

**PLANNING COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES,
LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on WEDNESDAY, 27
APRIL 2022 at 10.00 am**

Present: Councillor S Merifield (Chair)
Councillors J Emanuel, P Fairhurst, R Freeman, G LeCount,
M Lemon (Vice-Chair), J Loughlin, N Reeve and M Sutton

Officers in attendance: H Ashun (Principal Planning Officer), N Brown (Development
Manager), C Gibson (Democratic Services Officer), A Lindsell
(Democratic Services Officer), A Lockhart (Interim Legal
Services Manager), M Shoemith (Development Management
Team Leader) and E Smith (Solicitor)

Public Speakers: A Clark, Councillor P Lees and Councillor G Mott (Elsenham
PC).

PC131 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bagnall.

Councillor Reeve declared a non-pecuniary interest in Items 5 and 6 as Portfolio
Holder for the Economy, Investment and Corporate Strategy.

Councillor Sutton declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 4 as Ward Member
for Takeley.

PC132 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 April 2022 were approved.

**PC133 UTT/21/3269/DFO - LAND TO THE NORTHWEST OF HENHAM ROAD,
ELSENHAM**

The Principal Planning Officer presented an application for approval of reserved
matters relating to outline application UTT/17/3573/OP for the erection of 350
dwellings, internal roads, open space and sports pitch provision, other
associated infrastructure including that required to serve future primary school
and early years facility and siting of sports pavilion.

The application was recommended for approval with conditions.

*The meeting adjourned at 10.20 am to resolve some technology issues. It
reconvened at 10.30 am.*

The Principal Planning Officer responded to questions from members and confirmed:

- The 54 documents published 25 April 2022 were published for consistency in response to the receipt of final Highway comments on 21 April 2022. These comments detailed minor non-material amendments which did not require consultation. Material amendments would require a consultation period of fourteen to twenty one days.
- Despite the allegations made regarding insufficient parking, Essex Highways had confirmed that there was sufficient parking provision provided within the proposal.
- The Parking Strategy allocated parking spaces as follows:
 - 1 parking space for 1 bedroom units
 - 2 parking spaces for 2 and 3 bedroom units
 - 3 parking spaces for 4 and 5 bedroom units
 - Cycle park provision in the play area
 - 25 parking spaces for the sports pitch and pavilion
 - A pedestrian drop off area opposite the school
 - Additional visitor parking provided throughout the site.
- The majority of the garden areas were compliant with the Design Guidance Standards, which were a material consideration, but did not form part of the policy. 3% of the gardens fell short of the guidance, which overall was considered satisfactory.
- The Environmental Health Officer had reviewed the application and taken into consideration the conditions imposed on the outline application relating to noise mitigation measures, which he noted appeared satisfactory. He anticipated that the methodology would be included in an application to discharge the condition of the original consent.
- The affordable housing garden sizes had been addressed within the non-material amendments site layout changes, alongside the provision of a communal amenity space for the apartment blocks.
- The Thames Water proposed condition had been added to the late list and it advised that there was sufficient capacity for 190 dwellings and that upgrades to the network would be required to achieve capacity.

The Development Manager confirmed that the non-material amendments made related to very minor changes in response to Essex Highways comments. He said that although concerns were understandable that larger changes could also have been made and potentially missed by the volume of documentation, the case officer had checked and was happy for Members to determine the application.

Members discussed:

- The insufficient parking provision allegations.
- The consultation period for material amendments.
- The vehicular route into the site, for the early years and school access.
- The pedestrian routes for drop off and link to the station.
- That the garden sizes did not meet the Essex Garden Design Guide for the affordable housing and whether it was appropriate to lower standards for affordable housing but not market housing.
- The affordable housing units distribution throughout the development.

- The presence of low density lighting for pedestrians and the preferred associated operational timings as part of the conditions of the outline scheme.
- Whether and how Essex Highways would prevent detrimental impact by traffic on the surrounding road network, specifically through Thaxted and Stansted in relation to their new policy.
- The reduced scale of the three storey units to what was permitted within the outline application.
- The apparent mis-representation of the access from the development to Hales Wood. There was no footpath and the access could be stopped if the landowner wished, which would negatively impact pedestrians accessing the school.
- Whether the implementation of an additional condition relating to parking provision for the school would prevent residents establishing reliance on using what would eventually be the school parking area.
- The over reliance on triple tandem parking which encouraged on-street parking.
- Concerns over the lack of drop off zone at the school.
- Concerns over the lack of information on the Highway issues.
- The presence of the valid outline planning permission and the lack of evidence of the alleged highway issues raised.
- The inadequacy and unsuitability of the pavilion proposal for the current football team`s needs.

The Development Manager confirmed that the valid outline planning consent existed, as a result of which Members had found this Detailed Following Outline (DFO) application before them for consideration, irrespective of any changes in policy by Essex Highways. He advised Members that they should only be considering matters detailed within the DFO application.

Councillor Fairhurst proposed the deferral of the application, based on the detail of the documents submitted as late issues, the garden size of the affordable homes, the football pitch, outstanding questions from the Parish Council, parking in connection with the school and visitor parking and clarity of the pedestrian link footpath to Hales Wood.

Councillor LeCount seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED to defer the application.

Councillor P Lees spoke to request that the application be deferred to allow Essex Highways to explain their decisions relating to parking.

Councillor G Mott (on behalf of Elsenham PC) spoke to request that the application be deferred to enable proper consideration by the Parish Council of the significant additional documentation now received.

A Clark (Applicant) spoke in support of the application.

The meeting adjourned at 11.55 am and reconvened at 12.05 pm.

PC134 UTT/22/0152/DFO - LAND WEST OF PARSONAGE ROAD, TAKELEY

The Principal Planning Officer presented details following outline application UTT/19/0393/OP of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 110 dwellings with associated open space landscaping and other drainage and highway infrastructure.

The application was recommended for approval with conditions.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to questions from members and confirmed:

- The increased amenity space resulting from the reduction from 119 to 110 dwellings within the current proposal.
- Condition 20 of the outline consent stated that prior to the commencement of development the scheme protecting the proposed dwellings from noise arising from road and air traffic should be submitted to the local planning authority.
- The Environmental Health Officer had reviewed the information submitted with this DFO application and considered that the proposals met the relevant guidelines for internal living accommodation and mitigation such as ventilation and glazing was proposed. Nevertheless there was a condition on the outline consent that required discharge in relation to noise.
- The absence of conditions requiring provision of a community building, therefore the developer could choose whether to provide a community building or a residential building.

Members discussed:

- The location of the thirteen metre three storey apartment block on the site at the highest point of the development.
- The absence of objections from the local flood authority following the conditions imposed on the outline application.
- The absence of any current objection from Manchester Airports Group.
- The presence of 40% affordable housing distributed throughout the site.

Councillor Emanuel proposed that the application be approved, subject to conditions including materials, fly parking restrictions, provision of the resident travel information pack and instant impact tree replacement.

Councillor Freeman seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED to approve the application, subject to conditions as detailed.

PC135 UTT/21/3735/FUL - CAMBRIDGE EPIGENTERIX, CHESTERFORD PARK, LITTLE CHESTERFORD

The Development Management Team Leader presented an application that proposed reconfiguring of the building into additional laboratory space and office usage.

The application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Members discussed the recently approved solar scheme at the Park.

Councillor Reeve proposed that the application be approved, subject to conditions.

Councillor Lemon seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED to approve the application, with conditions.

PC136 **UTT/22/0326/FUL - EMMANUEL BUILDING, CHESTERFORD PARK, LITTLE CHESTERFORD**

The Development Management Team Leader presented an application for a proposed installation of FFN Generator and erection of louvered enclosures.

The application was recommended for approval, with conditions.

Members discussed the consideration of back up options for the generator.

Councillor Fairhurst proposed that the application be approved, subject to conditions.

Councillor Reeve seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED to approve the application, subject to conditions.

The meeting ended at 12:51.