

committee agenda



District Development Control Committee Tuesday, 5th February, 2008

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping

Time: 7.30 pm

Democratic Services Officer: Simon Hill, Research and Democratic Services
Tel: 01992 564249 Email: shill@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Members:

Councillors B Sandler (Chairman), D Kelly (Vice-Chairman), K Chana, M Colling, R Frankel, Mrs A Haigh, J Hart, J Knapman, J Markham, P McMillan, Mrs P Smith, P Turpin, H Ulkun, Mrs L Wagland and M Woollard

**A BRIEFING WILL BE HELD FOR THE CHAIRMAN, VICE-CHAIRMAN AND GROUP
SPOKESPERSONS OF THE-COMMITTEE, AT 6.30 P.M.
IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1 PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

1. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION

1. This meeting is to be webcast. Members are reminded of the need to activate their microphones before speaking.

2. The Chairman will read the following announcement:

“I would like to remind everyone present that this meeting will be broadcast live to the Internet and will be capable of repeated viewing and copies of the recording could be made available for those that request it.

If you are seated in the lower public seating area it is likely that the recording cameras will capture your image and this will result in the possibility that your image will become part of the broadcast.

This may infringe your human and data protection rights and if you wish to avoid this you should move to the upper public gallery”

2. ADVICE TO PUBLIC AND SPEAKERS AT COUNCIL PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEES (Pages 5 - 6)

General advice to people attending the meeting is attached together with a plan showing the location of the meeting.

3. MINUTES (Pages 7 - 8)

To confirm the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee – attached

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

5. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (COUNCIL MINUTE 39 - 23.7.02)

(Assistant to the Chief Executive) To report the appointment of any substitute members for the meeting.

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(Assistant to the Chief Executive) To declare interests in any item on this agenda.

7. PLANNING APPLICATION EPF/2401/07 – 19 HEATH DRIVE, THEYDON BOIS – SECOND FLOOR EXTENSION (Pages 9 - 14)

(Director of Planning and Economic Development) To consider the attached report.

8. PLANNING APPLICATION EPF/2328/07 - THATCHED HOUSE, HIGH STREET, EPPING - ERECTION OF A SIDE EXTENSION (Pages 15 - 20)

(Director of Planning and Economic Development) To consider the attached report.

9. NORTH WEALD REDOUBT (PART OF FORMER RADIO STATION SITE), NORTH WEALD – USE OF SECTION 106 CONTRIBUTIONS (Pages 21 - 24)

(Director of Planning and Economic Development) To consider the attached report.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, together with paragraphs 6 and 25 of the Council Procedure Rules contained in the Constitution requires that the permission of the Chairman be obtained, after prior notice to the Chief Executive, before urgent business not specified in the agenda (including a supplementary agenda of which the statutory period of notice has been given) may be transacted.

In accordance with Operational Standing Order 6 (non-executive bodies), any item raised by a non-member shall require the support of a member of the Committee concerned and the Chairman of that Committee. Two weeks' notice of non-urgent items is required.

11. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

Exclusion: To consider whether, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press should be excluded from the meeting for the items of business set out below on grounds that they will involve the likely disclosure of exempt

information as defined in the following paragraph(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended) or are confidential under Section 100(A)(2):

Agenda Item No	Subject	Exempt Information Paragraph Number
Nil	Nil	Nil

The Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, which came into effect on 1 March 2006, requires the Council to consider whether maintaining the exemption listed above outweighs the potential public interest in disclosing the information. Any member who considers that this test should be applied to any currently exempted matter on this agenda should contact the proper officer at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Confidential Items Commencement: Paragraph 9 of the Council Procedure Rules contained in the Constitution require:

- (1) All business of the Council requiring to be transacted in the presence of the press and public to be completed by 10.00 p.m. at the latest.
- (2) At the time appointed under (1) above, the Chairman shall permit the completion of debate on any item still under consideration, and at his or her discretion, any other remaining business whereupon the Council shall proceed to exclude the public and press.
- (3) Any public business remaining to be dealt with shall be deferred until after the completion of the private part of the meeting, including items submitted for report rather than decision.

