

**PLANNING COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD
SAFFRON WALDEN at 2pm on 29 APRIL 2015**

Present: Councillor J Cheetham (Chairman)
Councillors C Cant, Davey, R Eastham, E Hicks, M Lemon, K
Mackman, J Menell, D Perry, V Ranger and J Salmon.

Officers in attendance: N Brown (Development Manager), K Denmark
(Development Management Team Leader), C Oliva (Solicitor), A
Rees (Democratic and Electoral Services Officer), M Shoesmith
(Development Management Team Leader), S Stephenson
(Technical Support Officer), A Taylor (Assistant Director Planning
and Building Control) and C Theobald (Planning Officer).

PC76 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Eden, Loughlin and
Wells.

No declarations of interest were received.

PC77 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 April 2015 were signed by the Chairman
as a correct record.

PC78 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

PC79 APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

It was noted that application UTT/15/0404/FUL Great Canfield had been
withdrawn by the applicant.

PC80 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

(a) Approvals

RESOLVED that the following applications be approved subject to the
conditions set out in the officer's report

UTT/15/0284/DFO Stansted - Details following application UTT/13/1618/OP
(Outline application for approximately 160 house dwellings, with associated
development and infrastructure) - Details of construction of a link road from
Cambridge Road in the application site – Land at Walpole Farm, Cambridge
Road, Stansted for Bloor Homes/Martin Grant Homes.

Sophie Pain spoke in support of the application.

UTT/15/0831/DFO Stansted - Details following outline application UTT/13/3345/OP for erection of 1 no. dwelling - details of access, scale, layout and appearance – Land at 40 Bentfield Road, Stansted, Essex for Mrs L Luther

Subject to the following additional conditions;

- A construction management agreement.
- A slab level agreement.

Eleanor Luther spoke in support of the application. Simon Howard-Dobson, Mr Yarnold (on behalf of Denise Wright) and Mr Yarnold spoke against the application.

UTT/14/3539/FUL Stansted - Replacement skatepark, including boundary fencing and 6 No. 8m high floodlighting columns – Stansted Skatepark, Lower Street, Stansted for Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council

Councillors Eastham and Mackman left the meeting during the consideration of this item.

Councillor Salmon declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Stansted Parish Council.

UTT/15/0395/FUL Saffron Walden - Omission of Condition 6 of UTT/12/5227/CA and Condition 7 of UTT/12/5226/FUL, and the varying of details approved under Condition 5 of planning permission UTT/12/5226/FUL “Erection of 31 sheltered apartments including communal facilities, access, car parking and landscaping” to allow for the removal of an additional section of wall and for the installation of railings – Saffron Lodge, Radwinter Road, Saffron Walden for Churchill Retirement Living

Subject to a S106 legal obligation to secure a contribution towards affordable housing .

UTT/15/0546/HHF Saffron Walden - Partial demolition of existing rear addition and demolition of existing front porch. Erection of two storey rear extension and single storey front extension. New rooflight to existing single storey roof to rear and new side door and windows with obscured glazing to side elevation – 53 Landscape View, Saffron Walden for Mr A Ketteridge

(b) Refusals

RESOLVED that the following applications be refused for the reasons stated in the officer’s report.

UTT/14/3675/DFO Little Dunmow - Details following outline application UTT/13/2340/OP (outline application for removal of existing earth bunds; demolition of 1 and 2 Pit Cottages and other buildings/hard standings on site; and erection of 40 dwellings with associated access, parking and garaging and

provision of public open space) - details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale – Former Dunmow Skips Site, Station Road, Little Dunmow for Persimmon Homes

Reason:

- 1 The proposed development, by virtue of its cramped layout, lack of play facilities and insufficient boundary screening would result in a form of development which would be out of scale, layout and appearance of surrounding development. The development fails to meet the requirements in relation to garden sizes as set out in the Essex Design Guide and there is insufficient open space, resulting in a form of development that would fail to meet the reasonable needs of future users. Thus the proposals fail to comply with Uttlesford Local Plan Policy GEN2 (adopted 2005).
- 2 The proposed development fails to ensure that sufficient visitor parking provision is provided, as required by the Parking Standards Design and Good Practice September 2009 and the Uttlesford Local Residential Parking Standards, adopted February 2013. This would be contrary to Uttlesford Local Plan Policy GEN8 (adopted 2005).

