

**PLANNING COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD
SAFFRON WALDEN at 2pm on 25 OCTOBER 2017**

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

Officers in attendance: N Brown (Development Manager), B Ferguson
(Democratic Services Officer), M Jones (Planning Officer), M
Shoemith (Development Management Team Leader), E Smith
(Legal Officer) and C Tyler (Planning Officer).

Also present: A Dern, Cllr P Lees, J Petchey, R Sach, S Weston, J Wigley.

PC49 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillors Freeman and Lemon.

Councillors Chambers and Ranger declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in application UTT-17-2167-FUL as the applicant was a fellow UDC Ward and Cabinet Member.

Councillor Fairhurst declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Member of Saffron Walden Town Council.

PC50 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2017 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

PC51 UTT-17-2241-FUL - HILL TOP YARD, MILL ROAD, HENHAM

The application site was a long narrow piece of land which was approximately 0.2 hectares in area and approximately 500 metres south of the settlement of Henham and 1 kilometre from Elsenham. The lawful use of the land was a haulage yard, with the stationing of two residential mobiles on the land. The proposal was for the retention of ten lamp posts at a height of 2 meters. It was noted that there were twenty unauthorised lamp posts existing on the site at a height of 5 meters. If approved, ten of the existing lamp posts would be reduced in height to 2 meters.

Councillor Davey said he would not be supporting the proposal as local residents were overwhelmingly against the application, as demonstrated by the number of representations outlined in the report. The Development Manager said the number of objectors to an application was a not valid planning reason to turn it down.

Councillor Wells asked why the recommendation permitted lighting between the hours of 07.00 – 22.00, when the majority of that time was during daylight hours. The Development Manager said this was to cover both the early morning and evening periods when lighting was required but this condition could be changed if members wished.

In response to questions from Councillor Loughlin, the Planning Officer said the site in question was not a conservation area; the commercial site next door was illuminated by flood lighting; and the permitted lamp posts would be fitted with hoods and reduced in height from 5 meters to 2 meters, which would be the same height as the perimeter fence.

Councillor Lodge said he was unsure if the plot was being used as a haulage site as the applicant had claimed and said he would not be supporting the application.

Councillor Ranger said he would support the application if condition two was amended, specifically if illumination was only permitted between the hours of 07.00 - 09.00 and 16.00 - 22.00, and also for a motion sensor to be fitted. Councillor Fairhurst agreed and said the application must be heard dispassionately as members could only consider what was in front of them, which in this case was an application for artificial lighting at a certified haulage yard. Councillor Loughlin added that the revised application had been changed significantly since it had last been submitted and would likely win on appeal if members rejected it against the officer's recommendation.

The Chairman asked for an amendment to condition 3, reducing the maximum illumination levels from 1000 lumens to 700.

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

Amended conditions

2. The lighting hereby permitted shall only be illuminated between the hours 07.00 and 9.00 and 16.00 and 22.00 hours. A restricted hours' time clock and a motion sensor shall be installed and permanently retained so that the lights are automatically turned off outside these times.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with ULP policies GEN4 and GEN5.

3. Each light hereby permitted shall be fitted with lights that result in maximum illumination levels of 700 lumens and that light shall be directed downwards and fitted with a hood.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with ULP policies GEN4 and GEN5.

Cllr P Lees and J Wigley spoke against this application.

PC52

UTT/17/2050/FUL– THE THATCH, ELSENHAM ROAD, STANSTED

The application was for the proposed erection of a single dwelling and garage. The dwelling would be within the existing curtilage of The Thatch, and sited within the rear garden area. The dwelling proposed would be two storeys with habitable accommodation within the roof space and basement. The dwelling would include external finishes of rendered and cladded walls under a plain clay tiled roof.

The Chairman said the reallocation of the driveway would save the trees that the Parish Council had been concerned about and had been the primary motivation for their objection. The Planning Officer added that he had spoken to the applicant who was willing to revise their plans if it resulted in a positive outcome.

Councillor Fairhurst proposed a deferment of the application to allow the applicant to amend the plans regarding the driveway, which would result in fewer trees having to be removed.

RESOLVED to defer the application in order for the applicant to amend the plans for the driveway.

PC53

UTT/17/2179/HHF– 3 WHITEGATES, HOLDERS GREEN ROAD, LINDSELL

Planning permission was sought for the construction of a single storey rear extension to the existing dwelling house. The extension would project 10.4 meters from the original rear façade and have a width of 7.3 meters. It would have an eaves height of 2.6 meters and consist of a dual pitch roof with a maximum height of 3.9 meters. External finishing materials were proposed to match those of the existing building. The extension would be constructed along the northern side boundary shared with number 4 Whitegates and 1.1 meters off the southern side boundary shared with number 2 Whitegates. The extension would provide additional living accommodation for 2 further bedrooms and a bathroom.

Councillor Hicks said this was a tragic case but he could not support the application as it was too unfair on the neighbours. Councillor Wells agreed and said she could not support it based on anything else other than sound planning reasons. Councillor Loughlin added that after visiting the site it was clear the proposed extension was too large and would have a huge impact on the neighbouring properties. She would not be supporting the application.

Councillor Davey referenced the Parish Council's comments in support of the application and said he would be voting in favour of the application.

Councillor Fairhurst said this was a difficult situation but there was a solution that could work fairly for all those involved. The Development Manager said if members rejected this application the applicant would have to go back to the drawing board and propose an entirely new scheme. The Chairman agreed and

said that whilst the general consensus from members was one of support for an extension, it would need to be compliant with planning regulations and considerate of the neighbour's needs.

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the reason stated in the report.

R Sach and S Weston spoke in support of the application. A Dern and J Petchey spoke against the application.

PC54

UTT/17/2167/FUL – THE DELLES, CARMENT STREET, GREAT CHESTERFORD

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 3.15pm. The meeting was reconvened at 3.30pm.

The application was for planning permission to erect a detached house and garage. The proposal represented an alternative design for Plot 1 of the two dwelling development approved by planning permission UTT/16/3394/FUL in February 2017. The main differences proposed were to the design of the garage, the fenestration of the house and an increase of its height by approximately 50 centimetres.

Councillor Lodge said he was wary of the new height of the garage as he felt it could be seen from Jackson's Lane. He said he would not be supporting the application.

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

The meeting ended at 3.45pm.