Background Papers: Paragraph 8 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules of the Constitution define background papers as being documents relating to the subject matter of the report which in the Proper Officer's opinion:

- (a) disclose any facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the report is based; and
- (b) have been relied on to a material extent in preparing the report and does not include published works or those which disclose exempt or confidential information (as defined in Rule 10) and in respect of executive reports, the advice of any political advisor.

Inspection of background papers may be arranged by contacting the officer responsible for the item.

This page is intentionally left blank

Advice to Public and Speakers at Council Planning Subcommittees

Are the meetings open to the public?

Yes all our meetings are open for you to attend. Only in special circumstances are the public excluded.

When and where is the meeting?

Details of the location, date and time of the meeting are shown at the top of the front page of the agenda along with the details of the contact officer and members of the Subcommittee. A map showing the venue will be attached to the agenda.

Can I speak?

If you wish to speak **you must register with Democratic Services by 4.00 p.m. on the day before the meeting.** Ring the number shown on the top of the front page of the agenda. Speaking to a Planning Officer will not register you to speak, you must register with Democratic Service. Speakers are not permitted on Planning Enforcement or legal issues.

Who can speak?

Three classes of speakers are allowed: One objector (maybe on behalf of a group), the local Parish or Town Council and the Applicant or his/her agent.

What can I say?

You will be allowed to have your say about the application but you must bear in mind that you are limited to three minutes and if you are not present by the time your item is considered, the Subcommittee will determine the application in your absence.

Can I give the Councillors more information about my application or my objection?

Yes you can but it must not be presented at the meeting. If you wish to send further information to Councillors, their contact details can be obtained through Democratic Services or our website www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk. Any information sent to Councillors should be copied to the Planning Officer dealing with your application.

How are the applications considered?

The Subcommittee will consider applications in the agenda order. On each case they will listen to an outline of the application by the Planning Officer. They will then hear any speakers presentations. The order of speaking will be (1) Objector, (2) Parish/Town Council, then (3) Applicant or his/her agent. The Subcommittee will then debate the application and vote on either the recommendations of officers in the agenda or a proposal made by the Subcommittee. Should the Subcommittee propose to follow a course of action different to officer recommendation, they are required to give their reasons for doing so.

The Subcommittee cannot grant any application, which is contrary to Local or Structure Plan Policy. In this case the application would stand referred to the next meeting of the District Development Control Committee.

Further Information?

Can be obtained through Democratic Services or our leaflet 'Your Choice, Your Voice'

This page is intentionally left blank

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Committee: District Development Control **Date:** 4 December 2007
Committee

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, **Time:** 7.30 - 7.35 pm
High Street, Epping

Members Present: D Kelly (Vice-Chairman), K Chana, M Colling, R Frankel, J Knapman, J Markham, Mrs P Smith and Mrs L Wagland

Other Councillors: -

Apologies: B Sandler, Mrs A Haigh, J Hart, P Turpin and M Woollard

Officers Present: B Land (Assistant Head of Planning and Economic Development), S G Hill (Senior Democratic Services Officer), S Dobson (Information Assistant (Public Relations)) and S Mitchell (PR Website Editor)

9. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION

The Vice- Chairman made a short address to remind all present that the meeting would be broadcast on the Internet, and that the Council had adopted a protocol for the webcasting of its meetings. The Sub-Committee noted the Council's Protocol for Webcasting of Council and Other Meetings.

10. VICE CHAIRMAN IN THE CHAIR

In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman Councillor D Kelly chaired the meeting.

11. FORMER COUNCILLOR DON SPINKS

The Committee noted that former Councillor Don Spinks had passed away on 3 December 2007. Members and Officers stood for a minutes silence in tribute.

12. MINUTES

Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 August 2007 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

13. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (COUNCIL MINUTE 39 - 23.7.02)

There were no substitute members present.

14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Pursuant to the Councils Code of Member Conduct, All members of the Committee declared a personal interest in agenda item 8 (7 Egg Hall, Epping) by virtue of the applicant being a District Councillor. All members of the Committee stayed in the meeting and took part in the debate on that item.

15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no further business.

