

**Late List –Planning Committee 05/04/23**

**Officers please note: Only** Late items from **STATUTORY CONSULTEES** are reproduced in full.  
**Others are summarised.**



**Statutory consultees are listed below:**

**Highway Authority**  
**The Health & Safety Exec**  
**Highways Agency**  
**Local Flood Authority**  
**Railway**  
**Environment Agency**  
**Historic England**  
**Garden History Society**  
**Natural England**  
**Sport England**

***Manchester Airport Group (MAG is the highway authority for the airport road network + the also section of Bury Lodge Lane running south from the northside entrance to the airport. On these roads, it therefore has the same status as Essex CC and National Highways do for the roads that they administer.)***

This document contains late items received up to and including the end of business on the Friday before Planning Committee. The late list is circulated and placed on the website by 5.00pm on the Monday prior to Planning Committee. This is a public document and it is published with the agenda papers on the UDC website.

Item Number	Application reference number	Comment
----------------	------------------------------------	---------

7	<p>UTT/22/2744/FUL</p> <p>L</p> <p>Land Known as 7 Acres, Parsonage Down</p> <p>TAKELEY</p>	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Hertfordshire and West Essex Integrated Care System</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Hertfordshire and West Essex Integrated Care Board</p> </div> </div> <p>Mr Laurence Ackrill Principal Planning Officer Uttlesford District Council Council Offices London Road Saffron Walden Essex CB11 4ER</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><a href="mailto:hweicbwe.planning@nhs.net">hweicbwe.planning@nhs.net</a> <a href="https://hertsandwestessex.icb.nhs.uk">https://hertsandwestessex.icb.nhs.uk</a></p> <p>Date: 20<sup>th</sup> March 2023</p> <p>Dear Mr Ackrill</p> <p><b>Medical Facility Opportunity: UTT/22/2744/FUL – Erection of 4 no. industrial/flexible employment (Use Class E) buildings with associated landscaping and parking   Land Known As 7 Acres Warish Hall Farm Parsonage Road Takeley</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting with us on the above. We have had time to review our position and hold discussions with the Uttlesford practices and GP Federation. The current primary care healthcare infrastructure in South Uttlesford is already under immense pressure and therefore having the use of a new Medical Facility in the Takeley area would be very welcome. This will provide a good opportunity to address the needs of Takeley residents as well as the large developments towards Dunmow.</p> <p>Subject to being able to agree commercial terms which the District Valuer would support, which we recognise sits outside planning, we are in principle, supportive of this development and understand that the developer has confirmed that we have 5 years to commit to the use of the building which we consider is adequate. New health facilities bring with them significant cost pressures for which we are not financially resourced. Confirmation of the value for this medical facility need to be collectively planned and agreed.</p> <p>We have various models for use of this building to be discussed and agreed with our practice partners, primary care network and the GP federation. All requiring business case approval by Hertfordshire and West Essex Integrated Care Board (HWE ICB).</p> <p>If further housing developments were to arise in Takeley we would request S106 contributions as the system cannot absorb future housing and population increase.</p> <p>The ICB is keen to continue to work with Uttlesford District Council as well as future developers to ensure that patients access to healthcare is not compromised by other proposals and developments.</p> <p>In terms of identifying a project in full at this stage the following points must be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All projects are subject to Full Business Case approval by the ICB, in some cases NHS England maybe required to give approval.</li> <li>▪ A commercial arrangement has to be agreed between the landowner, developer and end user based on a compliant design specification and demonstrate value for money.</li> <li>▪ A project identified and costed in response to the planning application may not meet the objectives of the current strategies or could have significantly increased in cost, especially if there has been any significant time lapse from the date of the response to the date of</li> </ul> <p>The following correspondence to be included:</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <p>Dr Jane Halpin, Chief Executive</p> <p>Rt. Hon. Paul Burstow, Chair</p> </div>
---	---	---

implementation of the planning consent. It is therefore imperative that S106 are regularly reviewed to ensure that demand is mitigated by the impact of additional housing.

