

**SITE PLAN ATTACHED**

**7. THE SURGERY SITE AND LANDINGS OUTINGS LANE DODDINGHURST  
ESSEX CM15 0LS**

**DEMOLITION OF FORMER DOCTORS SURGERY AND ADJACENT  
DWELLING KNOWN AS THE LANDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF 6 NO.  
DETACHED DWELLINGS AND 2 NO SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS.**

**APPLICATION NO: 15/00267/FUL**

<b>WARD</b>	Brizes & Doddinghurst	<b>8/13 WEEK DATE</b>	05.05.2015
<b>PARISH</b>	Doddinghurst	<b>POLICIES</b>	NPPF NPPG CP1 H6 H9 H14 T2 T5 C5 C16
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Caroline McCaffrey	01277 312603	
<b>Drawing no(s) relevant to this decision:</b>	PL10A; PL11A; PL12A; PL13A; PL14A; PL15A; PL16A ; PL02; PL01 /A; PL21; PL22; ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT dated 27 May 2015; CONCEPT LANDSCAPING SCHEME dated 10 July 2015;		

This application was referred by the Parish Council for consideration by the Committee. The reason(s) are as follows:

Eight houses will result in a very cramped development with inadequate amenity areas and impractical parking for this rural location. Amenity space is wholly out of keeping with the area and will lead to impractical parking arrangements as virtually everyone who travels from Doddinghurst needs a car - and with 4 and 5 bedroomed houses two parking spaces will prove to be wholly insufficient. Original guidance for 'affordable' homes provision under current guidelines is an unneeded provision.

## Update since publication of Report

**Paragraphs 012-023 of the guidance on planning obligations has been removed from the National Planning Practice Guidance as of 31st July. It is no longer the government's policy that small scale development should be exempt from affordable housing requirements or other tariff style contributions.**

### 1. Proposals

The roughly rectangular site extends back from Outings Lane across the rear of two detached houses (Granville and Heimat) and Barfield Cottages (a terrace of four houses) in Blackmore Road. Full Permission is sought to demolish the buildings on the site and construct six detached houses and a pair of semi-detached houses. The proposed site access would be centrally-placed in the boundary with Outings Lane with the shared drive running at right angles to the road ending in a "T" shaped turning head. Two dwellings are proposed on each side of the access drive with two of the detached houses and the semi-detached pair being built across the rear of the site.

The five bedroom dwellings on Plot 1 and Plot 8 on either side of the site entrance are proposed to have accommodation over three floors with the top floor in the roof space. The other four detached houses would have two floors with four bedrooms and the two-storey semi-detached houses would have two bedrooms. The detached dwellings are indicated to have private gardens ranging from 116 sq m to 180 sq m with the two-bedroom properties having 55 sq m. The detached houses would each have a single garage with at least one additional parking space. The smaller houses would have two parking spaces clear of the private drive.

The detached houses are all designed on an "L" shaped plan. The five bedroom houses have full-height eaves whereas the four bedroom properties have lower eaves with the top floor being lit by semi-dormer windows creating a cottage appearance. A similar design approach has been adopted for the semi detached pair. Most of the main habitable room windows face to the front and rear, but an exception occurs with plot 7 which backs on to "Granville " in Outings Lane; however this house has no upper-floor windows at the rear.

The two-bedroom semi detached houses are proposed to be "affordable" but the application provides no indication as to how this would be achieved and no planning obligation or draft obligation has been submitted.

## **2. Policy Context**

Relevant Policies:

The National Planning Policy Framework  
The National Planning Practice Guidance

Local Plan Policies

CP1: general development criteria  
H6: small unit accommodation  
H9: provision of affordable housing  
H14: housing density  
T2: highway considerations in new development  
T5: Parking - general  
C5: retention and provision of landscaping  
C16: development within the vicinity of a listed building

## **3. Relevant History**

- 13/00578/FUL: Construction of 2 No dwellings. - Application Refused
- 13/00008/OUT: Outline application for the demolition of former doctors surgery and construction of two detached dwellings. Access, layout and scale to be determined. appearance and landscaping reserved. - Application Permitted
- 12/01280/OUT: Outline Application with all matters reserved for 2 No detached residential dwellings. - Application Permitted
- 14/00627/FUL: Demolition of former doctors surgery and adjacent dwelling known as The Landings and construction of 5 no. detached dwellings. - Application Refused

## **4. Neighbour Responses**

Representations from two neighbouring properties in Blackmore Road.