16. EPF/1840/07 - 7 EGG HALL, EPPING - SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND PITCHED ROOF TO PORCH

The Committee considered and approved a planning application for a single storey side extension and pitched roof to porch at 7 Egg Hall. The application had been referred to the committee, as the applicant was a district councillor.

No objection had been made to the application.

Resolved:

That planning application EPF/1840/07 be granted subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this notice; and
- (2) Materials to be used for the external finishes of the proposed extension shall match those of the existing building.

CHAIRMAN

Report to District Development Control Committee

Date of meeting: 5 February 2008

**Subject: Planning Application EPF/2401/07 – 19 Heath Drive,
Theydon Bois – Second Floor Extension**



**Epping Forest
District Council**

**Officer contact for further information: N Richardson (ext 4018)
Committee Secretary: S Hill Ext 4249**

Recommendation:

That the committee considers the recommendation of the Area Plans subcommittee East to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Report Detail

1. This application has been referred by the Area Plans Sub Committee East with a recommendation for approval. There was a split vote at their meeting on 16 January 2008 and the Chairman did not vote. The report to the sub-committee carried a recommendation from officers to grant planning permission and the planning merits of the case are attached.

Planning Issues

2. The debate at the sub-committee meeting centred mainly on the fact that the extension onto this flat roofed, semi-detached, “art-deco” designed house, may imbalance this pair of houses as viewed in the street scene and from the houses opposite. It is also a Locally Listed building and there were objections from some Members that the extension will harm its identified special architectural character.

3. The house and adjoining no.17 are unique “art-deco” houses, distinguishable from the surrounding 1930's built traditional houses that prevail in the road. The extension will extend across the roof but it is slim and set back from the front and rear roof edges and will be behind an existing parapet roof feature. It will continue on from a stair-tower that is already of a similar height on the roof, original to the house. The design relates to the house and no objections were raised by the council's Planning Conservation Officer.

Conclusion

4. Should the Committee grant planning permission it should be subject to conditions requiring matching external materials.

This page is intentionally left blank

APPLICATION No:	EPF/2401/07
SITE ADDRESS:	19 Heath Drive Theydon Bois Epping Essex CM16 7HL
PARISH:	Theydon Bois
WARD:	Theydon Bois
APPLICANT:	Mr & Mrs L Martin
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:	Second floor extension.
RECOMMENDED DECISION:	Grant Permission (With Conditions)

CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this notice.
- 2 Details of the types and colours of the external finishes shall be submitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority in writing prior to the commencement of the development, and the development shall be implemented in accordance with such approved details.

This application is before this Committee since the recommendation differs from the views of the local council (Pursuant to Section P4, Schedule A (g) of the Council's Delegated Functions).

Description of Proposal:

Extension on existing flat roof to create extra bedroom. Extension to be 3.2m wide and 3.6m long set back from the front parapet edge of the main roof by 2.4m and rear parapet edge of the main roof by 3.1m. Roof addition to have a flat roof finish.

Description of Site:

One of a pair of semi-detached dwellings on the south-east side of Heath Drive. Unique compared with the surrounding residential area, these two houses are of a distinctive flat roofed design with white external finish, dating from 1920's, in the "art deco" style. The application house has been extended previously at the rear.

Relevant History:

EPF/1162/85 – Single storey rear extension and garage – Granted.
EPF/1499/87 – 2nd floor rear extension and single storey rear extension – Refused.
EPF/164/88 – 2nd floor extension – Refused.
EPF/449/01 – New 70 degree mansard roof to form 2 bedrooms, shower and w.c for private dwelling house – Refused and Dismissed on Appeal.

Policies Applied:

HC13A – Local List of Buildings

DBE9 – Development not result excessive loss of amenity

DBE10 – Extension complement and, where appropriate, enhance appearance of existing building and street scene.

Issues and Considerations:

The main issues are firstly, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the street scene; and secondly, the effect on the living conditions of the residents of neighbouring residential property.

1. Character and Appearance

The application house and the adjoining semi, no. 21, are of a design and visual appearance that distinguishes them from the other properties in the vicinity. They have recently been “locally” listed because of their “art-deco” design, being of special architectural value in the context of the surrounding residential houses.