Subject to assurance from Uttlesford District Council that the medical facility will be available to the NHS healthcare and demonstrates value for money, the ICB does not raise an objection to this planning application.

Yours faithfully,


**Sue Fogden**  
**Assistant Director – Premises**  
**NHS Hertfordshire and West Essex Integrated Care Board**

Dr Jane Halpin, Chief Executive

Rt. Hon. Paul Burstow, Chair



8	<p>UTT/21/0688/FU L</p> <p>Land at Cole End Lane</p> <p>WIMBISH</p>	<p>The following amendments are due the ongoing S106 negotiations following the publishing of the committee report.</p> <p><b>Paragraph 1.2 of the committee report states:</b> <i>'A S106 agreement has been completed and as per the requested this has been brought back to the Planning Committee to be ratified'</i></p> <p>It is confirmed the S106 agreement is still in draft form and therefore the details of Schedule 1 and 2 of the S106 as set out in the committee report are subject to amendments, however the principle of the decommissioning process are agreed. As requested this has been brought back to the Planning Committee to be ratified.</p> <p><b>Paragraph 14.1 of the committee report states:</b> <i>'Evidence of the Decommissioning Cost projections for the 5th, 10th, 15th, 20th, 25th, 30th and 35th anniversaries of the Date of Final Commissioning'</i></p> <p>This should be amended to: <i>'Evidence of the Decommissioning Cost projections for the 5th, 10th, 15th, 20th, 25th, 30th 35th and <b>40th</b> anniversaries'</i></p> <p><b>Paragraph 16.2 of the committee report states:</b> <i>'The decommissioning cost will be provided prior to the commencement of the development and then every 5 years, if the cost to decommissioning the development would result in net loss to the developer then a decommissioning bond or deposit would be secured'</i></p> <p>This should be amended to: <i>'The decommissioning plan will be provided prior to the commencement of the development. Evidence of the Decommissioning Cost projections for the 5th, 10th, 15th, 20th, 25th, 30th 35th and 40th anniversaries will be provided, if the cost to decommissioning the development would result in net loss then a decommissioning bond or deposit would be secured'</i></p>
9	<p>UTT/21/2461/DFO</p> <p>Land West of Isobel Drive</p>	None

	ELSENHAM	
10	UTT/22/1718/FUL  Land West of Colehills Lane  CLAVERING	 <p>The following additional conditions are suggested to be imposed on the decision if Members are mindful to approve the application in addition to those suggested in Section 17 of the Committee Report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, prior to any above ground works of the development hereby approved, details of the proposed solar panels including materials, texture and colour for each of the dwellings shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall thereafter be carried out and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.  Reason: In the interests of ensuring an appropriate design and the preservation of the character and historical setting of the abutting Conservation Area in accordance with Policies GEN2 and ENV1 of the Uttlesford District Local Plan as Adopted (2005) and the National Planning Policy Framework.</li> <li>2. The proposed works hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the 'Flood Action and Safe Access Route Plan' (March 2023) prepared by MTC Engineering unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  Reason: To ensure safe emergency access for occupants in the case of a large storm event in accordance with Policy GEN3 of the Uttlesford District Local Plan as Adopted (2005) and the National Planning Policy Framework.</li> </ol> <p>It is also suggested that the drawing reference of Condition 3 as highlighted in Section 17 of the updated committee report should be revised from Drawing No. 1169-04A to Drawing No. 1169-04B to take account of the revised materials pallet submitted by the applicant.</p> <p>PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS <b>Clavering Parish Council</b></p>

Chairman: Stephanie Gill  
The Bower House, High Street, Clavering CB11 4QR  
01799 550212  
Clerk to the Council: [clerk@claveringparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@claveringparishcouncil.gov.uk)

++ by email +

Lindsay Trevillian  
Case Officer  
Planning and Development  
Uttlesford District Council

31<sup>st</sup> March 2023

Dear Lindsay Trevillian,

**Refer: UTT/22/1718/FUL SECOND Re-consultation**  
**Full Planning Application for erection of 10no. dwellings with associated landscaping, access and parking.**  
**Land West of Coleshill Close Middle Street**  
**LATEST RESPONSE DATE FOR CONSULTEES: 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2023**

Further to the letter of today's date on the above and referred to in the same letter, please find below photographs of the proposed flood evacuation route onto Coleshill Lane byway.

