

SITE PLAN ATTACHED

03. LAND ADJACENT TO 42 IRIS CLOSE PILGRIMS HATCH ESSEX

CONSTRUCTION OF A THREE BEDROOM DETACHED HOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING

APPLICATION NO: 14/00934/FUL

WARD	Pilgrims Hatch	8/13 WEEK DATE	26.09.2014
PARISH		POLICIES	NPPF NPPG CP1 T2
CASE OFFICER	Charlotte Allen		01277 312536
Drawing no(s) relevant to this decision:	PLANNING STATEMENT; TREE SURVEY; ADDITIONAL INFORMATION; L.001; P.01; P.02; P.03; P.04; P.05; P.06; P.07; P.08; 14-569;		

Update following 14th October Planning and Development Control Committee

Ownership and Rights Over the Land

Referral of both applications to Planning and Development Control Committee was delayed by issues associated with ownership and designation of the land, which required clarification. This arose partly from an ownership certificate attached to the applications being in favour of Essex County Council and partly from local resident concerns and claims that the land had always been understood to be amenity land or open space. The land is what was commonly referred to in the past as Sites Left Over After Planning (SLOAP) which could be defined as pockets of land lacking in clear definition of use that remained after a housing development. It was common for housing developments in the second half of the 20thC to include SLOAP, particularly where design layout and legal issues remained unresolved

Officers have now completed their investigations and established the following facts:

- The applicant is a company closely associated with the original developer of the housing estate.
- The owner of the application sites and adjoining undeveloped land is the applicant, as confirmed by land charge searches.
- All the green areas on the estate were adopted as highways. The Highways Committee of Brentwood Urban District Council on the 5th June 1972 in Minute resolution 69 authorised adoption of the roads.
- The planning statement submitted with the application included a signed copy from Essex County Council of the extinguishing of highway rights, subject to no objection from Brentwood Borough Council, by agreement or by grant of planning permission.
- A Deed of Agreement made under the Highways Act 1959 between George Wimpey and Brentwood Borough Council was exchanged in 1968 included reference to a proposal for the Council taking over the whole site as public open space and sewers, but there was no adoption of the green areas as open space. The operative clause of the Deed states that “the Council shall adopt the areas coloured as part of the roads maintainable at public expense”. It has been part of Highway Law since 1925 that the improvement of roads includes grass areas, and in the consolidation Highways Act of 1980 this power extends to the laying out of grass verges.
- Brentwood Borough Council granted a planting licence under the Highways Act 1980 to the then owner of 61 Iris Close. This confirms that the Council never did adopt the land for any purpose other than highways.
- Essex County Council have confirmed that they have no interest in the land other than highways authority and received transfer of this authority over the land in 2005, without qualification, from Brentwood Borough Council.
- The land has been maintained by up to 11 cuts of grass a year by Brentwood Borough Council probably since the estate was built out. The land being highway land, the Council received payment from Essex County Council for 2 cuts a year, since transfer back of the highways agency agreement. The maintenance, therefore, was not undertaken for amenity or other reasons separately from being highway land.

The investigation was thorough and can only lead to a conclusion that there is no firm basis for any claim that the land has been designated for any purposes other than highways and sewers.

Planning Policy Designation

Local Members have queried why the land has not been designated under local planning policy as 'Protected Urban Open Space'. In view of the land being highway land, it would have been excluded in the past for assessment as open space to be protected.

The Council last reviewed its opens spaces in 2003 for the purpose of revising open space byelaws. The schedule of open spaces at that time included some small plots at Hubert Road, Bird Lance, Victor's Crescent and Doddinghurst Road, but not Iris Close.

As regards any future designation, now that the highway authority has expressed a willingness to extinguish highway rights over the land, the site could be included in the next review of open space, assuming no permission is granted for other uses. As part of the preparation of the Local Plan, consultants are being commissioned to undertake a review of all green spaces in the Borough. The findings of this work are hoped to be published in the New Year.

