

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL OFFICES GREAT DUNMOW at 7.30 pm on 14 JUNE 2001

Present:- Councillor Mrs J F Cheetham – Chairman
Councillors Mrs C A Cant, R A E Clifford, Mrs C D Down,
Mrs E J Godwin, P G F Lewis, Mrs C M Little, R W L Stone and
A R Thawley.

Also present:- Councillor R P Chambers

Officers in attendance:- J Bosworth, R Harborough, B D Perkins,
Mrs J Postings and M T Purkiss.

27 **QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

Before the start of the formal meeting, Mr Newlyn, in respect of the Rochford Nurseries Development, and Mr McNaught, in respect of the Oakwood Park, Little Dunmow development, made statements. A summary of the statements is appended to the Minutes.

28 **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors W F Bowker, D M Miller, R C Smith and Mrs E Tealby-Watson.

29 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2001 were received, confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

30 **BUSINESS ARISING**

(i) Minute 301(iv) Regional Planning Guidance

Councillor Mrs Cheetham circulated a written report on the workshop held at Saffron Walden on 24 May 2001 concerning the London Stansted Cambridge Sub-Regional Study.

(ii) Minute 304 Planning Policy Guidance Revised Consultation Paper – Development and Flood Risk

Members noted a response which had been received from the Government Office for the East of England. The response concluded that experience from the 2000/01 winter would be taken into account in any reassessment of flood risk and would feed into the long term planning of the Environment Agency and MAFF on arterial drainage improvements.

MATTERS REFERRED FROM DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SUB-COMMITTEE

(i) **Erection of House and Detached Garage and Creation of New Access – Land Between 4 and 5 School Villas, Great Easton for Uttlesford District Council (UTT/0156/01/DC)**

At the meeting of the Development Control Sub-Committee on 21 May 2001, Members had been informed that this application was contrary to Development Plan policies and no supporting argument had been submitted to justify a departure from the Development Plan. The delegation scheme prevented the Sub-Committee from refusing District Council applications and accordingly it had been referred to this Committee for decision.

RESOLVED that planning permission be refused in respect of application UTT/0156/01/DC for the reasons listed in the Town Planning Register.

(ii) **Erection of New Community and Sports Centre, Formation of Associated Parking Area, New Vehicular Access, New Footpath and Multi-use Games Area – Playing Field Off The Street, Manuden (UTT/1731/00/OP)**

This application had been referred for decision by the Development Control Sub-Committee on 11 June 2001. It related to the provision of community facilities outside development limits contrary to Policy S2 of the District Plan. However, the Sub-Committee felt that the proposals justified a departure from the Plan.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted for planning application UTT/1731/00/OP, subject to the conditions recorded in the Town Planning Register.

(iii) **Erection of a Replacement Village Hall, Change of Use of Land and Creation of a New Vehicular Access on Land Adjoining St Johns Church, Little Walden (UTT/1727/00/OP)**

At the Development Control Sub-Committee meeting on 11 June 2001 this application had been referred to the Committee as it was contrary to Policy S2 of the District Plan. However, the Sub-Committee considered that the proposals were justified as a departure from the Plan.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted for planning application UTT/1727/00/OP, subject to the conditions recorded in the Town Planning Register.

UTTLESFORD LOCAL PLAN

Councillor Chambers declared an interest in any matter relating to agriculture as he was an agricultural contractor.

Officers explained that the District Plan adopted in 1995 was intended to remain relevant up to 2001. The Replacement Structure Plan for the period to 2011 had been adopted on 9 April 2001 and a new Local Plan needed to be prepared.

Members considered the text and proposal maps for consultation and noted that the recommended draft:

- Took the principles of sustainability fully into account;
- Linked with other strategies and plans for our community in Uttlesford;
- Built on the experience of operating existing policies in the Adopted District Plan;
- Included no new strategic housing land, and excluded some green field land proposed for development in the Adopted Plan. It proposed increases in the number of dwellings on two sites in the Adopted Plan: an additional 200 homes on the Rochford Nurseries site in Birchanger and Stansted Mountfitchet and an additional 100 homes on “Sector 3” at Woodlands Park, Great Dunmow;
- Included no new strategic employment development sites, and excluded some of the green field land proposed for development in the Adopted Plan at Chesterford Park.

Once it had been printed the Plan would be placed on formal deposit for six weeks starting in October. Representations would be analysed and Officers would report back to Members recommending any changes that might be appropriate. There would then be a second deposit stage for representations on any such changes and objections would be considered at a public local inquiry in due course.

In the period between now and October workshops would be arranged as briefings for Town and Parish Councils and for other groups expressing an interest. This would enable their representations to be fully informed when the deposit period commenced. It was emphasised that responses to the deposit draft plan must be made formally during the designated period as this was a process regulated by statute.

The Committee then considered the text of the local plan.