As an informative and further to the questions raised by the Planning Committee at their meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> February to Planning Officers, the flood evacuation route of the three properties Oaklands, Mulberry House and Beech House, sited opposite the application site and on the lane adjoining the application site:

Documents submitted under UTT/13/0956/FUL when the application went to Appeal with the Inspectorate , clearly states in its revised Flood Risk Assessment dated May 2013,

		<p><i>4.5 Should the vehicular access become temporarily unuseable during flood event on Mill Hill, this would be a short duration event and the site would provide a safe haven for residents. In the event that an emergency pedestrian access was required it would be possible to access Middle Street via The Wheelhouse if it were unsafe to use the existing access and Mill Hill due to flooding.</i></p> <p>This evacuation route allowed safe, unfettered access onto Middle Street, on an elevation higher than the road alongside the Stort, and thence to the Pelham Rd and Stortford Rd, on which is an Emergency Refuge Centre for Clavering (Christian Centre); once past the curtilage of The Wheelhouse, the evacuation route is on tarmacked paths and roads.</p>
--	--	--





		<p>Coleshill Lane Byway – taken from opposite side of byway to where emergency evacuation route would enter the byway and looking towards road next to River Stort. 21<sup>st</sup> March 2023 Reproduced by kind permission Family Gill</p>
--	--	--



		<p>Coleshill Lane Byway – taken from opposite side of byway to where emergency evacuation route would enter the byway and looking north, ie away from road next to River Stort. 21<sup>st</sup> March 2023 Reproduced by kind permission Family Gill</p>
--	--	--



		<p>Colehills Byway - Hazards on proposed evacuation route to immediate north of proposed entrance onto byway. Note also that water enters Byway from drainage ditch just to north of this utility cable.</p> <p>21<sup>st</sup> March 2023 Reproduced by kind permission Family Gill</p>
--	--	--



		<p>– Continuation north of the evacuation route taken from previous photograph and looking towards road next to River Stort. Note surface water runs along centre of byway here 21<sup>st</sup> March 2023 Reproduced by kind permission Family Gill</p>
--	--	--





		Coleshill Lane Byway – Continuation north of the evacuation route taken from previous photo and looking towards road next to River Stort. Note deep gulleys cut by water here 21 <sup>st</sup> March 2023 Reproduced by kind permission Family Gill
--	--	--



		<p>Coleshill Lane Byway – Continuation north of the evacuation route to be taken from previous photo and looking towards road next to River Stort, which is obviously on lower contours. Note deep gulleys cut by water here. Also ground still muddy and uneven, despite being near apex of route.</p> <p>21<sup>st</sup> March 2023 Reproduced by kind permission Family Gill</p>
--	--	---



		<p>– Further continuation north of the evacuation route to be taken from previous photo and looking away from road next to River Stort, which is obviously on lower contours. Note deep gulleys cut by water here. Also ground continues as muddied and uneven.</p> <p>21<sup>st</sup> March 2023 Reproduced by kind permission Family Gill</p>
--	--	---





Entrance to Coleshill Byway still under water after adjoining road flooded and was impassable December 2020.  
14<sup>th</sup> December 2022 Reproduced by kind permission Family Gill

## Clavering Parish Council

Chairman: Stephanie Gill

The Bower House, High Street, Clavering CB11 4QR

01799 550212

Clerk to the Council: [clerk@claveringparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@claveringparishcouncil.gov.uk)

[++ by email +](#)