Councillor Mackman did not vote on the application as he arrived at the meeting whilst it was being considered.

Hayley Evans spoke in support of application.

UTT/14/3819/FUL Chrishall - Erection of 5 (No.) proposed dwellings with garages, home offices and access roadway – Hillside Farm, Mill Causeway, Chrishall for Mr and Mrs Smart

Bill Bampton spoke in favour of the application. Chris Booth, Tom Jackson and John Kay spoke against the application.

Councillor Perry did not vote on the application as he arrived at the meeting whilst it was being considered.

UTT/15/0145/FUL Stansted - A development comprising a ground floor retail unit, 1 bed apartment at first floor and 1 bed apartment at loft level (Option B, revised application) – Land South of Clark Close, Stansted for Mr Chirayo Patel.

Reason:

- 1 It is considered that the location of the proposal would be inadequate to accommodate delivery vehicles to serve the proposed retail unit. As such the proposal cannot be accommodated within the surrounding transport network, contrary to Policy GEN1 of the Adopted Uttlesford Local Plan 2004.

- 2 It is considered that the proposed retail unit by way of its location would have a materially adverse effect on the reasonable occupation and enjoyment of nearby residential properties, contrary to Policies GEN2 of the Adopted Uttlesford Local Plan 2004.
- 3 The proposal fails to provide adequate off street car parking to accommodate the proposal contrary to Policy GEN8 of the Adopted Uttlesford Local Plan 2004.

UTT/15/0666/HHF Saffron Walden - Retrospective application on the community/street scene – 20 Loompits Way, Saffron Walden, Essex for Miss Julia Smith.

PC81

LAND NORTH OF STANSTED ROAD, ELSENHAM – UTT/14/3279/DFO

The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control outlined his report. At the Committee meeting on 11 March, Members refused planning permission for the application. The matter was brought back to the Committee on 8 April to clarify the reasons for refusal. Members deferred the matter so that a transcript of the debate could be produced to clarify what had been said at the meeting. The report now recommended that the reasons for refusal at the meeting on 11 March should be confirmed as follows;

- (a) The proposed development would result in a poor design and location of the vehicular access point from Stansted Road being in close proximity to a neighbouring residential property at Hillcroft, and therefore creating harmful impact through noise and disturbance to residential amenity. This would be contrary to policies GEN1 and GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005.
- (b) The proposed development would result in a poor layout of design through the use of garage courts for some of the parking provision. This would be contrary to policy GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005.

Councillor Cheetham invited Dr Mott and Peter Johnson to speak. She explained that if the Committee decided to re-consider the application they would be given a chance to speak again.

Dr Mott said access was not the sole issue, a number of design issues had also been raised by councillors during the meeting. A number of councillors had not spoken at the meeting so the prevalence of this issue could not be fully known.

Peter Johnson reiterated the point made by Dr Mott that councillors had raised numerous concerns about the development. The revised scheme did not adequately address the concerns raised about parking provision. Additionally, there were a number of two and a half storey dwellings proposed throughout the development which were out of keeping with the street scene. The design was fundamentally flawed.

The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control re-emphasised that currently Members were only deciding what the reasons for refusal were, not

whether Members agreed with the decision to refuse the application. As Councillor Cant was not present at the meeting on 11 March she could not vote at this part of the debate.

Councillor Perry proposed that the Committee should confirm the reasons for refusal of the application as outlined in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Ranger.

RESOLVED that the Committee agree that the reasons for refusal of the application were as outlined in the report.

The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control explained that the applicant had made amendments to the proposals which aimed to address the reasons for refusal. If the Committee wished to re-consider the application it would first have to agree to suspend the council standing orders. Councillor Cant could vote on this matter.

Councillor Cheetham proposed that Council procedural rule 13.2 be suspended. This was seconded by Councillor Hicks.

RESOLVED that the standing order 13.2 be suspended to enable the committee to reconsider the application.

The Development Manager said the applicant had attempted to address the reasons for refusal. With regards to the first reason for refusal, the new proposal relocated the access road 2.2m to the east. This was the furthest that Essex Highways thought the access road could be moved without affecting visibility and confirmed they would raise objections if it were moved any further. It was considered that the revised application had adequately addressed the reasons for refusal on this matter.

The Development Manager explained that officers did not feel the second reason was sustainable on appeal as the design complied with Uttlesford Car Parking Standards. Furthermore, all the plots complied with the garden sizes within the Essex Design Guide. The second reason for refusal had therefore been addressed through clarification.

Councillor Cheetham invited Dr Mott, Peter Johnson and the agent, Peter Biggs to speak on the revised application.

Dr Mott said that although the relocation of the access road was an improvement, it should have been relocated 9m to the east. He did not accept Essex Highways comments about visibility being compromised if the access road was relocated by more than 2.2m to the east. The revised proposals still had areas for concern as the parking still breached highway provisions. Given the scale of the development there was also scope for problems caused by sub-letting. The application should be rejected for failure to comply with GEN1 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005. Lastly a number of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) made development untenable.

Peter Johnson said that the Parish Council acknowledged that a number of applications had received outline planning permission, but there was still a need for future developments to integrate with the local area, which this application had not met. The Parish Council agreed with Dr Mott regarding access. Overall they felt the application could be better and would like to see improvements made.

The agent, Peter Biggs then spoke about the application. He said whenever issues had been raised by the Committee; he had looked to address those issues and had always complied with planning policy. Furthermore, none of the statutory bodies had ever raised any objections. Officers had recommended approval of the application whenever it had been brought before the Committee and the additionally the report before the Committee said the changes made to the application overcame the reasons previously given for refusal.

Councillor Cheetham asked for clarification about sub-letting and TPOs. In response the Development Manager explained there was no concern surrounding TPOs as any works to the trees would require consent. Sub-letting required planning permission so this wasn't seen as an issue either.

Councillor Perry asked for consideration of the application to be deferred, due to inadequate consultation. Essex Highways needed to provide more information about access and more information was needed about the TPOs. Councillor Salmon seconded the proposal.

The motion for deferral was put to the vote and was defeated, with four votes in favour and five against.

Councillor Hicks then proposed that the application be approved. Councillor Ranger seconded the proposal.

Councillor Ranger raised concerns about the car parking courts and asked whether a condition could be added to ensure the final designs of the car parking was satisfactory. In response, the Development Manager suggested adding a separate condition stating that plans for the car parking courts had to be submitted and approved.

In response to points made by Councillors Cant and Cheetham, the Assistant Director Planning and Building Control explained there were only a few parking courts throughout the development and they were all adjacent to the respective properties. He added that Councillor Cant couldn't vote on the proposed approval of the application as she had not attended the previous meeting when the application was initially discussed.

RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the conditions in the report to the Committee on 11 March 2015 and the a further condition; requiring that further details relating to landscaping should be submitted and approved before the commencement of the development.

PC82

**WEST OF WOODSIDE WAY, GREAT DUNMOW – LPA REF
UTT/13/2107/OP**

Members received a report from the Assistant Director Planning and Building Control which recommended the variation of condition 2 on application UTT/13/2107/OP to allow a request for an extension of the commencement condition as follows.

- 1) Application for approval of the Reserved Matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than the expiration of 3 year from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be begun no later than the expiration of 2 years 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.

The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control explained that previously it had been Council policy to ask for works to commence one year after permission was granted. This was no longer the case and three years was now deemed appropriate.

Councillor Ranger proposed the recommendations as outlined in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Lemon.

RESOLVED that condition 2 be amended as recommended in the report.

PC83

**NOTIFICATION OF WORKS TO A TREE – 23 WEARNS COTTAGE, 9
CARMEN STREET, GREAT CHESTERFORD**

The Development Manager explained that urgent works were required to a the tree at Carmen street Great Chesterford. The Council's Landscaping Officer had raised no objections to the works.

RESOLVED that no objections were raised to the works.

PC84

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Councillor Cheetham said she would like to thank officers and Members, as it was her last meeting as a district councillor. She had been a member of the Planning Committee for 17 years and had enjoyed her time as a member. Although, Members had often disagreed with each other at meetings this had never affected their relationship outside of the Committee.

Councillor Cant echoed the statement of Councillor Cheetham saying she was glad to have been a councillor for the last 18 years. She thanked officers for their help throughout her time as a member of the Council.

Members thanked Councillors Cant and Cheetham for the service to both the Council and the Committee. Councillor Menell also extended thanks to Councillor Godwin, who had left the Committee earlier in the year.

The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control thanked the Committee for their support. He added that there had been some quite radical changes to planning policy since 2011, which the Committee had dealt with well.

The meeting ended at 6.20pm.