Concerns expressed about a number of aspects of the proposal as follows:-

- Loss of green space - back garden development of this type should be avoided.
- Development is too dense; houses in this area have larger plots and the proposal would not be in keeping with the area.
- The three storey houses would be out of character with the existing houses in Outings Lane. They will dwarf nearby houses and would not be in keeping with the grain of the area.
- The setting of the Grade II listed building (Barfield Farm) would be harmed.

- The design of the houses does not reflect the innovative design of the modern houses nearby.
  - The number of affordable homes is not sufficient to satisfy Policy H9.
  - Dwelling on plot 8 would have an unacceptably overbearing effect on "Granville" and would reduce light to the garden.
  - Garden of Granville would be overlooked from plots 2,3,7 and 8 and possibly 4,5 and 6.
  - Full height upstairs windows at Granville cannot be curtained and would be overlooked from Plot 2 and roof windows of plot 8.
- Barfield Cottages would be overlooked from windows on the rear of Plots 1 & 8 and the front window of Plot 5, will look across into the garden and directly into the bedroom window.
- Mature trees would be lost and roots may be affected - cannot be assessed without a proper tree schedule.
  - No problems with the trees being retained but there are 2 trees behind Barfield cottages that need to be cut and maintained. At present they are so high and unstable that, in a storm, there is a significant risk of them falling onto my property. They also block the sun light into the garden, which makes a part of the garden quite damp.
  - Proposal would result in disturbance from activity associated with the houses - use of gardens, vehicle movements etc.
  - The parking provision would be insufficient. People don't use their gavgages for parking and it is likely that the households would have more than two cars.
  - No provision has been made for visitor parking.
  - With insufficient parking there is concern that overspill parking will be on Outings Lane. This is relatively narrow and parking will impact on access as any vehicle parking there will mean that the carriageway is reduced to one lane, causing both congestion and safety issues.
  - The local road network would not be able to accommodate the traffic generated by the development.
  - The proposal would result in the loss of the parking bay which is used by some nearby residents.
  - There are frequent collisions between vehicles exiting Outings Lane and consideration needs to be made to improvements to the junction as part of the development.
  - The dwellings would place unacceptable strain on local services such as doctors schools etc.
  - The construction process would result in loss of amenity.
- Concern about effect on stability of the garage at Granville which is close to the boundary.
- Insufficient information about finished and site levels.
  - No ecological survey.
  - Reference is made to some of the financial information concerning development costs when permission was granted for the new surgery.

## 5. Consultation Responses

- **Parish Council:**

Doddinghurst Parish Council objects strongly to this application. With eight residential properties this is a gross overdevelopment of the site. The government relaxed the Planning Gain in 2012 and the site does not require affordable homes and nor are they appropriate for this location. A previous application for five residential homes was supported by the Parish Council. The current application provides very cramped amenity space for the homes being proposed. This leads to limited space for parking and outdoor activity for families living on the site in a very rural location. Whilst the density proposed may be suitable for an inner city it is wholly inappropriate in a rural location such as Doddinghurst. Finally the oversupply of homes on the site will create parking issues and hazards to all local residents as the access to the site is very close to Deal Tree Corner junction odd Outings lane.

- **Highway Authority:**

The Highway Authority would not wish to raise an objection to the above application as shown on Drawing no. PL 01A, subject to conditions being attached to any approval, given the location, the previous use of the site and the area to be available for parking within the sites, which will comply with Brentwood Borough Council's adopted parking standards for the proposed dwellings.

Conditions to include the provision of a footway as shown on Drawing no.PL01A, the approval of a Construction Method Statement, tree planting proposed within the highway shall be agreed with the Highway Authority. Trees shall be sited clear of all underground services and visibility splays, no discharge of surface water onto the Highway, cycle parking for properties no 5 and 6 shall be provided in accordance with the EPOA Parking Standards, provision of Residential Travel Information Packs for sustainable transport. A number of informative are also recommended.

- **Anglian Water Services Ltd:**

No comments received at time of writing report.