Lindsay Trevillian

Case Officer

Planning and Development

Uttlesford District Council

31<sup>st</sup> March 2023

Dear Lindsay Trevillian,

**Refer: UTT/22/1718/FUL SECOND Re-consultation**

**Full Planning Application for erection of 10no. dwellings with associated landscaping, access and parking.**

**Land West of Coleshill Close Middle Street**

**LATEST RESPONSE DATE FOR CONSULTEES: 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2023**

Further to the letter of today's date on the above and referred to in the same letter, please find the link to the UDC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment update in the Public Domain, as delivered to the UDC Local Plan



Leadership Group on Monday 29<sup>th</sup> November 2021 authored by UDC Luke Mills, New Communities Senior Planning Officer.

<https://uttlesford.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s25826/Strategic%20Flood%20Risk%20Assessment%20update.pdf>

Clavering Parish Council determined in its consideration of the Re-consultation of this application and given the questions raised by the Planning Committee at their meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> February to Planning Officers that the following informative statement concerning the nature of the road adjoining the application site be made: With reference to the published document, which also appears on the UDC website as being for consideration under planning matter, Uttlesford Protected Lane Assessment. (Published March 2012 by Essex County Council.), Clavering Parish Council has always understood this lane to be a Protected Lane.

See <https://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/article/4940/Historic-environment>

The map on page 8 of the document clearly shows the extent of the protected lane as extending past the byway and onto the junction of the B1038.

It is noted that the Protected Lane is called 'Cock Lane' in this document.

As UDC is aware, the extended section of Cock Lane between the road bearing away to lead to Langley and the B1038 keeps being given various names. The UDC Planning Department has referred to it in various applications as Mill Hill, Mill Lane, Plantation Hill, and Middle Street. The UDC Electoral Roll shows it as Middle Street. Locally the name for this is Lower Way; it is observed that it is the Lower Way exit of Cock Lane onto the main road through Clavering (the B1038) to the Pelhams. Cock Lane also exits onto the main road at Starlings Green, an area at the parish boundary on a higher elevation to its exit next to the River Stort in the valley.

Yours sincerely,

Cllr Stephanie M. Gill  
Chairman

In absence of an appointed Clerk to Clavering Parish Council



## Clavering Parish Council

Chairman: Stephanie Gill

The Bower House, High Street, Clavering CB11 4QR

01799 550212

Clerk to the Council: [clerk@claveringparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@claveringparishcouncil.gov.uk)

[++ by email +](#)

Lindsay Trevillian

Case Officer

Planning and Development

Uttlesford District Council

31<sup>st</sup> March 2023

Dear Lindsay Trevillian,

**Refer: UTT/22/1718/FUL SECOND Re-consultation**

**Full Planning Application for erection of 10no. dwellings with associated landscaping, access and parking.**

**Land West of Coleshill Close Middle Street**

**LATEST RESPONSE DATE FOR CONSULTEES: 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2023**

Mr Nigel Brown advised that the Parish Council's formal objection letter was to be received by 17.00hrs on 31<sup>st</sup> March to be passed to the Planning Committee as a 'late item'

Accordingly, photos and any documents mentioned as attached will follow under separate cover.

