The applicant has submitted a drainage report which is only a preliminary drainage strategy with further investigation/details required at a detailed design stage. The Essex County Council SUDS team originally issued a holding objection for that reason.

Following further discussions, the SUDS team has agreed that a detailed surface water drainage scheme could be required by condition and therefore has withdrawn its objection.

Other matters

A representation suggests a higher level of parking provision than required by the adopted standards, suggesting one space per bedroom rather than two spaces per dwelling. The parking standards are an appropriate starting point and there is no evidence to justify implementation of a new higher standard here. Other comments relate to matters already covered in the report or private ownership matters which are not planning issues.

Green belt balance

The planning history of a site may form part of a case for a very special circumstance. In this case, permission was granted in 2012 for the redevelopment of the garden centre on this site. That permission expired but was granted a second time in 2016 as circumstances had not changed. Although that permission has also now expired, pre commencement conditions were discharged and a material start made on the development before it expired. This has been confirmed in a lawful development certificate and the development having been commenced within time may continue at any time. That permission therefore represents a fall back position. Therefore, rather than just comparing the proposal to the current development on the site, it is material to compare the proposal to the approved garden centre redevelopment scheme.

That proposal was for a single building at the back (east) of the site with a display area between it and the car park at the front of the site adjacent to the access. The building was to be a simple rectangular plan form, with low eaves (2.9m high) and pitched roof (6.7m high).

The applicant has made reference to a reduction in volume of buildings when comparing the approved garden centre development and this proposal, though accepts that the dwellings at the rear would be two metres taller (i.e. 8.75 m tall) than the approved garden centre building. The applicant comments that the site would have less

area used for parking and more for landscaping but doesn't explain how that effects openness when compared to a development proposing six dwellings across the site, each with accommodation over two floors.

The applicant has provided a selection of comparative dimensions, areas and volumes between the approved garden centre redevelopment and this proposal. It has not been possible to replicate the applicant's measurements, those provided appear to overstate the size of the permitted garden centre building and underestimate the size of the proposal. However, footprint, volume and internal area are not good assessments of openness – as discussed at a pre application meeting last year for a different proposal - this has not been discussed with the applicant. The committee will recall officer advice that there is no official measure to assess openness and the NPPF even in its revised form does not suggest a method to compare existing and proposed development or judge openness. However, this issue has been addressed to some degree in National Planning Practice Guidance (001 Reference ID: 64-001-20190722). This new guidance is based on caselaw and indicates that assessing the impact on openness:

“requires a judgment based on the circumstances of the case. By way of example, the courts have identified a number of matters which may need to be taken into account in making this assessment. These include, but are not limited to:

- openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects – in other words, the visual impact of the proposal may be relevant, as could its volume;
- the duration of the development, and its remediability – taking into account any provisions to return land to its original state or to an equivalent (or improved) state of openness; and
- the degree of activity likely to be generated, such as traffic generation.”

It is to be noted that this is guidance rather than policy and it gives examples of matters which 'may need to be taken into account' which it makes clear are not all embracing or necessarily excludes other matters.

Even before the publication of the guidance, officers have long advised that as openness is a visual quality, normally considered to be the lack of buildings, a useful way to assess the new build elements of proposals in comparison with existing lawful development is a visual comparison of the massing, spread and position of existing and proposed buildings. This is in compliance with the first bullet point above, taking volume to mean massing rather than a mathematical calculation. As advised on previous occasions while its not unusual for people to quote numerical data for footprint, floorspace or volume when considering redevelopment proposals in the greenbelt, reliance on mathematical data can be misleading. This remains officers' view and equating volume in visual terms as size, massing, bulk is both an appropriate method of assessment and consistent with this national advice.

Under the implemented scheme, much of the site was to remain without buildings. The intention of the permitted scheme which was to keep the indoor display area building in one corner – the previous buildings were lower but slightly more spread out. The garden centre parking and outdoor display area would have a very limited effect on openness and that would be transient, not the greater impact of the permanent buildings of the scale described above. This residential redevelopment proposal stretches development further across the site and the dwellings would have greater scale which together would detract from the openness of the greenbelt further compounding the harm of this inappropriate development.

Part of the character of the area relates to the spaciousness of the site. Some of the openness in the locality has been eroded in recent years through permissions granted for a new dwelling at The Old Barn, and the six new dwellings at Land West of North Drive (Hutton Grange). Those developments have weakened the contribution that this and adjacent sites make to supporting the purposes of the green belt. However, currently the prevailing characteristic of the site remains its openness, which would remain if the garden centre redevelopment permission was fully implemented, while this proposal would largely remove that characteristic.

It is considered that the matters raised as very special circumstances do not meet the test in the NPPF that the harm to the openness of the green belt *by reason of inappropriateness*, the poor layout and design, out of character with the area and the inadequate drainage submission is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

With regard to a fall back position, there are three tests established in case law for assessing a fall back position. First whether there is a fall back use, that is to say whether there is a lawful ability to undertake such a use; secondly, whether there is a likelihood or real prospect of such occurring. Thirdly if the answer to the second question is "yes" a comparison should be made between the proposed development and the fall back use. However, while the garden centre redevelopment proposal is capable in planning terms of being carried out and a comparison has been carried out above, there must be some doubt that there is a likelihood or real prospect of the garden centre redevelopment proceeding. These weakens the weight attributable to the fall back development.

The reason for the call in to committee is quoted in full at the head of the report. This report acknowledges that the site is previously developed but identifies the tests required by the NPPF – an assessment of openness of existing and proposed development, in this case tempered by a consideration of the commenced garden centre redevelopment. The proposal fails those tests. On that basis as indicated above, while there is potential for some form of redevelopment here, it would need to be one having less effect on openness, and a better overall design, than this proposal. A policy compliant form of development would protect the green belt and bring about the hoped

for benefits listed in the referral. The case officer has discussed possible revisions to the proposal but the applicant wants the application determined as it stands.

Notwithstanding the advice in this report, if the committee were minded to resolve to grant permission, it would need to decide which conditions should be imposed on that permission.

7. Recommendation

The Application be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

R1 The proposal is unacceptable because it would result in the erection of new buildings in the greenbelt outside any exception listed in the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal therefore represents inappropriate development in the greenbelt which is by definition harmful. The front two plots would sit in a prominent forward position, present side elevations and back gardens to North Drive which is not characteristic of the area. The rear plots would be closely packed both in relation to each other and to the north and south boundaries and the greater scale of all the dwellings means they would be clearly visible from adjacent land and alter the character of the area. The layout is highway and parking dominated, suburban in character and is not indicative of good design. The applicant has not demonstrated very special circumstances that the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CP1, GB1 and GB2 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 and Chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative(s)

1 INF05 Policies

The following development plan policies contained in the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 are relevant to this decision: CP1, GB1, GB2, PC1, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 and NPPG 2014.

2 INF20 Drawing Numbers (Refusal)

The drawing numbers listed above are relevant to this decision

3 U0007906

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and clearly identifying within the grounds of refusal either the defective principle of development or the significant and demonstrable harm it would cause. Furthermore the opportunity was provided for the applicant to revise the proposal in a way that might have overcome the objections to the application but the applicant requested that the application be determined as it stands.

Documents: All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online:
www.brentwood.gov.uk/planning