The previous mansard roof proposal on top of the whole roof would have detracted from its distinctive design and harmed the visual appearance of this dwelling and unbalance this pair of houses. The Planning Inspector quite rightly dismissed the last appeal for this reason.

This proposal is for an extension on top of the flat roof, but it is much slimmer and set well in from the front and rear wall and roof parapet. It is no wider than the existing stair-tower and in fact will be lower, but of the same design. There will be a view from the road and nearby gardens, but not to the extent that it will be visually intrusive to the street scene. The objections to it being overdevelopment are unfounded. The house has been extended before but not previously on the roof. The alteration will change its appearance relative to the other semi at no.17, but the extension is small and proportional, such that the change in the symmetry of the two houses will not be to the detriment of the street scene.

The special character of this pair of houses will not be compromised and the art-deco style remains, such that they remain worthy of local listing.

2. Living Conditions of Neighbouring Residents

The previous appeal for a full mansard roof was judged by the Planning Inspector to not materially harm the living conditions of neighbours by means of overshadowing and overlooking. The proposed windows to the front and rear of the development the subject of the current planning application will be set further back on the roof and be in a smaller extension. With the presence of the parapet roof safeguarding against loss of privacy to houses opposite at nos. 28 – 34 Heath Drive, officers conclude on this matter that the concerns regarding loss of privacy are unfounded. The roof area is also accessible from the stair tower and therefore already in use, but again, if used as a seating area, it would not result in undue loss of privacy.

Summary:

This is a much improved proposal from that previously dismissed on appeal, where previously the appeal was dismissed solely on the grounds of harmful visual impact and not damage to the living conditions of local residents. This is now a slimmer extension and a design in keeping with the appearance of the main house, which will not harm the appearance of the street scene or the

reason for this being a locally listed building. It complies with policies HC13A, DBE9 and DBE10 and is therefore recommended for approval.

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:

PARISH COUNCIL – Strongly object, this is one of a unique pair and the proposals will destroy the symmetry to this important building, which is on the local list, and will be detrimental to the street scene.

32 HEATH DRIVE – Object, art-deco 1930's flat roofed house, out of keeping in area of mainly mansard designed houses, site already overdeveloped without adding a roof extension as well, existing rear extension not seen from road and proposal should be viewed in conjunction with this, local listed building to retain original qualities, extension be a very ugly lopsided view from our house and open door for no.17 to do the same and look like 3 storey flats and exaggerate the already outstanding oddity, draw attention to conclusions of Planning Inspectors letter.

36 HEATH DRIVE – Make it look like a two-storey block of flats and adversely affect the wider environment.

30 HEATH DRIVE – Object to second floor bedroom affecting our privacy, visually unbalance if next door do not carry out the same type of extension, set a precedent for any other house to consist of 3 floors, and be out of character.

15 HEATH DRIVE – Will unbalance the pair of houses and be out of keeping with their well-known "sun trap" style, look like a 3-storey building.

17 HEATH DRIVE – Extension seems modest and hardly visible from the street, stair tower of no.19 has been altered and the roof line is not symmetrical and the straight lines of the extension might be an improvement, house not of architectural merit but bedroom would add to its attraction, which we are giving serious consideration to doing.

34 HEATH DRIVE – Object: Result in unbalanced/uneven appearance, unacceptable from houses opposite and in street scene.

THEYDON BOIS AND DISTRICT RURAL PRESERVATION SOCIETY – House on Local list and therefore important, but extension is unsympathetic and pair of houses will look lopsided and of unequal height, be overdevelopment and out of character in the street scene, detrimental to this building and neighbouring houses contrary to DBE9.



Epping Forest District Council

Area Planning Sub-Committee East



The material contained in this plot has been reproduced from an Ordnance Survey map with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery. (c) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

EFDC licence No.100018534

Agenda Item Number:	3
Application Number:	EPF/2401/07
Site Name:	19 Heath Drive, Theydon Bois, Epping CM16 7HL

Report to District Development Control Committee

Date of meeting:

Subject: Planning Application EPF/2328/07: Thatched House, High Street, Epping - Erection of a side extension



**Epping Forest
District Council**

**Officer contact for further information:
Committee Secretary: S Hill Ext 4249**

Recommendation(s):

That Planning application EPF/2328/07 for the erection of a side extension at the Thatched House Hotel, High Street, Epping be refused for the following reason:

- (1) The proposal would result in the loss of off-street parking and would lead to an insufficient number of spaces for the hotel, causing increased congestion. This is contrary to policy ST6A of the adopted Local Plan and Alterations.

