PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 2 JUNE 2025

SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA

Item No. 9/1(a) 25/00184/F Page No. 14

Third Party: Provided additional comments on the principle of development, raising concern over the pressure on parking and access via Little Lane, reference to the pre-application advice being likely to refuse, reference to an indicative street scene showing additional space between the west of the property and the boundary, and the proposal results in overdevelopment.

Cllr Ryves: Requested guidance on restrictive covenants and if they can be considered as part of this planning application.

Planning Control Manager's Comments:

The majority of the issues raised within the third-party objection have previously been discussed in the Officers Report. In regard to the pre-application advice, the response was likely to refuse on the basis of highway safety. In contrast to the pre-app, this application was supported by a traffic study which met the requirements of the Local Highway Authority and as a result, do not consider that the proposal would lead to highway safety concerns.

In regard to the Street Scene, the LPA understands that this is indicative only, and as such it includes landscaping, particularly on the west side of the dwelling, which is not existing on site and which is not within the red line area subject to approval under this application. The officers report to committee assesses the impact of the development based on the overall plans, including the Proposed Site Plan (835/24/02 Rev C) which shows clearly the proximity between the dwelling and the shared west boundary.

As noted within the Committee report, restrictive covenants are not a material planning consideration and are instead deemed to be a civil matter.

Item No. 9/1(b) 25/00280/F Page No. 29

Planning Control Manager's Comments:

There is a typo on Page 36 of agenda. The final sentence of 'Form and Character' should read:

'The development is considered ***acceptable*** in terms of visual appearance and is in accordance with Policy LP21.'

Item No. 9/1(c) 24/02233/F Page No. 40

Applicant: Submitted an 'Inspection, Cleaning and Maintenance Schedule' for Drove Orchards Juicing Tent.

Planning Control Manager's Comments:

The submission of the Maintenance Schedule is acceptable as this assures the LPA that the structure, which is temporary in nature, will not become neglected and cause harm to the National Landscape.

Additional Condition:

3.Condition The Juicing Tent hereby approved shall be maintained in accordance with the submitted 'Inspection, Cleaning and Maintenance Schedule', received 23rd May 2025, in perpetuity. If the use of the tent ceases, it shall be removed from the application site and the land reinstated to its condition prior to the implementation of this development.

3. Reason In the interests of the preserving the setting of the National Landscape, in accordance with Local Plan Policies LP15 and LP16 and section 15 of the NPPF.

Item No. 9/1(d) 25/00264/O Page No. 49

Parish Council: Submitted lengthy additional comments which can be summarised as:

- Additional housing growth should not be on an existing established plot (garden); it should be on un-developed land
- The proposal would impact on the 'green' appearance of the lane
- The sub-division of the plot would erode the character of this section of Church Lane and create a cramped appearance
- The Old Parsonage and the plot in its entirety is considered a non-designated heritage asset
- The Old Parsonage is one of the few large plots remaining in the small hamlet
- The number of bedrooms proposed (the Parish's preference is for 1 or 2 bedrooms)
- Surface Water Flooding (creating an access would create a new route for run-off water)

Planning Control Manager's Comments:

The Parish's comments in relation to Policy 7 are noted. However, the Neighbourhood Plan allows in principle development in rear gardens of existing dwellings and sensitive infilling of small gaps. Whilst the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan do not allocate sites in Roydon, it is recognised in both that housing can be delivered by windfall development (LP02).

The issues on 'green' appearance, cramped development (it is considered that The Old Parsonage would remain with a substantial plot), Non-Designated Heritage Assets and surface water drainage, the latter of which is addressed by conditions 5 and 12, are covered in the Officer Report.

In relation to the number of bedrooms given the outline nature of the application this is currently not known.