- **Essex & Suffolk Water:**

No comments received at time of writing report.

- **Arboriculturalist:**

The trees on the site are not preserved and would not justify a TPO. The submitted scheme has the correct elements for landscaping the site using some specimen planting and native hedge. It will not replace the tree losses but will establish trees which may mature with the development. I believe some more

mature hedge planting at the top of the hammerhead facing the access road will soften the view coming up the road and from the Outings Lane long view.

- **Design Officer:**

No comments received at time of writing report.

- **Historic Buildings And Conservation Officer:**

Significance

The development site lies within close proximity to the Grade II listed Barfield Farmhouse, C17th former hunting lodge, (List entry number 373611).

Proposal

Demolition of former doctor's surgery and adjacent dwelling known as The Landings and construction of 8 No. Detached dwellings.

Background

Located in Doddinghurst, the site is accessed from the main thoroughfare of Outings Lane. Immediately adjacent (southerly) to the development site is a strip of Green Belt land, separating the site from the Grade II listed C17th Barfield Farmhouse, this separation is retained within these proposals.

Residential properties within the immediate context of the site are predominantly modest of a chalet style, with a few mid to late C20th forms - the forms to the North of the site distinctively express architecture of their time with postmodern influences. It is apparent from a site assessment, the levels at this location place these post modern dwellings at a higher vantage point, overlooking the application site; it should be noted no level information has been submitted within this application, which given the topography is unfortunate thus leaving accuracy of datum points for the development inconclusive. Within the wider context are a limited number of terraced dwellings on the Blackmore Road.

The proposals seek the demolition of the redundant former doctor's surgery and the residential dwelling of The Landings; no objections are raised to the principal of demolition.

Having assessed the design submitted following a previously refused scheme and with regards to the proximity of the listed building I advise the following:

Discussion

The layout for the dwellings proposes centralised access with Plot 4 as the focal point at the centre of the turning head. Parking at the principal elevation for Plot 1 and Plot 8 is not ideal however given planting is annotated on Drawing PL01A and given the setback nature of these dwellings I advise this can be acceptable subject to a landscaping condition.

The language for the two primary Plots (Plot 1 and Plot 8) is acceptable although the ridge on the rear gable should be reduced; this reduction would improve the design and compensate for the continuous massing and the wide rear gable which is not traditional.

The proposed remaining plots propose a cohesive design given the language of the primary plots on the principal thoroughfare, I raise no objections to the scale and massing of these plots despite their wide rear gables as the massing is lesser than the principal plots.

Landscaping and surface materials must ensure the development has a verdant element given the context; it should be noted there is insufficient evidence submitted at present with regards to landscaping.

Within the submitted information there is no detail for the material intent, I advise this aspect is subject to conditions given the vernacular language proposed and with regards to the proximity of the neighbouring listed building.

Recommendation:

Subject to minor design revisions in respect of the ridge at the rear gable of Plots 1 and Plot 8, and subject to Conditions I raise no objections to these proposals.

- **Housing Services Manager:**  
No comments received at time of writing report.
- **Schools, Children Families Directorate:**  
No comments received at time of writing report.

## 6. Summary of Issues

Introduction

This application follows the refusal of permission for a development of five houses on the same site under reference 14/00627. That application was refused for three reasons; firstly the absence of affordable housing contrary to Policy H9, secondly the scale and design of two of the houses at the site entrance and thirdly the failure to make efficient use of the site by reason of the low density of the proposal and the absence of a mix of housing units.

## Principle of Development

The site lies within the defined settlement of Doddinghurst on the south-western side of Outings Lane. It adjoins residential dwellings fronting Blackmore Road to the north-west and residential gardens to the south-west. There are residential dwellings opposite the site and, to the south-east, the site adjoins Green Belt land with Barfield Farm (Grade II Listed) located beyond an undeveloped strip of land.

The site was partly residential in character and partly used as a doctors' surgery. Within this built up area the residential garden would not fall within the definition of "Previously Developed Land" as it appears in the Framework; however the surgery site is "previously developed land" (PDL). For this proposal the sites cannot realistically be distinguished and it is therefore considered that the support given for the redevelopment of PDL is of limited weight in the determination of this application. The Framework indicates that Councils should consider the case for setting out policies to resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens but it does not rule out the development of garden land. Brentwood Borough Council has no specific policy for garden land and this proposal must therefore be considered in the context of the Framework and the Development Plan policies.