	<p>Thank you for the invitation to the Clavering Parish Council as statutory consultees, to comment on the submission of documents on 13<sup>th</sup> March, some 19 days after the Planning Committee deferred determination of this application, of a revised Flood Action and Safe Route Access Plan plus a Summary of Flood Risk at the Site and Development Measures/Impact on Flood Risk.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council called and Extraordinary Meeting on 27th March – the earliest I could do to deliver a valid summons and be quorate, in order to determine its response.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council considers that the new documentation submitted does not overcome the objections raised previously.</p> <p>Please refer to the letters of objection sent by Clavering Parish Council on 18<sup>th</sup> July 2022 and 24<sup>th</sup> November 2022.</p> <p>The documentation submitted shows an evacuation route via Coleshill Lane – a byway. This must be accessed from the planned development via steps down as the byway is at a lower level than the site.</p> <p>The byway is extremely uneven and muddy, even when there is no flooding taking place on the road adjoining the River Stort, and carries surface water from the fields along the byway – sited to the north of the development site.</p> <p>The attached photos were taken recently, at least three days after the last rains in Clavering and when there had been no recent flooding situation on the road adjoining the River Stort.</p> <p>Also attached is a photo of the area post flooding where the byway meets the road adjoining the River Stort. Note the byway at this point is below the road and remains flooded when the river is high as the drain cannot function due to the non- return valves at the river’s edge.</p> <p>Further, the Council remind UDC Planning Officers that at a <b>refused</b> appeal, UTT/19/1275/FUL, and Inspector determined that this byway, when it was mooted for pedestrian use for a proposed new property in Stickling Green.</p> <p><i>14. It is not lit, nor formed of a robust hard surface. Indeed a wet, muddied and uneven surface was in evidence during Inspection.</i></p>
--	--

		<p>The photos provided show that there are deep gulleys in this byway cut by water flow. The claim in the documents submitted that there will be a dry evacuation is clearly not evidenced by these photographs or by anyone visiting the site.</p> <p>The Parish Council also queries the reliance in the newly submitted document that the flood risk to the development site is 1 in 1000yrs occurrence. This is not borne out by recent experiences in the past 10 years alone.</p> <p>Then Parish Council considers the evacuation route shown to be extremely dangerous to anyone using it, let alone those who may have any form of restrictive movements/known disabilities. It is unconscionable that a district council should permit such an evacuation route in an area of known, recent recorded flooding</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council was not able to trace any sequential flood risk assessment for this site when it considered this application on 27<sup>th</sup> March.</p> <p>It has traced Uttlesford's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment pub May 2016 which states: <i>4.3.2.1 Sequential Approach must be followed for all types of development</i> <i>4.3.2.2(there) must be wider sustainability benefits to the Community that outweigh the flood risk</i></p> <p>Also traced was a Strategic UDC Report dd 29<sup>th</sup> Nov 2021 – as attached which stated <i>The district is relatively unconstrained in terms of flood risk, such that it should be possible to allocate sites outside such areas</i></p> <p>Clavering Parish Council repeats its previous objections in brief for good order.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>It further considers that the relocating of dwellings onto marginally higher ground on the site does not reduce the risk of flooding, but actually causes greater harm to the countryside by increased visibility from the neighbouring public rights of way, and is to the detriment of the adjoining conservation area.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council still considers that it is unconscionable for a developer to promote a scheme to build housing on an area known to flood and where all access routes promoted on and from the development are in known flood risks zones and there are recent recordings of flood occurring in this area. Flooding has occurred on Lower Way, cutting off this site in 2012, twice in 2014, and at least seven times 2020-2021. Historic flooding has also taken place at the site and is recorded. Colehills Lane byway is always under water at time of heavy rains and is cut off at times of flood, yet this continues to be promoted in the application as a safe access from the site.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council is aware that it is the responsibility of Uttlesford District Council to manage the flood risk for this development, which includes determining the safety and acceptability of the proposal and reminds UDC of this.</p> <p>As the Clavering Parish Council understands matters, it is the responsibility of UDC to have their own valid, independent information on the following to enable UDC to determine if permissions should be granted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sequential test in relation to fluvial flood risk</li> <li>• Safety of people</li> <li>• Safety of the buildings</li> <li>• Flood recovery measures</li> <li>• Sustainability of the development</li> </ul> <p>A proposed 'safe refuge' for the housing must illustrate how, at flood times, the dwellings may be accessed by emergency services/evacuated.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council <b>OBJECTS</b> to the above planning application as it <b>FAILS the Uttlesford District Council (UDC) Local Plan (2005) policies S7 Protection of Countryside</b></p>
--	---