Application for Asset of Community Value

A report will be presented to a Special Meeting of Community Committee on 20 November 2014 for members to consider to decide whether, or not, to list the land as a community asset. Should the Council decide to list it, then the Council will inform the current owner, who has to inform the Council if, and when, there is an intention to dispose of the land. The Community Group then have 6 weeks to indicate whether they would like to be considered as a possible bidder for the asset and, if so, this starts a 'moratorium' whereby the owner is not allowed to dispose of the asset for 6 months. At the end of this period, the owner may choose to whom to sell the asset and at what price.

In this instance, the owner/applicant is a developer and builder and there is, therefore, no reasonable expectation of any intention to dispose of the land. A planning approval is likely to result in implementation of the permitted plans without any transfer of the land.

Members may give weight to the application for an asset of community vale as a material planning consideration, especially as an expression of the strength of residents' concern to retain the land as amenity space. However, Members should temper this with the probability of no disposal, so no community purchase, prior to implementation.

1. Proposals

This application is presented straight to committee, rather than going through the weekly list process given the high level of neighbour representation received.

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a detached dwelling to the east of No.42 Iris Close. The proposed dwelling is of a chalet design and has three bedrooms. There is a detached garage to the east of the dwelling.

There is a concurrent application for a new dwelling on the site opposite this proposed development, which is separate from this proposal.

2. Policy Context

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into effect on 27 March 2012 and is now a material consideration in planning decisions. The weight to be given to it will be a matter for the decision makers planning judgement in each particular case. This Framework replaces all the national planning guidance documents as stated in the NPPF, including Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Planning Policy Statements. Notwithstanding this, the NPPF granted a one year period of grace for existing adopted Local Plan policies which has now ended, but, the NPPF advises that following this 12 month period, due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the Framework, (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given). The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) is a material consideration in the determination of this application.

Local Plan Policies

CP1 - General Development Criteria

LT2 - Development of Existing Urban Open Space

T2 - New Development and Highway Considerations

3. Relevant History

- 14/00935/FUL: Construction of a three bedroom detached house with associated access, parking and landscaping -

4. Neighbour Responses

To date 61 objection letters have been received which object to both this application and the application on the land opposite the site which raise the following concerns:

- Loss of valuable green amenity space
- Green area used by children as a safe place to play; will affect children in the area.
- Large detached houses not in-keeping and would be unsightly; semi-detached and terraced houses in the area and are out of proportion.
- Overlooking
- Affect property values
- Loss of outlook
- Loss of view
- Loss of trees
- Harm to wildlife/biodiversity; particularly bats, badgers (badger sett on site), birds, hedgehogs, foxes
- Amenity area used by community; similar to village green
- Lack of consultation by Council with local residents
- Development is not in the Local Development Plan
- Negative impact on visual amenity
- Negative impact on residential amenity
- Infilling/garden grabbing.
- Eroding community resource.
- Harm character of area - was designed with open gardens and small greens
- Valued by older residents and parents.
- Already highly populated area.
- More cars/traffic
- Parking is already an issue and will be exacerbated.
- Disruption during construction
- Precedent for other green spaces in Pilgrims Hatch
- Flowers estate has small gardens and large Bishops Hall Park is too remote.
- Would turn footpath into alley; security issues.
- Inappropriate and overdevelopment
- Access to houses would reduce parking.
- Danger Iris Close and Heather Close will become a through road.
- Developer may amend plans for more development
- Loss of sunlight and daylight and overshadowing.
- Turning area could not longer be used.
- Would affect public footpath
- Road safety issues
- Is the only piece of green other than the park
- Amenity grabbing - depriving the community of a valued resource
- Local Plan preferred options indicates six sites in Pilgrims Hatch but also reports the area requires more children's play areas.
- May increase flooding.
- Noise and pollution

- Is higher ground than Heather Close
- Would lose the benefit of 2 street lights; security concerns.
- Loss of 4 parking spaces at the end of the cul-de-sac.
- Green is an integral part of the Flowers estate
- For developer/Council
- Further overcrowding
- Was refused permission due to impact to Heather Close.
- Have seen all our green spaces built on
- Only Green area on Iris Close/Flowers estate
- Refusing applications would reduce carbon emissions.
- Would remove 57 percent of the open green space
- Contrary to Policy CP1
- Overbearing houses
- Will 1 new house really make a difference to housing need.
- Planting of birch trees will block sunlight.
- Will destroy sense of openness.
- Already lost part of park to Marconi Gardens.