The Council cannot currently identify sufficient land for housing that would satisfy the requirements of the Framework. The site is within a residential area as identified by the Local Plan and is within the defined settlement of Doddinghurst; it is therefore considered that the site is in a sustainable location. The principle of residential development is therefore acceptable. The main considerations in this case are the density of development and housing mix, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, design, whether the proposal affects the significance of the nearby heritage asset (Barfield Farm), the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of nearby residents, parking and highway considerations, Living conditions of the occupiers of the proposal, landscape and ecology considerations.

### Density of development and housing mix

Local Plan Policy H14 states that residential densities will be expected to be no less than 30 dwellings per hectare, unless the character of the area determines that such densities would be inappropriate. This proposal seeks to develop at a density of about 25 dwellings per hectare. This is contrary to Policy H14 but the density is greater than the previous proposal which was refused on the basis of insufficient density. It is considered that the proposal strikes a balance between the need for higher densities and the need to have regard to the character of the area. It is considered that the density proposed is acceptable.

The site is within a residential area as identified by the Local Plan and as such the principle of developing the site for residential purposes is acceptable. RLP Policy H6 states that in new housing development, the Council will seek a mix of units on



suitable sites of 6 units or more or on suitable sites of 0.2 hectares or more, 50% of the total units should be 1 or 2 bedroom properties, except where it can be demonstrated that such a mix of units would be inconsistent with the character of the area.

This proposal is for 8 dwellings therefore the 25% of smaller houses within the proposal falls short of the 50% in Policy H6. The application provides no reasoned argument as to why the 50% proportion has not been achieved. In considering the previous proposal the officer report commented that the existing dwellings on Outings Lane were mainly family sized detached dwellings on large plots. The introduction of the smaller houses improves the housing mix as compared with the previous proposal and it is considered that the proposal strikes an appropriate balance between the need for a mix of house types and the need to have regard to the character of the area.

Policy H9 of the Local Plan states that on sites of 5 units and above within the defined settlements outside of the Brentwood Urban Area, the Council will seek to ensure that 35% of the dwellings are affordable housing. For a development of 8 houses that would equate to 3 houses (rounded up from 2.8). As indicated above two of the houses are proposed to be affordable - which equates to 25% of the total. The application provides no information to support this under-provision and provides no information on the method of delivery of the affordable housing.

Previously, Government policy (as set out in a ministerial statement by the then Minister of State, Department for Communities and Local Government (Brandon Lewis) (Included as a revision of on-line Planning Practice Guidance on 27 February 2015 Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 23b-012-20150227)) indicated that contributions towards affordable housing through (Section 106) planning obligations should not be sought from small scale development, defined as including residential developments of 10 units or less (or 5 units in designated rural areas).

However, following the recent judgment (on the application of West Berkshire District Council and Reading Borough Council) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 2222 (Admin), paragraphs 012-023 of the guidance on planning obligations have been removed and it is no longer government policy to exempt smaller sites from providing affordable housing.

Therefore whilst the applicant has indicated a willingness to provide some affordable housing, the provision is less than required by Local Plan Policy H9 and there is no mechanism or formal undertaking to do so. In the absence of supporting information on the under-provision of affordable housing contributions, or of the mechanism for delivery, the application does not comply with Policy H9 of the Local Plan and Chapter 6 of the NPPF which encourages the delivery of a wide choice of high quality homes, seeks to widen opportunities for home ownership and aims to create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities.

Character and appearance and design.

The Council's Design and Historic Buildings Consultant indicates that subject to the approval of details the dwellings are mostly acceptable. The consultant has reservations about the gabled rear projections of the two largest houses. However both limbs of the "L" shaped plan are the same width and there is no hierarchy in the elements of the houses. Whilst this recommendation is noted it is considered that the consistent height of the dwellings is a valid design approach and that the overall size and design of these two dwellings would not detract from the character and appearance of the area.