Report Detail

1. (Director of Planning and Economic Development) This application is before this Committee since it is an application that is submitted on behalf of a Councillor (Pursuant to Section P4, Schedule A (j) of the Council's Delegated Functions).

Description of proposal:

2. This application is a revised scheme for a single storey side extension to an approved reception building (EPF/1892/05) for 2 proposed bedrooms with wheelchair access to comply with Building Regulations requirements.
3. The extension is to project by 7.6m to the southeast of the site and will occupy 3 previous parking spaces for the hotel. The development will leave a gap of 2.45m between the new building and the existing Hemnall Mews flat development adjacent. Pedestrian access to the High Street from the rear of the site will remain.
4. A similar scheme was refused by the area planning committee on 21/03/2007 (EPF/1213/06). The recent withdrawn application in August 2007 (EPF/1307/07) differed from the refused scheme by way of reducing the width of the extension by 25cm.
5. The only further change from the previous withdrawn application (EPF/1307/07) is the provision of 3 bicycle parking spaces and 3 motorcycle spaces to the rear of the site adjoining Hemnall Street.

Description of Site:

6. The hotel is a Grade 2 Listed Building, the front elevation of which is situated within the key frontage of Epping town centre. The hotel has 12 bedrooms (staff and guests) and the whole site is within the Epping Town Conservation Area.

7. To the rear is Henmnall Mews, a residential flat development approved in 2002 and revised in 2005 (EPF/478/05).

Relevant History:

8. The site has the following relevant history:

EPF/1035/02- Partial demolition of hotel and erection of 14 dwelling units- approved.

EPF/1943/04- Creation of loft bedrooms within existing roof space- approved

LB/EPF/1944/04- Grade II Listed Building application for creation of loft bedroom within existing and approved (LB/EPF/1019/04) roof space including new dormer windows- refused.

EPF/478/05- Partial demolition of the rear of Thatched House Hotel and the erection of 14 No. new apartments with basement parking, (revised application).- approved.

EPF/1892/05- Erection of new reception area- approved.

EPF/1213/06- Single storey side extension to approved reception for two proposed bedrooms with wheelchair access. (Revised application)- Refused.

EPF/1307/07- Erection of side extension to reception area for 2 no. bedrooms with wheelchair access. (Revised application)- Withdrawn.

Policies Applied:*Adopted Local Plan*

CP7A- Urban Form and quality
HC7- Development within a Conservation Area
DBE1- Design of new buildings
DBE2- Impact on surrounding properties
DBE9- Impact upon amenity
ST4A- Road Safety
ST6A- Vehicle Parking

Issues and Considerations:

9. The key issues relevant to this application are the appropriateness of the development within the Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Listed Building, amenity issues and highways considerations.

Conservation Area Policy and the Listed Building

10. This extension will increase the floor area of the reception area approved in 2005 by approximately 50m². The building will be traditionally designed with low eaves and will complement the adjacent Listed Thatched House pub.

11. The Town Council previously objected to this proposal on the grounds of overdevelopment and the impact upon the adjacent Listed Building, the Thatched House pub. However the Thatched House is already surrounded by other buildings and given the town centre location, there can be expected to be a high density of buildings.

12. The extension is located to the rear of the premises and will not be visible from the Epping town centre street scene. It is therefore acceptable in terms of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and no objections have been received from the Councils Heritage Conservation officers.

Amenity Considerations

13. In terms of amenity considerations, the extension will be situated 2.45m (previously 2.25m) from the adjoining flats at Hemnall Mews. The resultant development would therefore be very close. However, given that the new extension would only be intermittently occupied and the ground floor flats already experience pedestrians and visitors passing by, refusal on this basis would not be justified.