5. Consultation Responses

• Highway Authority:

Having regard to the fact that both of these development sites are situated at the end of a cul-de-sac, in both cases the speed and weight of traffic is going to be very low. The geometry of the turning head already provides the new access points with suitable visibility splays and the sites can accommodate parked vehicles in accordance with current policy standards.

The Highway Authority therefore does not wish to raise objections to the above applications subject to the following:

o Prior to occupation of the development the vehicular parking facilities, as shown on the submitted plan shall be constructed, surfaced and maintained free from obstruction within the site at all times for that sole purpose.

Reason: To ensure that vehicles can enter and leave the highway in a controlled manner in the interest of highway safety in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

o No unbound material shall be used in the surface treatment of the vehicular access within 6 metres of the highway boundary.

Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

o Any vehicular hardstanding shall have minimum dimensions of 2.9 metres x 5.5 metres for each individual parking space, retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure adequate space for parking off the highway is provided in the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

o All single garages should have a minimum internal measurement of 7m x 3m, and all garages shall be retained for the purposes of vehicle parking in perpetuity

Reason: To encourage the use of garages for their intended purpose and to discourage on-street parking, in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011

o No works shall commence until a detailed sustainable transport mitigation package has been submitted to and agreed, in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This package will provide information on how the applicant proposes to mitigate any increase in private vehicular use associated with the development and will include appropriate information on all sustainable transport modes including bus and rail travel, cycling, walking (including the local Public Rights of Way network), taxi travel, car sharing and community transport in the vicinity of the site. The package shall thereafter be implemented as agreed for each individual dwelling and/or premises within 14 days of the first beneficial use or occupation of that unit.

Reason: In the interests of mitigating the impact of the approved development by seeking to reduce the need to travel by private car through the promotion of sustainable transport choices.

Note: Essex County Council as Highway Authority can assist in the production of appropriate material as packs of information are available for purchase by the developer. Contact the Sustainable Travel Planning team on 01245 436135 or email travelplanteam@essex.gov.uk for more information.

o No works shall commence on either site until such time as the removal of highway rights procedure has been completed and confirmation of this has been provided in writing to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Any works being commenced on site whilst highway rights still exist will be considered a breach of the Highways Act 1980.

Note: The Highway Authority does not object to the proposed removal of highway rights in this location.

INF01 Highway Works - All work within or affecting the highway is to be laid out and constructed by prior arrangement with, and to the requirements and satisfaction of, the Highway Authority, details to be agreed before the commencement of works.

The applicants should be advised to contact the Development Management Team by email at development.management@essexhighways.org or by post to:

Essex Highways, Colchester Highways Depot, 910 The Crescent, Colchester, CO4 9QQ.

INF02 Cost of Works - The Highway Authority cannot accept any liability for costs associated with a developer's improvement. This includes design check safety audits, site supervision, commuted sums for maintenance and any potential claims under Part 1 and Part 2 of the Land Compensation Act 1973. To protect the Highway Authority against such compensation claims a cash deposit or bond may be required.

- **Environment Agency:**

As the proposed development site is less than 1 hectare in size, and located in Flood Zone 1, the main flood risk issue to consider is the management of surface water run-off. This is covered by our Flood Risk Standing Advice (FRSA) available online here:

<https://www.gov.uk/flood-risk-standing-advice-frsa-for-local-planning-authorities>

- **Arboriculturalist:**

No - the tree information is good, no arb reasons for refusal it will need to be included as a condition with monitoring by a qualified arboriculturalist

6. Summary of Issues

The application site is located on the northern side of Iris Close and currently forms an open area of green space with some trees on the site. There are houses to the west and north of the site, and houses beyond the green to the east and south. The site is allocated for residential purposes in the Local Plan. The site does not lie within a protected urban open space.