		<p>ENV1 Conservation Area  ENV2 Design  ENV7 Protected Lanes  GEN1 Access  GEN2 Design  GEN 7 Nature</p> <p>At today's date, it is known that UDC has only a 4.85 years housing land supply and therefore the 2005 Local Plan is not saved, Clavering Parish Council <b>OBJECTS</b> to the planning application as it is <b>CONTRARY to the National Planning Policy Framework</b>  It <b>FAILS</b> all three tests of sustainability – economic, environmental and social.  Is contrary to:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Para. 8 c</td> <td>Natural Environment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Para 85</td> <td>Impact on local roads</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Para 104 and 111</td> <td>Highway Safety</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Para 126</td> <td>Effective Community Engagement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Para 130 a</td> <td>Adding to the quality of the area</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Para 130 c</td> <td>Local character ...and landscape setting</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Para 174 b</td> <td>Countryside</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Para 202</td> <td>Local character and distinctiveness</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Para 185 c</td> <td>Artificial light</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Para 163 &amp; 170</td> <td>Ensuring development does not increase flood risk elsewhere</td> </tr> </table> <p>There has been no effective community engagement.</p> <p>This site is recognised as sitting in the Langley Chalk Uplands Landscape Character Assessment, this is acknowledged to have a high sensitivity to change.</p> <p>There are plans to widen Lower Way, which is the correct name of the road that the development is to sit on. This would damage the Protected Lane that this road is and also would remove old hedgerow. UDC's attention</p>	Para. 8 c	Natural Environment	Para 85	Impact on local roads	Para 104 and 111	Highway Safety	Para 126	Effective Community Engagement	Para 130 a	Adding to the quality of the area	Para 130 c	Local character ...and landscape setting	Para 174 b	Countryside	Para 202	Local character and distinctiveness	Para 185 c	Artificial light	Para 163 & 170	Ensuring development does not increase flood risk elsewhere
Para. 8 c	Natural Environment																					
Para 85	Impact on local roads																					
Para 104 and 111	Highway Safety																					
Para 126	Effective Community Engagement																					
Para 130 a	Adding to the quality of the area																					
Para 130 c	Local character ...and landscape setting																					
Para 174 b	Countryside																					
Para 202	Local character and distinctiveness																					
Para 185 c	Artificial light																					
Para 163 & 170	Ensuring development does not increase flood risk elsewhere																					

	<p>is drawn to the Planning Appeal in Clavering which contain the Inspector’s comments that there is a need to preserve Protected Lanes.</p> <p>No swept path analyses have been shown in this application. As UDC has larger than the usual refuse collection trucks, this must be demonstrated for an all matters except access application.</p> <p>There is NO connectivity with the rail station at Newport or Audley End, as there is no daily public transport. (The school buses do not connect with the rail stations either)  It may be possible to cycle to the rail stations but there are no safe cycle paths to either station  There is no connecting safe pedestrian link from the proposed site to the village amenities of the shop, school, village hall &amp; etc. Residents have questioned ownership of land proposed by the developer for a new pavement.</p> <p>Regarding the three strains of Sustainability, this application fails as follows:</p> <p><b>Economic Role</b>  There is no long term contribution to the economy of Clavering as the application does not provide places of employment. Though it may be that the site could be developed by local contractors there is no guarantee of this.</p> <p><b>Environmental Role</b>  The proposed development has a significant impact on the countryside as detailed above and also does not introduce positive biodiversity as it brings about a loss of habitat on a gravel site/flood plain.  The proposed development shows housing details which are contrary to the existing in this conservation area of Clavering  There is a potential of increased flood risks to other local areas, despite a ‘flood water holding tank’ proposal.</p> <p><b>Social Role</b>  Clavering was the RCCE Essex Village of the Year in 2014 and its vibrancy was cited.  Throughout the Covid-19 pandemic the community worked together in many ways supporting other community members; its Platinum Jubilee Celebrations were coordinated by parishioners – not with just the Parish Council at the helm. There are thriving groups from Beavers and Cubs through Cricket and Bowls teams to a History</p>
--	---