14. There are no amenity issues with regard to the *Guardian* offices to the south west of the site and there is only 1 main window in this elevation which has small velux roof lights.

Highways policy

15. The Council resolved to refuse permission previously due to the loss of off street parking, resulting in an insufficient number of spaces for the hotel, causing increased congestion.

16. The new extension will result in a loss of 3 parking spaces, leaving the hotel with approximately 5 spaces close to the rear Hemnall Street site entrance. In light of guidance within the 'Vehicle Parking Standards', (*Essex Planning Officers Association, 2001*), the requirement for parking provision is 1 space per bedroom (guest or staff). The hotel accommodation will be increased to 14 rooms as a result of this extension and on this basis parking is inadequate.

17. This latest revised application proposes bicycle and motorcycle parking facilities to the site frontage, which was not previously included within the ownership of the applicant in the 2007 withdrawn submission. Whilst there is some doubt as to whether the land is actually in the ownership of the applicant and not the Highways Authority, this does not alter the merits of the application. The bicycle and motorcycle storage will not make up for the loss of off street parking which formed the previous reason for refusal.

18. In addition to the above, nearby 'Clarks International' objected to the previous application on the grounds of congestion to the rear of the site, in particular

with regard to the large vehicles associated with refuse collection and the servicing of the hotel. The proposed extension will exacerbate this situation.

Conclusion

19. Whilst the design of the building is acceptable in itself, the immaterial 25cm change in width of the building and the proposed motorcycle and cycle parking does not in any way address the 2006 reason for refusal. Consequently, the scheme is still considered to result in an increase in congestion in the vicinity. Refusal is recommended.

Summary of objections/observations:

TOWN COUNCIL- Committee object as the extension is viewed as overdevelopment of the site. There is also concern regarding the loss of parking.

CLARKE INTERNATIONAL-(Responded to all submissions). Overdevelopment of this area resulting in serious access and parking issues.

EPPING SOCIETY- Application is too similar to previous submission and the proposed cycle and motorbike parking will not replace disabled car parking for whom the development is intended.

In addition the development is too close to the recently erected block of flats and will obstruct views from their windows.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to District Development Control Committee

Date of meeting: 5 February 2008

Subject: North Weald Redoubt (part of former Radio Station Site), North Weald – Use of Section 106 Contributions



**Officer contact for further information: P Sutton (ext 4119)
Committee Secretary: S Hill Ext 4249**

Recommendations:

- (1) That up to £20,000 of the £30,000 contribution being held by the Council for the management and future maintenance of the North Weald Redoubt (under the terms of a planning agreement signed in 1998), be used to part fund the preparation of a Conservation Management Plan for this Scheduled Ancient Monument; and**
- (2) That the Council enter into a Deed of Variation to vary the term of the section 106 agreement dated 29/07/98 so that up to £20,000 of the £30,000 contribution may be used for the preparation of a Conservation Management Plan for this Scheduled Ancient Monument.**

Report Detail

Background

1. The North Weald Redoubt was built between 1889 and 1904 as a “mobilisation centre” for the protection of London. It was retained as a military base in the decade leading up to 1914, and it is then thought to have served as an arsenal for the duration of the Great War. In 1919 the site was sold at auction to the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company, who established a radio station on the surrounding hillside and used the redoubt buildings for storage. The radio station came under the direct control of the government during World War II and after the war, in 1950, the radio station came under the control of the Post Office and the redoubt was used and maintained by the GPO (and latterly British Telecom) until the site was decommissioned in the early 1990’s.

2. The Redoubt at North Weald is one of fifteen London Mobilisation Centres, constructed during the 1890’s, and which formed part of the comprehensive military scheme known as the London Defence Positions, drawn up in 1888 to protect the capital. Essentially a contingency plan, it provided for the establishment of a 72 mile long, entrenched stop-line divided into ten tactical sectors and supported by artillery batteries and redoubts. Although the stop-line and main defence positions were not to be established until an invasion was imminent, it was thought prudent to build a series of mobilisation centres where troops could assemble and collect tools and supplies. However, by 1905, with official confidence in the Royal Navy restored, the now obsolete mobilisation centres were gradually abandoned and sold off. The North Weald Mobilisation Centre, officially known as the North Weald Redoubt, exhibits a

remarkable level of survival, no doubt largely as a result of the sympathetic reuse of the site as a radio station after the First World War. Unusually, it also retains all the principal elements of its dual-purpose design. The Redoubt was scheduled as a Ancient Monument in 1972 in recognition of its archaeological and historical significance.