The main considerations in the determination of this proposal are therefore; principle of development; design; effect on residential amenity and living conditions of nearby neighbours; parking and highway considerations and landscaping and ecology considerations:

Principle of the Development

The site is allocated for residential purposes in the local plan and is not designated as protected urban open space. Chapter 8 of the NPPF seeks to promote healthy communities, with paragraph 69 stating that planning decisions should aim to achieve places which promote high quality public space and paragraph 73 stating that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. However, Paragraph 76 states that local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as 'Local Green Space' local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Paragraph 77

states that the Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space.

From the representations received it is clear that local residents feel this area of green space has a strong local amenity value, however, given that it is not allocated as protected urban open space, or as a local green space as outlined in the NPPF and given that the proposal would not result in the loss of the entire open green space, the principle of the development is acceptable, subject to other considerations such as design, parking and residential amenity.

Design

In design terms, the style of the dwelling has been influenced by the surrounding context. The dwellings on this side of Iris Close are characterised by chalet-type dwellings and this proposal includes front and rear dormers. The ridge and eaves height clearly reflect that of the adjoining dwellings. However, the dwelling is not identical to the adjoining dwellings and there are differences, including the detached nature of the dwelling and detached garage which are not characteristic of the area. The width of the dwelling is also larger than the adjoining residents. However, a streetscene elevation has been submitted which demonstrates that whilst the dwelling will not be a copy of the adjoining dwellings, it will not appear incongruous in the streetscene.

It should also be noted that Paragraph 60 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles of particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. While there are differences between the design proposed and the adjoining dwellings, as outlined in the NPPF it is unreasonable to stifle originality through requirements to conform, and in any event the overall style of the proposal does reinforce local distinctiveness. Therefore, the proposal complies with aims and objectives of Chapter 7 of the NPPF and Policy CP1(i) and (iii) of the Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

In terms of overlooking no side windows are proposed. The front windows would overlook the public realm and as such would not result in any unacceptable overlooking. The rear windows would be located a minimum of some 12m from the rear boundary which is not dissimilar to the rear isolation spaces of adjoining residents. A degree of views into neighbouring gardens is to be expected in a residential area of this nature and the proposal would not result in significant or demonstrable levels of overlooking. No objection is therefore raised on this basis.

In terms of an overbearing impact the dwelling would be located a minimum of some 20m from the fronts of dwellings in Heather Close with the garage a minimum of some

16.5m from the front elevations of dwellings in Heather Close. Given this degree of separation the proposal would not result in any undue overbearing impact or dominance to these residents. The dwelling would not extend beyond the rear wall of the adjoining dwelling at No.42 and would not therefore result in any significant harm in terms of an overbearing impact to No.42. All other properties are too remote to be adversely affected in this regard. Given the design, size and location of the dwelling the proposal would not therefore result in any significant overbearing impact, dominance, loss of light or loss of outlook.

No objection is therefore raised in this regard in terms of Paragraph 17 of the NPPF or Policy CP1(ii) of the Local Plan.

Living Conditions

All habitable rooms will be provided with windows to provide light, outlook and ventilation and a garden area in excess of 100 sq. m will be provided. The proposed development would therefore provide adequate living conditions to any future occupiers in accordance with Planning Policy.

Parking and Highway Considerations

The Highway Authority has commented that having regard to the fact that both of these development sites are situated at the end of the cul-de-sac, in both cases the speed and weight of traffic is going to be very low. The geometry of the turning head already provides the new access points with suitable visibility splays and the site can accommodate parked vehicles in accordance with current policy standards. The Highway Authority therefore does not wish to raise an objection to the proposal subject to conditions and on this basis, the proposal complies with the relevant policy requirements.

Landscaping and Ecology Considerations

The Council's Tree Officer has raised no objection to the proposal and suggests that any works to trees are monitored by a qualified Arboriculturalist. Subject to conditions requiring a landscaping scheme to be submitted, there would be no adverse impact on trees.

