

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
15 March 2012 at 6:00pm**

**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

**Part A**

(open to the public including the media)

**Pages**

**10. Amendment Sheet**

**70 - 72**

See Amendment Sheet attached.



# AMENDMENT SHEET

Planning Committee  
15 March 2012

## AMENDMENTS OF CONDITIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

### LATE AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED INTO THIS AMENDMENT SHEET AND ARE SHOWN AS EMBOLDENED

#### 7.2 091282 – Pattens Yard, Nayland Road, West Bergholt

One additional email raising similar concerns to those detailed in the report – concerned that there are lorries and skips on the site and that it appears that the goal posts have been moved.

*(Note: This email followed a reconsultation because previously the description did not accord with the description on the application forms. This was an administrative error. There are no changes to any details in the application)*

#### 7.3 101541 – Lower Park, Colchester Road, Dedham

##### English Heritage Advice

English Heritage wrote to you on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2011 regarding a similar proposal, which has now been resubmitted with a revised layout and detailed design approach.

The development site projects into the parkland to the west of Lower Park House, which is a substantial private green space that contributes positively to the conservation area's special character as well as forming part of the wider setting of the grade II listed house.

We would repeat our previous advice that we feel encroachment into the parkland should be resisted unless your council is completely satisfied that there is no alternative location within the substantial gardens of Lower Park where the proposed facilities might be placed.

PPS5 policy HE7.5 stresses the need to take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment including its scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and use. If buildings are to be permitted here, we feel that the current submission appears more fitting in terms of its layout, and the orientation, massing, form and detailing of the structures than the preceding scheme and that it would not have an adverse impact.

**Recommendation: We would urge you to address the above issues, and recommend that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice. It is not necessary for us to be consulted again.**

**Conservation Officer Advice**

**The main conservation issues raised by this application are the effect that the proposed development would have on the setting of the Lower Park, a grade II listed building, and the character and appearance of the Dedham Conservation Area.**

**The Statement of Significance describes the historic development of Lower Park and concludes that it is a fine C19 house that stands in a largely parkland setting. The west side of the Lower Park is described as lacking the visual qualities of the south and east elevations.**

**The proposed stables are located some 44m to the north west of the house and straddles the boundary between the house and the adjacent parkland. Given the distance between the house and the proposed stable block, and the fact that the existing mature trees will act as a screen, it is not considered that the proposed development will have a significant impact on the immediate surroundings (setting) of the listed house.**

**It is noted that the design of the proposed buildings have been amended in-line with the suggestions previously made by English Heritage. This has resulted in the reduction in height of the main storage barn and the adoption of an architectural style that is related more to the character of the house in terms of forms, details and materials.**

**The proposed stable block will be visible across the parkland from the private drive. It is noted that additional tree planting is proposed with the parkland and this will help to filter these views of the proposed development. The existing established planting surrounding Lower Park and its parkland setting is such that views of the proposed development will not generally be visible from public rights of way. Given this, it is not considered that the proposed development would have a significant impact on the wider setting of the Dedham Conservation Area.**

Further to the above, a letter of representation has been received from English Heritage in respect of this proposal. English Heritage's advice is that the encroachment of development into the parkland of Lower Park should be resisted unless the local planning authority is satisfied that there are no alternative locations with the garden of Lower Park. I would make the following observations:

- The siting of the proposed buildings on the land to the east of Lower Park (beyond the shelter belt) would have a minimal impact on the setting house; however this part of the site is visually more prominent from Essex Way and, as such, any development in this location would have a greater impact on the wider countryside setting.
- The siting of the proposed buildings immediately to the north of the house within the main domestic garden would have a greater (detrimental) visual impact on the setting of Lower Park.
- Siting the proposed development to the north west of the house (as proposed) would not have a significant impact of the setting of house or that of the wider conservation area; moreover by placing development in this location, the existing modern non-descript outbuildings and alien planting will be removed and replaced by buildings / planting of a more sympathetic design / type.

It is noted that English Heritage state that the current scheme would not have an adverse impact on the setting of Lower Park.

Agenda Item 8 – Area S2Sw of the Colchester Garrison Urban Village

There is a typographical error in Para 3.2 (second bullet point). This should read: "*The Council is responsible for the nomination of perspective **purchasers** ....*" not "*The Council is responsible for the nomination of perspective purchases ...*".

In paragraph 3.2 (fourth bullet point), it should read "*After nine months ...*" not "*After twelve months ....*".

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
15 March 2012 at 6:00pm**

**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

**Part B**

(not open to the public or the media)

**Pages**

**There are no Section B Items**