

**PLANNING COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD  
SAFFRON WALDEN at 2pm on 30 AUGUST 2017**

Present: Councillor A Mills (Chairman)  
Councillors R Chambers, J Davey, R Freeman, A Gerard  
(substituting for P Fairhurst), E Hicks, M Lemon, J Lodge, J  
Loughlin and L Wells.

Officers in attendance: A Bochel (Democratic Services Officer), N Brown  
(Development Manager), K Denmark (Development Management  
Team Leader), L Mills (Planning Officer), S Pugh (Head of Legal  
Services), E Smith (Legal Officer) and L Trevillian (Senior  
Planning Officer).

Also present: J Bishop, V Choat, R Earthy, A LeClerq, P Katz, D Malins, Cllr T  
Moore, Cllr J Redfern, R Woodcock

**PC27 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies were received from Councillor Fairhurst.

*Councillor Freeman declared an interest as a member of Saffron Walden Town  
Council.*

**PC28 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 August 2017 were approved and signed  
by the Chairman as a correct record.

**PC29 UTT/17/1452/DFO - LAND NORTH OF BARTHOLOMEW CLOSE, GREAT  
CHESTERFORD**

The application was for approval of the reserved matter of 'access', following a  
grant of outline planning permission for a residential development of up to 14  
dwellings (UTT/14/0425/OP). The proposal included a new vehicular access at  
the end of Rookery Close, and a cycle link off Stanley Close to the north-east of  
the site.

RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the  
conditions in the report.

*Cllr J Redfern, V Choat, A Leclerq and P Katz spoke on this application.*

**PC30 UTT/17/1114/OP – LAND EAST OF GREEN HOLLOW, CLAPTON HALL  
LANE, DUNMOW**

Outline planning permission was sought for the demolition of all structures and buildings on the site and the construction of five residential dwelling houses with all matters reserved apart from access and layout.

RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the conditions in the report.

*Cllr T Moore spoke on this application.*

**PC31 UTT/17/1991/FUL - WEST WINDS, NORMANS WAY, STANSTED**

The application was for planning permission to demolish the existing dwelling and erect five detached houses. A shared driveway would use the existing access point off Normans Way.

RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the conditions in the report.

*R Woodcock and J Bishop spoke on this application.*

**PC32 UTT/17/1227/FUL - LAND EAST OF NEWTON VILLAS DUNMOW**

The proposal related to the demolition of the remaining garage and the erection of two one-bed flats and two two-bed houses. These would be two storey buildings constructed in red brickwork with weatherboarding and brown tiled roofs. Six car parking spaces would be provided to serve the properties.

The second part of the proposals were for the provision of additional parking for the residents of Newton Grove. It was proposed to replace the existing green to the front of the properties with a car park providing 16 car parking spaces serving 8 properties.

RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the conditions in the report.

*D Malins spoke on this application.*

**PC33 UTT/17/1011/FUL - JACOBS GREEN, PARK LANE SAFFRON WALDEN**

The application was for planning permission to erect a detached house and associated garage. An existing shared vehicular access would be used.

RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the conditions in the report.

**PC34 UTT/17/1124/FUL - HAYDENS END, GREEN STREET, GREAT CANFIELD**

Planning permission was granted under application UTT/14/0141/FUL that amongst other things allowed for two detached buildings. One was to be used as stables and the other for a machinery store with a wash down area and feed room.

During the construction of these buildings, the applicant unlawfully linked the two buildings together, effectively turning the two buildings into one large building, which was now subject to the retrospective proposal. Furthermore, the height of the buildings was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans. The height of the stable building to its ridge had been constructed 500mm lower than that approved whilst the storage building had been constructed on average 100mm higher. In addition, further window and door opening had been inserted and different external finishing materials were used.

Retrospective planning permission is thereby sought by the applicant to regularise the unlawful works as explained above.

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reason:

The proposed development constitutes non-exceptional development in the open countryside. The visual appearance of the building is considered to be domestic and the scale and height of the building has resulted in a building that is not subservient to the main dwelling which is considered harmful to the character and appearance of the site and would harm the setting of the adjoining listed building and therefore fails to accord with Policies S7, ENV2 and GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (adopted 2005).

*R Earthy spoke on this application.*

*The Head of Legal Services entered the meeting at this point.*

PC35

## **CHIEF OFFICER'S REPORT – PLANNING APPEALS**

The Development Manager said there was a need to document the guidelines that officers and members follow on the occasion that members reject recommendations of officers, and the case then goes to appeal. The draft protocol put that procedure into writing.

Councillor Freeman said the protocol was an officer-centric document, and was not as supportive of the views of members as it could be. Planning Committee members were elected to make decisions, but officers could ultimately choose not to support an appeal, despite the wishes of members. He was not being critical of officers about this, but there could be the possibility that officers from other authorities could be brought in to defend planning appeals instead.

The Chairman said the process worked well as it was. The last 4 appeals of decisions made against officer recommendation had been won by the Council.

Councillor Loughlin said members could make decisions democratically, but it was part of the process that appeals be successful if there was no good planning reason for refusal. Officers were always helpful when it came to working on appeals.

The Development Manager said if an individual officer had a difference of opinion with the case officer, then that person would conduct the appeal. However, if no officer in the department felt that they could defend the decision that was made, then a third party would be brought in to defend in consultation with members.

Councillor Lodge said officers were always helpful for appeals. However it would be good for members to get to choose who helped defend appeals, because they were the elected decision-makers.

The Development Manager said Councillor Lodge's suggestion would be difficult because the preparation time for appeals was limited.

Councillor Hicks said the system worked well as it was. Planning Committee members had to make the right decision for Uttlesford as a district.

Councillor Loughlin said taxpayers might not consider further spending to be a good use of public finances. Planning Committee members were well-trained, do a good job, and often successfully defend appeals.

RESOLVED that the Protocol for defending Planning Decisions Made Contrary to Officer Recommendation be adopted.

The meeting ended at 4pm.