In terms of ecology, it is noted that a number of neighbours have raised concerns about the impact of the proposal on ecology, including protected species and there are claims that there is a badger sett on the site. The planning statement submitted suggests that the site has no intrinsic ecological value. However, given the comments received from the neighbours, it is necessary to condition any grant of consent to require the submission of an ecological survey before any work commences on the site. Subject to such a condition, the proposal satisfies the policy requirements..

Other Considerations

The majority of the neighbour objections have already been considered including the loss of the green space, residential amenity issues, such as overlooking, trees, design, impact on wildlife and highway and parking considerations.

With regard to the loss of the green space/community space and its use by children, it is noted that this space is important to local residents, however, as already stated it is not a protected open space and there will still be a green space retained for public enjoyment.

Property values and developer profit are not material planning considerations. Adequate neighbour consultation was undertaken. Noise during construction is not a reason to refuse an application and construction disruption can be partially controlled with the imposition of a condition requiring a construction method statement. The site may not be specifically allocated for housing development in the Local Plan but it is allocated for residential purposes making the principle acceptable, subject to meeting other considerations.

The development is not considered to be garden grabbing and in any event, the Council has no relevant policies related to development of back gardens.

Comments relating to overdevelopment and the high population and density of the area; the proposal equates to a density of some 25 dwelling per hectare which is not considered excessive within an urban location. Concern has been raised that this proposal will set a precedent for other green spaces in the area, however, each planning application is considered and determined on its own merits.

With regard to comments that the developer may amend the application and apply for other development on the site, this proposal must be considered as submitted and any amendments/new scheme would require further permission. A neighbour refers to being refused themselves due to impact on adjoining residents, but as stated each application must be considered on its own merits.

Comments have been received that the proposal would turn the nearby footpath into an alley, causing security concerns, however, a fairly large green space will be retained between the dwelling and the adjoining properties in Heather Close. With regard to concerns about the creation of a through road and the loss of the cul-de-sac, this proposal does not propose such an alteration. A number of neighbours have commented that this proposal would result in the loss of four parking spaces at the end of the cul-de-sac, however, this area is a turning head and not an allocated parking area.

Neighbours have stated that the green space needs to be retained as garden areas are small and the park is too far away, however, dwellings in this area are provided with gardens and not all of the green space will be lost. There is no evidence that the

proposal would increase flooding or noise in the area. Concerns about access to fences is a civil matter.

Conclusion

The site is not protected urban open space and the principle of development is acceptable in this location; the proposal amounts to sustainable development as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework and having taken into consideration all other material matters, including representations made by neighbouring residents, is considered acceptable subject to conditions.

7. Recommendation

The Application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:-

1 TIM01 Standard Time - Full

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

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 DRA01A Development in accordance with drawings

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved drawing(s) listed above and specifications.

Reason: To ensure that the development is as permitted by the local planning authority and for the avoidance of doubt.

3 MAT01 Samples (details acceptable)

No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In Order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

4 BOU01 Boundary treatment to be agreed (gen)

The development shall not be commenced until details of the treatment of all boundaries including drawings of any gates, fences, walls or other means of enclosure have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved boundary treatments shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be permanently retained and maintained.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area and living conditions of adjacent occupiers.

5 CON1 Construction Method Statement

No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:

- i. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials
- iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- iv. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
- v. wheel washing facilities
- vi. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
- vii. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
- viii. hours of working and hours during which deliveries may be taken at the site

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, visual and neighbour amenity.

6 LAN02 landscaping, full, details not submitted

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a scheme of hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted scheme shall indicate the existing trees shrubs and hedgerows to be retained, the location, species and size of all new trees, shrubs and hedgerows to be planted or transplanted, those areas to be grassed and/or paved. The landscaping scheme shall include details of all surfacing materials and existing and proposed ground levels. The landscaping scheme shall be completed during the first planting season after the date on which any part of the development is commenced or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Any newly planted tree, shrub or hedgerow or any existing tree, shrub or hedgerow to be retained, that dies, or is uprooted, severely damaged or seriously diseased, within five years of the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with another of the same species and of a similar size, unless the local planning authority gives prior written consent to any variation.

