

Report to: Planning Committee	
Planning Committee Date: 28th November 2023	
For: Decision	
Key Decision: No	Decision Planner Ref No: N/A
Application No:	23/00455/OUT
Description:	Outline planning application for 8no. dwellings with all matters reserved
Location:	Land Adjacent Kitchen Hill Bulmer
Applicant:	C/O Agent, Mr D Burke
Agent:	Mr Sam Lees, Reeve Brown, Linkwood Stud, Halstead, CO9 2PE
Date Valid:	21st February 2023
Recommendation:	It is RECOMMENDED that the following decision be made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application REFUSED for the reasons outlined within this Update Report.
Options:	The Planning Committee can: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Agree the Recommendation b) Vary the Recommendation c) Overtturn the Recommendation d) Defer consideration of the Application for a specified reason(s)
Appendices:	Appendix 1: Reason(s) for Refusal Submitted Plan(s) / Document(s)
	Appendix 2: Policy Considerations
	Appendix 3: Site History
Case Officer:	Melanie Corbishley For more information about this Application please contact the above Officer on: 01376 551414 Extension: 2527, or by e-mail: melanie.corbishley@braintree.gov.uk

1. UPDATE REPORT

1.1 This update relates to 1 matter:

- Updated Highways Recommendation.

2. Highway Recommendation

2.1 Following the publication of the Planning Committee Agenda, Officers sought clarification from ECC Highways with regards their recommendation and the scheme has been reviewed and an updated recommendation made.

2.2 ECC Highways have now submitted the following response:

The documents accompanying the planning application have been duly considered and site visits undertaken. From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is NOT acceptable to the Highway Authority for the following reason:

The applicant is unable to provide visibility at the proposal site access in accordance with the prevailing speed limit (derestricted) and therefore the proposal is contrary to the Highway Authority's Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

Note: It may be possible to base the visibility on the 85th percentile vehicle speeds and therefore were the applicant to submit a speed survey conducted in accordance with CA185, the Highway Authority would be able to consider further the acceptability of the proposed visibility.

2.3 A copy of ECC Highways recommendation is attached.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 Given the above comments, it is recommended that a second reason for refusal is added to reflect the revised consultation response from ECC Highways, relating to insufficient highways visibility information.

4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1 It is RECOMMENDED that the following decision be made:
Application REFUSED for the reasons outlined below:

Reason 1

The proposed development would result in sporadic development, sprawling beyond the defined development boundary into the open countryside and eroding the current green gap between Ballingdon and Batt Hall. In addition, when combined with the significant facing back of the existing hedgerow in order to create the required highway visibility splays,

this would dilute the site's green character further. Consequently, the scheme would result in the intrusion of development into the surrounding landscape, giving rise to harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Further harm is created by the location of the site which lies approximately 2 km/1.3 miles from the town of Sudbury where there are services and facilities. To access the town by foot or by bus would require future occupants to walk along a narrow unlit pavement from opposite the site and therefore new residents would rely on private vehicles to access employment, schools and other community services and facilities.

The adverse impacts of the development are considered to outweigh the benefits and the proposal fails to secure sustainable development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies SP1, SP3, SP7, LPP1, LPP52 and LPP67 of the Adopted Braintree District Local Plan 2013 – 2033.

Reason 2

The Applicant is unable to provide visibility at the proposal site access in accordance with the prevailing speed limit (derestricted) and therefore the proposal is contrary to the Highway Authority's Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011 and Policy LPP52 of the Adopted Braintree District Local Plan 2013 – 2033.

CHRISTOPHER PAGGI
PLANNING DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Corbishley, Melanie

From: Corbishley, Melanie
Sent: 28 November 2023 17:14
To: Corbishley, Melanie
Subject: FW: 23/00455/FUL - Revised Recommendation

Site Number: 23/00455/OUT
Proposal: Outline planning application for 8no. dwellings with all matters reserved
Address: Land Adjacent Kitchen Hill Bulmer Essex

Revised Recommendation

The documents accompanying the planning application have been duly considered and site visits undertaken. From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is NOT acceptable to the Highway Authority for the following reason:

The applicant is unable to provide visibility at the proposal site access in accordance with the prevailing speed limit (derestricted) and therefore the proposal is contrary to the Highway Authority's Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

Note: It may be possible to base the visibility on the 85th percentile vehicle speeds and therefore were the applicant to submit a speed survey conducted in accordance with CA185, the Highway Authority would be able to consider further the acceptability of the proposed visibility.

pp. Director for Operations: Environment and Economy

Kind regards,
Debbie Wing

Debbie Wing | Strategic Development Officer

Highways

**Essex
Highways** 

Safer, greener, healthier

E: debbie.wing@essex.gov.uk
W: www.essex.gov.uk/highways