Councillor Clifford made it clear that he would not support the proposed increase in the number of dwellings at the Rochford Nurseries site from 400 to 600. Councillor Mrs Godwin supported him and said that this increase would lead to unacceptable pressures on the local community and the road network. She stated that the B1383 was already congested and, if 600 dwellings were constructed, it would become gridlocked. Councillor Clifford referred to problems with the existing Stansted surgery and suggested that any centre constructed on the Rochford Nurseries site would only be an outpost and not the main centre.

Councillor Thawley supported the provision of 650 dwellings on the Oakwood Park site. He felt that the suggested density for this would be in keeping with

a rural area. He also considered that other rural settlements could be made viable if some housing were allowed across the District. The Director of Community Services suggested that the best method of improving the vitality of rural settlements was probably through the Exception Housing Policy.

Councillor Mrs Cant considered that before allowing new agricultural dwellings in the countryside, an assessment should be made of whether other nearby buildings could be used. In relation to parking standards, she felt that the maximum parking standards for new homes could lead to further on-street parking problems. The Director of Community Services agreed to revisit the explanatory text in the Plan on these issues.

Councillor Clifford referred to proposals for Stansted Park and the Leader said that this could be looked at.

The Leader of the Council stressed that everyone in the District would have the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Members were being asked at this stage to agree a draft Plan for the purposes of public consultation. The result of that consultation would mean that Members would be better informed before they took any decisions.

Councillor Mrs Cant added that the proposals were very encouraging and it was the best possible Plan which could be put forward at this stage. She thanked Officers for the excellent work which had been undertaken in this matter.

RESOLVED that

- 1 the proposed text and proposals map extracts for consultation be approved, subject to any further editorial changes necessary, and
- 2 a deposit draft plan be prepared and put on deposit for objection or other representations in October following printing.

Councillors Clifford and Mrs Godwin asked that their abstention from voting on this decision be recorded.

33

BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2000/01

Members received a Budget Monitoring Report setting out the provisional outturn for 2000/01 against the 2000/01 revised budget.

Members noted that there was an overspend, mainly relating to the cost of appeals, of £11,000 with fee income slightly down, at £8,000 below the revised estimate.

34 **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SUB-COMMITTEE**

The Minutes of the meetings of the Development Control Sub-Committee held on 19 March, 9 April, 30 April and 21 May 2001 were received.

35 **URGENT ITEMS**

(i) **Great Dunmow Museum**

The Chairman agreed to the consideration of this item, as an early decision was required.

The Head of Local Plan and Conservation reminded Members that a grant of £10,000 had previously been made to the Great Dunmow Museum from Section 106 monies. Much of this money had now been expended and an excellent facility had been provided. The Museum wished to purchase a slide projector at a cost of £1,245 and a grant of £750 had been made by the Stansted Airport Consultative Committee. The balance of £495 was therefore requested from Section 106 monies.

RESOLVED that, subject to the agreement of Copthorne Homes Ltd, a grant of £495 be made from Section 106 monies.

36 **DELEGATION TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SUB-COMMITTEE**

RESOLVED that the Development Control Sub-Committee be authorised to deal with planning matters requiring a decision during the summer recess.

37 **LAST MEETING**

The Chairman said that this would be the last meeting of the Planning and Development Committee. She said that she had looked back at the first meeting of this Committee which had been held on 21 March 1974 and noted that it had been stated that the intention was that local planning matters would be put firmly in the hands of District Councillors.

She said that the Committee had tried to work together for the good of the District and she thanked Members and Officers for their support. She hoped that the new Environment and Transport Committee would keep up the good work. Members thanked her for the considerate way in which she had chaired meetings of the Committee.

The meeting ended at 8.40 pm.

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**1 Statement made by Mr Newlyn**

Mr Newlyn spoke in relation to the Rochford Nurseries site. He stated that the site had previously been in the adopted plan for 400 dwellings and a proposal for 600 dwellings was now being considered. He said that since the resolution of the Council in early 1999 infrastructure problems had been resolved, particularly in relation to Pesterford Bridge. The Section 106 Agreement had been delivered to the Council on 13 June. He referred to the suitability of the Pesterford Bridge solution, the tidying up of the site and the low density which met pre-PPG3 guidance.

2 Statement by Mr McNaught

Mr McNaught said that he had been representing the owners of the sugar beet site at Little Dunmow for over 10 years. Since the grant of planning permission on appeal in 1998 his clients had been considering options. These had included the possible relocation or upgrading of the Felsted Sewage Works. He hoped to deliver a further 17 acres of brown field land in accordance with PPG3. He said that the application for 900 dwellings had been withdrawn and a new application submitted was for 820 dwellings. He was surprised that the Council were seeking to restrict the numbers of units on the site and also the extent of the area for development. He implored Members to consider the proposals very carefully.

The Chairman stated that their views would be taken into account when the Committee discussed these issues.