Reason: In order to safeguard and enhance the character and appearance of the area.

7 PARK01 Garage for parking only

Vehicular access to the garage shall not be restricted by any reduction in the size or change in the nature of the garage door and the clear space within the garage shall not be reduced in size through the construction of internal walls. The garage shall not be used or adapted for use for any purpose other than domestic storage and the

parking of private motor vehicles associated with the dwelling and it shall not be used for habitable living accommodation of any kind.

Reason: To ensure that adequate on-site parking is available in the interests of highway safety and maintaining the character and appearance of the area.

8 U08670

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the dwelling hereby permitted shall not be extended or enlarged in any way without the prior grant of specific planning permission by the local planning authority.

Reasons: To safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

9 RESL05 No PD for dormers/roof

Aside from those indicated on the approved drawings, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) no dormer windows, or rooflights shall be constructed and no change shall be made to the shape of the roof without the prior grant of specific planning permission by the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

10SIT01 Site levels - to be submitted

Details of existing and proposed site levels and the finished floor levels of the proposed buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted. Construction shall be in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of nearby residents.

11 U08671

Prior to occupation of the development the vehicular parking facilities, as shown on the submitted plan shall be constructed, surfaced and maintained free from obstruction within the site at all times for that sole purpose.

Reason: To ensure that vehicles can enter and leave the highway in a controlled manner in the interest of highway safety.

12 U08672

No unbound material shall be used in the surface treatment of the vehicular access within 6 metres of the highway boundary.

Reason: To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety.

13 U08673

Any vehicular hardstanding shall have minimum dimensions of 2.9 metres x 5.5 metres for each individual parking space, retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure adequate space for parking off the highway is provided in the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

14 U08674

All single garages should have a minimum internal measurement of 7m x 3m, and all garages shall be retained for the purposes of vehicle parking in perpetuity

Reason: To encourage the use of garages for their intended purpose and to discourage on-street parking, in the interests of highway safety.

15 U08675

No works shall commence until a detailed sustainable transport mitigation package has been submitted to and agreed, in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This package will provide information on how the applicant proposes to mitigate any increase in private vehicular use associated with the development and will include appropriate information on all sustainable transport modes including bus and rail travel, cycling, walking (including the local Public Rights of Way network), taxi travel, car sharing and community transport in the vicinity of the site. The package shall thereafter be implemented as agreed for each individual dwelling and/or premises within 14 days of the first beneficial use or occupation of that unit.

Reason: In the interests of mitigating the impact of the approved development by seeking to reduce the need to travel by private car through the promotion of sustainable transport choices.

16 U08676

No works shall commence on either site until such time as the removal of highway rights procedure has been completed and confirmation of this has been provided in writing to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Any works being commenced on site whilst highway rights still exist will be considered a breach of the Highways Act 1980.

17 U08677

During the development process, the development shall be monitored by a qualified arboriculturalist.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

18 U08705

No development shall take place until an ecological survey has been undertaken and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity.

Informative(s)

1 INF04

The permitted development must be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and specification. If you wish to amend your proposal you will need formal permission from the Council. The method of obtaining permission depends on the nature of the amendment and you are advised to refer to the Council's web site or take professional advice before making your application.

2 INF05

The following development plan policies contained in the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 are relevant to this decision: CP1, T2 the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and NPPG 2014.

3 INF21

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

4 U02117

All work within or affecting the highway is to be laid out and constructed by prior arrangement with, and to the requirements and satisfaction of, the Highway Authority, details to be agreed before the commencement of works.

The applicants should be advised to contact the Development Management Team by email at development.management@essexhighways.org or by post to:

Essex Highways, Colchester Highways Depot, 910 The Crescent, Colchester, CO4 9QQ.

5 U02118

The Highway Authority cannot accept any liability for costs associated with a developer's improvement. This includes design check safety audits, site supervision, commuted sums for maintenance and any potential claims under Part 1 and Part 2 of

the Land Compensation Act 1973. To protect the Highway Authority against such compensation claims a cash deposit or bond may be required.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

DECIDED: