

UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF REPRESENTATIONS

12 February 2014

P.7 UTT/13/2917/FUL – Hailes Wood Elsenham

35 additional objections received. New points raised:

1. Proposed revisions would result in increased traffic through Hailes Wood as The Crown PH access has been removed.
2. Question relevance of 5 year land supply.

P.45 UTT/13/3406/FUL – Site at 121 Radwinter Road, Saffron Walden

TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS: No objections but the Town Council were very concerned that there did not appear to be a play area situated within the development, and they felt that this was imperative.

CONSULTATIONS:

Health and Safety Executive (HSE): The revised application, ref UTT/13/3406/FUL, still straddles the Consultation Zone but the area of land of the proposed housing development has been reduced within the inner and middle zones. In addition, none of the dwellings are within the inner zone. The applicant, Countryside Properties PLC, has provided HSE with a site layout plan and information describing the accuracy of the 'on the ground' detailed topographical survey of the site, from which the layout was derived. Provided this plan is included with the application to define the housing development area and layout, it is appropriate for the Council to use it for inputs to PADHI+ to obtain HSE's advice on the application. I would then expect HSE's advice to be "do not advise against".

ECC Ecology: The additional documents are acceptable and I welcome the additional Recommendation (5) in the Phase 1 Habitat Survey. However, the wording should be amended slightly to reflect the text above it and the advice in Leonie Gough's letter of 7th October 2013 regarding planning applications UTT/13/1981/OP and UTT/13/1982/FUL. Thus,

"Calcareous grassland should be developed in the proposed wildlife area to the east of the site at a replacement ratio of at least 1:1" should be amended to, "a replacement ratio of greater 1:1".

REPRESENTATIONS: 3 Additional letters have been received, including 1 raising points previously reported.

Saffron Walden Skate Group: Respectfully like to suggest that some S106 funding from this planning application should be allocated to youth facilities or to provide salaries for youth workers in the town. We believe that there is little open space or recreational land offered with the application and new residents will use the skatepark and adjacent land for recreation. The youth service in Saffron Walden is now practically dependent upon the voluntary sector and this situation will only become worse with the closure of Fairycroft House in spring 2014. It is extremely difficult to access revenue funding for salaries to pay youth workers.

Uttlesford Area Access Group: There needs to be a positive statement that all houses will meet the Lifetime Homes Standard and that 5% of houses will also meet the Wheelchair Accessible Housing criteria.

P.92 **UTT/13/2107/OP – Land west of Woodside Way, Great Dunmow**

TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS: At its meeting on 30th January the Town Council considered the additional information supplied by the applicant. It was noted and appreciated that the applicant had addressed many of the concerns raised by the statutory consultees, who now raise no objections, and the questions raised by the Town Council.

However, the Town Council still registers an objection to this development and reiterates the reasons as set out in its letter dated 21st October 2013 which were, in essence, that

a) the application before us does not guarantee the infrastructure and community benefits that it proposes. For the sake of our community, the town, and its residents we must be certain that the provision and delivery of community benefits are secured as far as is reasonably possible for the benefit of the town.

b) members and residents are all deeply concerned at the impact of the additional number of people on the town and the sheer scale of the development. It is acknowledged that this site has been identified in the Draft Local Plan for development. But it is a draft which has not yet passed inspection or been adopted by the District Council. An inspector has not yet deemed this site to be capable of supporting sustainable development

We had requested a copy of the Draft Heads of Terms for the Section 106 Agreement but at the time of our meeting this had not been received. Therefore we are not certain of the community benefits proposed, or the trigger points that will be in place to ensure their delivery in a timely manner. The Town Council requests an influence over the content of the agreement and the timing of the triggers for delivery.

At the Council meeting on 30th January members expressed their gratitude to Andy Blackwell (Bidwells), Peter Biggs (Barratt Homes) and Nikki Davies (Meeting Place Communications) who have attended numerous meetings and updated the Council on progress. At the same time they have willingly answered questions and researched queries. This communication is greatly appreciated and the Town Council will do all it can to keep this dialogue open.

In the meantime, the Town Council is facing a proposal containing the largest number of new homes for many years and wishes to be given the opportunity to represent its residents in order to ensure that the enormity of this development will not adversely

impact on the character and long term sustainability of the town, and we re-iterate our objections to the application whilst awaiting the answers to our earlier questions re 106 monies.

Little Easton Parish Council: Little Easton Parish Council withdraws its objection on ecological grounds, as additional information has been submitted by the applicant. ECC Ecology stresses the environmental importance of the "green corridor connecting the SSSI and nearby Hoglands Wood LoWS. For this mitigation to be effective it is essential that these areas are intact and managed in the long term." For this reason, the Parish Council strongly opposes the request from a developer for future access through the site's northern boundary. Although access is a reserved matter, if the green corridor were compromised by allowing a road through it, the proposal would fail the NPFF on environmental sustainability. It would also have traffic impacts that have not been considered as part of the current application. The Parish Council requests a separate s106 obligation for a protected and maintained natural and semi natural open space in the north-western corner and a 20m buffer wildlife corridor along the entire northern edge of the site.

REPRESENTATIONS: 1 additional letter has been received.

Further to my previous letters, I draw attention to the recent Stage 3 Road Safety Audit which has been carried out on Woodside Way by Essex Highways. Paragraph 1.4 states as follows:-

"The Audit Team understands further planning approval is sought for land on the north side of Woodside Way. The existing development is limited to the south side of the carriageway only. This further proposed development has not been considered as part of this RSA; however, it should be noted that separation of two separate developments by a high speed road is inappropriate, and is likely to result in numerous movements, vehicular and pedestrianized across Woodside Way which have not been catered for by this scheme."

P.140 UTT/13/3118/OP – Land Off East View Close And Walden Road Radwinter

1. Revised wording of the recommendation:

RECOMMENDATION – CONDITIONAL APPROVAL and S106 LEGAL OBLIGATION

- I **The applicant be informed that the committee would be minded to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in paragraph (III) unless the freehold owner enters into a binding obligations to cover the matters set out below under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991, in a form to be prepared by the Assistant Chief Executive – Legal, in which case he shall be authorised to conclude such an obligation to secure the following:**
 - (i) **Financial contribution towards primary and secondary education provision**
 - (ii) **Provision of affordable housing - 12 Units for affordable rent on rural exception allocation basis i.e. first let offered (forever) to Radwinter residents or connection followed by cascade neighbouring Parish until UDC wide.**
 - (iii) **Maintenance of open space**

- (iv) **Provision of off-site land – extension to recreation ground**
- (v) **Pay the Council's reasonable costs**
- (vi) **Pay monitoring charge**

II In the event of such an obligation being made, the Assistant Director Planning and Building Control shall be authorised to grant permission subject to the conditions set out below.

III If the freehold owners shall fail to enter into such an obligation by 19 February 2014 the Assistant Director Planning and Building Control shall be authorised to refuse permission in his discretion at any time thereafter for the following reasons:

- (i) **Lack of financial contribution towards primary and secondary education provision**
- (ii) **Lack of provision of affordable housing - 12 Units for affordable rent on rural exception allocation basis i.e. first let offered (forever) to Radwinter residents or connection followed by cascade neighbouring Parish until UDC wide.**
- (iii) **Lack of contribution toward maintenance of open space**
- (iv) **Lack of provision of off-site land – extension to recreation ground**

Revised wording to condition:

1. Approval of the details of the layout, scale, landscaping and appearance (hereafter called "the Reserved Matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before development commences and the development shall be carried out as approved.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. (A) Application for approval of the Reserved Matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than the expiration of 2 years from the date of this permission.
(B) The development hereby permitted shall be begun no later than the expiration of 1 year from the date of approval of the last of the Reserved Matters to be approved.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and Section 92 of the Town and country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 3 Prior to occupation of any dwelling, the upgrade of the surface of the western end of public footpath 87 from the development towards East View Close to provide a suitable surface for year round use to enable pedestrian access to the primary school and East View Close. Details to be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority, prior to commencement of development.

REASON: In the interests of sustainability and accessibility. To ensure that the development accords with the Highway Authority's Development Management

Policies, adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011 and Uttlesford Local Plan Policy GEN1.

4 Following response from ECC Ecology – see below – an additional condition is recommended:

No development will commence on site nor any site clearance or on - site investigation works shall take place until an Habitat Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The mitigation measures set out in the Plan shall be implemented prior to any development or site clearance or on - site investigation works taking place or in accordance with a timetable set out within the approved Plan.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and in the interest of the protection of the wildlife value of the site in accordance with Policy GEN7 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (adopted 2005).

2. Revision to Officer report F Mix of Housing and Affordable Housing (NPPF, ULP Policies H9 and H10)

Subsequent to the report being written it has been brought to the Officers attention that during the pre-application process the Parish had requested that the Affordable Housing was offered to local Radwinter residents and connections before being cascaded to the closest Parishes and then UDC wide.

Within the Council adopted Housing Allocations Policy/Scheme document dated January 2013 the final paragraph states:

Local Lettings Plans – sustainable communities

In exceptional circumstances, the council may decide to let properties on a slightly different basis from normal, in the interests of building a strong and sustainable community or to deal with particular local issues. The decision to apply a local lettings scheme will be jointly made by the landlord of the property and the council. On new development, the partnership may consider widening eligible bands for home types on first lettings, again taking equal opportunities and legal issues into account.

The Parish have been proactive in bringing this site forward and have been trying to ensure that the community benefit from any housing scheme. In this instance the recommendation is to allow the affordable accommodation to be offered to local residents/connections first before cascading to the wider Uttlesford District

3 Parish Council

For many years the Parish Council has worked closely with the landowners and are happy with the proposed development because we feel that it would benefit the village in the long term. We are also very happy with the improvements to the village which would be financed by this development. The Parish Council has always supported the development on the understanding that the affordable housing provided would be for the existing Radwinter residents and was given to understand by Officer of Uttlesford District council some time ago that all the affordable properties would be provided for

people with an immediate connection with the village, in perpetuity. If the plan honours this agreement then the Parish Council is pleased to support it.

Radwinter Parish Council requests that English Rural Housing Association be appointed to manage the affordable housing as they already manage some houses in the village very successfully.

We accept the independent assessment that the proposed junction on the main road is safe, but feel that pedestrian safety could be improved further by the inclusion of a refuge island, which would give the added benefit of acting as a traffic calming measure.

Finally, we are mindful of the concerns of the residents of East View Close about heavy lorries using access to the site. We request that construction traffic is only allowed to enter the site from the main road.

4 ECC Ecology

Objection subject to further information.

The previous reports have been amended but the amended versions do not make sufficiently clear what has been altered and why.

The retention of the veteran trees is welcomed. However, these will now be within the open amenity area and so the value of them in the context of their current surrounding woodland/scrub habitat is lost.

I would welcome a habitat management plan to manage all habitats associated with the development in the long term.

The majority of land not proposed to be built upon is classed as 'open space'. This does not demonstrate that biodiversity would be the priority use/objective for this land.

5 Agent response:

With regards to the query of what has been amended in the reports this is simply an elaboration on the previous version and adding the species lists and desktop study as requested. In response to the comment on a sub-optimal flora survey period our ecologist states that it should be noted that reptile and bat surveys were undertaken in 2013 between spring and autumn, giving opportunities for further evaluation of the habitats throughout the seasons. Only commonly occurring species were identified as per the species lists.

6 Further Representations Received

Comments have been considered in the main report. A resident would like a photo of the recent flood to be noted:



Formatted: Font:

P.175 UTT/13/3444/DFO – Land South Of Stanley Road And Four Acres Great Chesterford

1. Parish Council

Apologies for the late comment - I noticed the cycle path/road to the West of the site into the adjacent LDF proposed plot does not go all the way to the boundary, there is a soft landscaping strip. There is a requirement for a cycle path all the way through the combined sites to Rookery Close.

Following this correspondence the agent/applicants submitted revised plans which have removed the 'landscape' strip between the application site and the cycle path now extends to the boundary.

2. Note from agent:

The comments regarding the wheelchair housing and turning circles have not previously been received. The submitted typology plans clearly demonstrate that there is sufficient space within the dwelling hallway to turn a wheelchair. The turning circles are illustrated as light blue hatched areas.

With regard to the changes in height between 17 Stanley Road, Plot1 and Plot 2 I have noticed that these heights refer to a superseded drawing. This may be an oversight on our part and I apologise for that. Please could you amend the following sentence in respect of the heights to ensure consistency with the submitted drawing:

Plot 1 maximum ridge height is 0.815m higher than 17 Stanley Road with Plot 1 ridge height being 2.654m lower than plots 2 & 3 ridge height.