		<p>Group which carried out an archaeological dig in 2021 – there is no need to introduce housing to revitalise the village. There is a lack of safe transport links and connectivity other than by car.</p> <p>As this application must be considered under the NPPF, given the lack of housing land supply for 5 years in UDC, the tilt of the balance of harm will be employed.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council believes that this application does NOT address the reasons for the refusal for the previous application (UTT/21/0977/OP) for the same number of dwellings at this site and which was considered under the NPPF.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council (CPC) believes that the provision of housing generated by this application in providing 10 houses to a 0.15 year deficit in the housing supply is not outweighed by the damage caused to the countryside, in its wider agrarian setting, and a historic rural settlement. CPC pays heed to the opinion of the Inspector at the last appeal in Clavering that ‘Clavering is sustainable for certain locations’ and this site is not at a location he identified.</p> <p>Accordingly this application should be <b>REFUSED</b></p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Cllr Stephanie M. Gill Chairman In absence of an appointed Clerk to Clavering Parish Council</p>
11	UTT/22/3013/OP	none



	Highwood Farm, Stortford Road  GREAT DUNMOW	
12	UTT/22/3298/OP  Lane South of Cannons Lane  HATFIELD BROAD OAK	TBC – awaiting conditions from Highways.  The following condition to be added:  Prior to the first occupation of the development, details of all enclosures around the site boundary (fencing, walling, openings etc) at a scale of 1:20, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include the proposed design, height and materials. The approved works shall be completed prior to occupation of the development and shall be permanently retained thereafter.  Reason: In the interest of public safety and security and to protect the visual amenity of the locality consistent with Policy GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005.
13	UTT/22/1014/OP  Land North of Hammond Road  HATFIELD BROAD OAK	The Heads of Terms for the s106 agreement in paragraph 17.1 of the committee report should be amended as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The phrase “a minimum of” should be amended from the provision of 40% of affordable housing. Policy H9 requires 40% affordable housing on developments, not a minimum of 40%. This change was requested by the applicant.</li> <li>• The Employment and Skills Plans should be omitted from the s106 agreement. Notwithstanding its recommendation by the Essex County Council (ECC) Infrastructure (Education), Table 2 in page 24 of ECC’s Developers’ Guide to Infrastructure Contributions (Rev 2020) sets a trigger of 50 no. units for such a contribution.</li> </ul> Condition 17 in section 17 of the committee report shall be amended to include the phrase “shall be implemented” as follows: Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, a package of pedestrian improvements between Barnfield and Broad Street Broad Street Green shall be implemented as identified in principle within the Pedestrian User Unit contained in the EAS Transport Statement, insofar as they are deliverable within highway and/or land in the control of the applicant, and shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footway widening/siding out/resurfacing.</li> </ul>

- Pedestrian warning signs.
- Improvements to/provision of dropped kerb crossings.
- Extension of footway/provision of dropped kerb crossing/vehicle crossover(s) at junction of Broad Green with Broad Street Green.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety and accessibility, in accordance with Policies GEN1, GEN8 of the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan (2005), the adopted Uttlesford Local Residential Parking Standards (2013), the adopted Essex County Council Parking Standards: Design and Good Practice (2009), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

The above follows a clarification from Essex County Council Highways:


Matthew Bradley - Strategic Development Manager (North) <[redacted]>  
 To:  Avgerinos Vlachos


Reply Reply All Forward

 You replied to this message on 24/03/2023 17:43.



On another note I have realised that my recommended condition 3 does not actually indicated that the works should be implemented, you may have picked up on that, if not are we able to make that clear on the update sheet issued before Committee?