The dwellings follow the underlying contours of the site and step down from the higher land at the rear and west side of the site towards the road and east of the site. The increased density has resulted in a need to remove a number of trees on the site; however the Arboricultural officer advises that the trees are not of a standard to warrant protection through a TPO. Residents have expressed concern about the loss of trees and it is regrettable that trees would be lost; however the planting scheme proposed, supplemented by additional hedge planting as suggested by the arboricultural officer, would off-set that harm and enable a higher density to be achieved as indicated by the previous refusal of permission.

Overall it is considered that the proposal would not conflict with parts (i) and (iii) of Policy CP1 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan which indicate that developments should be of a high standard of design and should not have an unacceptable detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This objective is consistent with one of the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that a high quality design should always be sought.

#### Effect on the significance of heritage asset

The proposed dwellings would be separated from the Grade II listed building by an area of open land. The Historic Buildings, Conservation and Design Consultant raises no objection to the proposal as regards its effect on the setting of the heritage asset. The proposal would not conflict with Chapter 12 of the Framework and Policies CP1 and C16 of the Local Plan.

#### Effect on living conditions of nearby residents

The north west boundary of the site runs along the rear boundaries of the houses in Blackmore Road and the south west boundary is parallel with the side boundary of the rear garden of Wayside Aquatics. Detached dwellings occupy plots on the opposite (north east) side of Outings Lane.

#### Outlook

The house on Plot 8 has its side gable and flank wall beyond running approximately parallel with the rear wall of Granville. At its closest point (at the front of the house) the flank wall of the Plot 8 house would be 1.5m from the boundary with the space widening to about 2.5m at the rear of the house. The pitched roof garage of Granville and the parking space in front of it would be alongside the house. The rear wall of Granville contains glazed doors at both ground floor and first floor level that provide the main outlook to the rear of the house. The proposed dwelling would not extend across the full width of Granville and its flank wall would be about 18m from the rear wall of the house. The dwelling on plot 8 would be prominently in view from the back of Granville; however it is considered that it would not be over-dominant when seen from the house or the garden. The house on Plot 7 would be behind Heimat, but it would be further from the boundary (6.5m) and from the rear of Heimat (22.5m) and it would not materially detract from outlook.

Barfield Cottages are positioned closer to the road than the detached houses and have longer rear gardens. The semi-detached pair would be positioned behind the two central cottages. The flank wall of the Plot 6 house would run parallel to the boundary with a gap of just over 1m. The flank wall would be about 27m from the main rear walls of the cottages. The ground floor extensions of the cottages would be closer but they would be sufficiently distant to prevent the proposed dwelling from being over bearing. The Plot 6 house would be clearly visible from the rear gardens of the cottages but it would not be excessively dominant and would not detract from the outlook from the gardens.

The semi-detached pair and the two houses on plots 3 and 4 would back onto the side boundary of the long rear garden of Wayside Aquatics; however they would be at an oblique angle when seen from the rear of the bungalow and would be of sufficient distance from the side boundary to prevent them from harming the outlook at the rear of that property. The houses would have no material effect on outlook from the dwellings on the north east side of Outings Lane.

### Overlooking

All upper floor main windows of the three houses closest to the north west boundary are at right angles to that boundary. Those windows would allow oblique views over the rear gardens of the Blackmore Road houses and if residents were to lean out of their windows they would have a more direct view towards the houses. However it is considered that the relationship between the dwellings would not result in unacceptable overlooking of adjacent properties from main windows. The Plot 8 house has three bathroom/en suite windows in its gable wall facing Granville with two roof lights in the top floor dressing room. The proposed house on Plot 7 has no north west facing windows in the upper floor and Plot 6 has a landing Window. None of the windows facing the Blackmore Road houses serves a habitable room and it is considered that subject to conditions requiring obscured glazing and limiting opening those windows would not result in unacceptable overlooking. The occupiers of Granville express concern about overlooking from

the front of the Plot 2 house; however that house would be about 45m from the rear wall of Granville and whilst it would have an outlook towards the rear of Granville it would not unreasonably detract from privacy. The occupiers of Granville also draw attention to the unusual design of the rear bedroom windows of that property; however it is considered that this would not prevent measures being taken, if necessary, to ensure a reasonable degree of privacy and the refusal of permission for this reason would not be justified.

The houses on plots 3 to 6 would have an outlook over the rear garden of Wayside Aquatics; however views towards the bungalow would be at an oblique angle. Taking account of the distance from the bungalow and garden it is considered that the proposal would not unacceptably harmful to the privacy of the occupiers of Wayside Aquatics. The houses on the opposite side of Outings Lane would be at least 30m from the nearest of the proposed dwellings (Plot 8). It is considered that this distance of separation would prevent unacceptable overlooking of the fronts of those properties.

#### Overview of living conditions

The proposal would change the outlook at the rear of the Blackmore Road houses and at the front of the Outings Lane properties and would result in an element of overlooking of rear gardens; however it is considered that the proposal would not be unacceptably harmful to living conditions. It would therefore not conflict with one of the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings should always be sought and would accord with Policy CP1 (ii) of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan which indicates that developments should not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of nearby occupiers.

#### Parking and highway considerations

The dwellings would each have at least two parking spaces (including garages). The driveways of plots 3 and 4 would be of sufficient length to accommodate two cars in addition to the garage and plots 1 and 8 would have capacity for at least three parking spaces plus the garage. The elongated turning head outside plot 3 would have capacity for parking spaces and the 4.8m wide carriageway of the shared drive would also enable kerb-side parking. Residents refer to the specific characteristics of this area; however in reality the parking space within the site would exceed the adopted standards. A resident indicates that the layby that formerly provided parking for the surgery is used by residents; however all nearby properties have off-street car parking and it is considered that the retention of those places for public parking cannot reasonably be required.

Residents and the Parish Council raise concern about the effects of the proposal on highway safety and the capacity of the road network. The geometry of the proposed site entrance would meet the adopted standards and the entrance would

be about 60m from the junction. The Highways Authority raises no objection to the proposal and there is no reason to conclude that the nearby junction does not have capacity to accommodate the vehicle movements arising from this proposal. The lay-by would be likely to result in unexpected manoeuvres in the highway and it is considered that its removal would be of benefit to highway safety. The proposal would generate vehicle movements on the road network in the area but there is no evidence to indicate that this would be unacceptably harmful.

The Framework (Paragraph 32) indicates that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where its impacts are "severe". There is no justification for the refusal of permission on parking or highway safety grounds.

Living conditions of the occupiers of the proposal

The Parish Council expresses concern about the cramped amenity space for the occupants of the proposed dwellings. However all of the larger house would have private gardens in excess of 100 sq m with all but one being over 130 sq m. The two two-bedroom dwellings would have gardens of 55 sq m. Being square in shape immediately to the rear of the houses they would be very convenient and usable spaces and it is considered that they would be adequate for the occupiers of the smaller houses.

Conditions

A detailed planting scheme has been produced to mitigate the loss of trees and a condition requires its implementation. The application provides limited information about materials, surface treatments and boundary treatments and conditions are therefore recommended to require the submission and approval of details. The installation of additional windows or roof lights in north-west facing walls and roof planes could result in unacceptable overlooking and a condition is recommended removing permitted development rights. A number of windows in north-west facing walls would enable direct overlooking of properties in Blackmore Road and a condition is imposed requiring obscured glazing and limited-opening lights.

Conclusion

The proposal over comes the concerns arising from the previous application as regards the scale and design of dwellings and density. At the time of writing this update, no justification has been received on the under-provision of affordable housing (although it is noted that the period between the change of government policy and timing of the report has been very short) which conflicts with Local Plan Policy H9. On this basis, the application is recommended for refusal.

## **7. Recommendation**

The Application be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

R1 U10825

The proposal fails to meet the criteria of Policy H9 of the Brentwood Replacement Local plan which seeks a proportion of 35% of the number of dwellings on sites of 5 units and above in this location to provide for affordable housing. This would conflict with the aims and objectives of Chapter 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework which encourages the delivery of a wide choice of high quality homes, seeks to widen opportunities for home ownership and to create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities.

Informative(s)

1 INF05

The following development plan policies contained in the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 are relevant to this decision: CP1, H6, H9, H14, T2, T5, C5, C16 the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and NPPG 2014.

2 INF20

The drawing numbers listed above are relevant to this decision

3 U02533

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

*BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS*

**DECIDED:**