

**1. APPLICATION No:** TRE/EPF/0794/05

**PARISH:** Willingale

**SITE ADDRESS:**

TORRELLS HALL COTTAGES, SHELOW ROAD, WILLINGALE

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

TPO/1/92: Western Section of Poplar Avenue: Fell and replace.  
(25 trees).

**DEFERRED** for members site visit.

---

**2. APPLICATION No:** EPF/1480/04

**PARISH:** Ongar

**SITE ADDRESS:**

ONGAR MOTORS & TRANSPORT CO, THE BOROUGH, GREENSTED ROAD,  
ONGAR

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Erection of medical and day care centre with associated parking facilities.

**REFERRED to development committee with recommendation to approve.**

---

**3. APPLICATION No:** EPF/1313/05

**PARISH:** Stapleford Tawney

**SITE ADDRESS:**

OS PARCEL 0002, BIRCHFIELD, STAPLEFORD TAWNEY

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Use of agricultural land as a private traveller site providing 16 pitches (Retrospective application).

**REFUSED:**

1. The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the use of the land to provide a private gypsy caravan site is inappropriate development that is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. Moreover due to the scale of the proposal, it retention of made ground over the land, the stationing of caravans and vehicles, erection of ancillary structures and means of enclosure together with the normal everyday activities of people living on the land and the proposal would cause significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt and only serve to perpetuate the acknowledged harm caused by the existing lawful use and undermine the purposes of including the land in the Green Belt. It has not been demonstrated that very special circumstances sufficient to overcome this harm exist in this particular case. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to policies CS2, CS4, C2 and H6 of the Essex and & Southend on Sea Replacement Structure

Plan, adopted April 2001 and to policies GB2 and H11 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan, adopted January 1998.

2. Due to the scale of the proposal, its retention of made ground over the land, the stationing of caravans and vehicles, erection of ancillary structures and means of enclosure it would fail to respect its landscape setting and cause permanent damage to the character of the landscape. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to policy NR1 of the Essex & Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan, adopted April 2001 and policy LL2 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan, adopted January 1998.
3. The access to the site does not enable those vehicles turning left into the site to do so without crossing the centre line of Epping Lane while the proposal would cause an increase in traffic above that generated by the lawful use of the site to the west along Epping Lane. This would perpetuate a hazard to road safety caused by the existing unlawful use of the land. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to policy T3 of the Essex & Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan, adopted April 2001 and policy T17 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan, adopted January 1998.
4. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate whether the risk to the development by flooding is acceptable and whether the impact of the development on the risk of flooding of adjacent land is acceptable. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to policy NR12 of the Essex & Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan, adopted April 2001 and policy U2 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan, adopted January 1998.
5. The existing means of disposal of sewage effluent is unsatisfactory and in the absence of any acceptable alternative proposals for the disposal of sewage effluent the proposal is likely to result in an unacceptable risk of pollution to the water environment. In addition, the existing use of the land has resulted in a number of diesel spillages/leakages and the proposal is likely to result in more similar contamination that poses a risk to the environment. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to policy NR12 of the Essex & Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan, adopted April 2001 and policy RP3 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan, adopted January 1998.
6. The site is situated in a remote rural landscape and is not actually accessible to local services, shops or schools by any other form of transport than private car. The proposal therefore conflicts with the sustainability aims of policy T3 of the Essex & Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan, adopted April 2001.
7. The site is exposed to high noise levels from traffic using the adjacent motorway placing it in Noise Exposure Category C. The site is therefore considered to have poor living environment where it would not be appropriate to allow a residential development unless there is special justification for it. In view of reasons of 1 to 6 above and since no

reasonable steps have been taken to find an alternative site there is no justification for allowing the proposed development on this site. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to policy BE6 of the Essex & Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan, adopted April 2001 and policy RP5 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan, adopted January 1998.

8. In view of reasons 1, 2, 3 and 7 above the proposal fails to comply with criterion c, d and e referred to the supporting text for policy H11 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan, adopted January 1998. Moreover, there are no special circumstances that would justify making an exception to Green Belt policies of restraint and the proposal would cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt and the character of the countryside. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy H11.

---

**4. APPLICATION No:** EPF/1224/05

**PARISH:** Theydon Mount

**SITE ADDRESS:**

HIGH WARREN, MOUNT END, THEYDON MOUNT

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Two storey side extension (Revised application).

**REFUSED:**

1. The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The proposed development is at odds with Government advice, the policies of the adopted Local Plan and approved Essex Structure Plan, in that it does not constitute a reasonable extension to an existing dwelling. Thus this application is unacceptable, because the proposed extension by reason of its size and scale would result in a disproportionate addition and furthermore it would be dominant and intrusive in the surrounding area; and the dwelling has accommodation which meets contemporary living standards. If approved it would set a dangerous precedent for other disproportionate extensions.