Planning background

3. Proposals for the redevelopment and reuse of the former Radio Station site, which included the North Weald Redoubt, were originally submitted under reference EPF/367/96 and comprised the following:

- a) demolition of former radio station buildings and the return of their plots to open countryside use;
- b) construction of residential development;
- c) change of use of part of the site (45ha) to a golf course;
- d) extension of public rights of way;
- e) access to Redoubt (the scheduled ancient monument);
- f) provision of a 2ha public park; and,
- g) relocation of the North Weald Bowls Club.

4. The application was described as “detailed” and an appeal against non-determination was made. Another planning application (EPF/863/96) was submitted as a duplicate. Plans Sub Committee considered the original application at its meeting on 29/08/96 and resolved that it would have refused planning permission, because it was contrary to emerging planning policy. An indicative scheme for the residential development showed 68 houses with a total footprint of 6,200m² on 3.9ha.

5. On 29/04/97 Development Committee accepted in principle revised proposals for 72 houses on 3.6ha. No layouts were presented but Members were advised that the total footprint should amount to 5,500m². The appeal against non-determination was consequently withdrawn.

6. After considerable negotiation, the content of the planning application was revised to include the following proposals:

- a) change of use of 45ha of agricultural land to a pay and play golf course, and for change of use of 5.7ha of land to a “pocket park”;
- b) 3.6ha of residential development (outline permission) and the construction of a clubhouse; and,
- c) the contribution of a sum of money to the Parish Council to be used for the creation and maintenance of a pocket park and the extension of the car park.

7. Planning permission was eventually granted in July 1998 subject to a section 106 agreement that required, inter alia, a payment of £30,000 to the District Council, which was to be used for the management and future maintenance of the Redoubt in accordance with a management strategy for the protection, landscaping, access and enhancement of the Redoubt. The strategy was also intended to secure the necessary funding for its future management and maintenance. The District Council (or other appropriate body) were also given an option to take direct ownership of the Redoubt once the management strategy was agreed. If this option was not exercised within three years, then the ownership would remain with the developers subject to maintenance and security provisions set out in the Agreement.

8. The Management Strategy was never completed and the developers continue to own the Redoubt, subject to the maintenance and security provisions. These required security fencing to be erected and maintained around the Redoubt, and to allow access to it by prior appointment, until the date of freehold transfer, the provision for which was set out in the Agreement.

9. The District Council has been holding the £30,000 contribution for the management and future maintenance of the Redoubt, although none of this sum has been spent to date, for that purpose. Advice from the Council's Legal Service has indicated that, since this money remains unspent for the purpose for which it was intended, and noting that ten years will soon have elapsed since the Agreement was signed, that a request from the owners for the money to be returned to them in full might be hard to deny. The owners have further suggested that, rather than seek the return of the money at this stage, the money should be used to appoint consultants to prepare a Conservation Management Plan for the Redoubt.

10. A brief for such a Management Plan was prepared by the owners and it was considered essential that any Management Plan would have to consider, and cost, the conservation repairs required, as well as proposals for the future use of the site and how it would be managed and financed. An estimate to carry out this work was received from a team of specialist consultants in the order of £40,000.

11. Officers consider that the use of some of the section 106 money for this purpose, is not significantly different from the intent of the relevant clause in the Agreement, that is "for the management and future maintenance of the Redoubt in accordance with the strategy ". Accordingly, the recommendation seeks approval for £20,000 of the sum to be spent on the preparation of a detailed Conservation Management Plan, provided that the owners also contribute the necessary matched funding to enable consultants to be appointed to prepare the Plan.

12. If Members agree with proposed course of action, then in order to formalise the arrangement, and to ensure that the Council would not be in breach of the original section 106 agreement, a Deed of Variation should be entered into.

This page is intentionally left blank