3. *Prior to first occupation of the development a package of pedestrian improvements between Barnfield and Broad Street Broad Street Green as identified in principle within the Pedestrian User Unit contained in the EAS Transport Statement, insofar as they are deliverable within highway and/or land in the control of the applicant to include:*

- *Footway widening/siding out/resurfacing.*
- *Pedestrian warning signs.*
- *Improvements to/provision of dropped kerb crossings.*
- *Extension of footway/provision of dropped kerb crossing/vehicle crossover(s) at junction of Broad Green with Broad Street Green.*

Have a good weekend.

**Matthew Bradley | Strategic Development Manager (North)**

**Strategic Development**



The phrase “in situ” is omitted from the reasons for conditions 4 and 5 in section 17 of the committee report, as per the applicant’s request. The same phrase shall be omitted from condition 12 in the same section. As currently worded, the reasons are not clear as they seemingly require the preservation of any potential

		<p>archaeological remains in situ regardless of their significance, which would be unreasonable. These changes do not affect the purpose of the conditions and make them compliant with paragraph 56 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Parish Council provided further comments on 31 March 2023; a summary of the key points that have not been covered in paragraph 9.1 of the committee report is presented below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visibility splays should comply with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.</li> <li>• Deliverability issue of proposed footway due to ownership.</li> <li>• Highway issues should be addressed prior to the grant of planning permission.</li> </ul> <p>A summary of the additional representations received for the application that have not been covered in paragraph 11.3.1 of the committee report is presented below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visibility splays not as shown by the developer.</li> <li>• Flood risk concerns.</li> <li>• Cumulative impacts to already compromised drainage systems.</li> <li>• Visual harm to the entrance of the village.</li> <li>• Overbearing impacts.</li> <li>• Devaluation of the road.</li> </ul>
14	<p>UTT/22/2977/DFO</p> <p>Land East of Shire Hill</p> <p>SAFFRON WALDEN</p>	none
15	<p>UTT/22/1452/FUL</p> <p>Bluegates Farm, Stortford Road</p> <p>LITTLE CANFIELD</p>	The Planning Service has received the following comments on 28.03.2023: The Highway Authority are satisfied that the largest of vehicles proposed to enter the site can enter and leave the highway in a forward gear, and have the ability to manoeuvre within the application site.
16	<p>UTT/21/3563/FUL</p> <p>Land East of St Edmunds Lane</p>	None

	GREAT DUNMOW	
17	<p>UTT/22/3321/OP</p> <p>Land R/o Woodene</p> <p>LITTLE CHESTERFORD</p>	<p>Paragraph 14.3.16 of the committee report is a comparison between a previous appeal scheme on the same site and the current application. The images shown at the end of this paragraph are screenshots of the (dismissed) appeal drawings. Members can compare those refused drawings with the ones included in the file of the current application. It is standard practice not to reproduce the drawings of an application within the officer's report to avoid lengthy reports.</p> <p>The last phrase in paragraph 14.4.4 of the committee report should not be interpreted as if the Conservation Officer assessed the principle of the development as acceptable because of the revised indicative elevations or any other drawings. The response from Conservation dated 20 February 2023 contains a preliminary assessment of the revised indicative details submitted that should be considered by the applicant at the next stage. These indicative details shall be scrutinised again and finalised at the reserved matters application (if outline permission is granted). The indicative drawings were not the reason why Conservation raised no objections to the principle of the development. The principle of the erection of a detached dwelling on this location was the sole consideration in Conservation's position.</p> <p>The Parish Council provided further comments on 10 March 2023; a summary of the key points that have not been covered in paragraph 9.1 of the committee report is presented below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous objection still stands.</li> <li>• Any scheme on the plot unacceptable.</li> <li>• Site too small for a single storey dwelling.</li> <li>• Countryside location / confirmed by the Examiner of the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>• Responses from Conservation and Landscape support the objections.</li> <li>• Construction Management Plan not enough for extended periods of excavations.</li> <li>• Awkward parking layout.</li> <li>• Revised drawings – more traditional appearance.</li> <li>• Conditions in case of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Limited height to one storey.</li> <li>o Limited loss of the historic bank.</li> <li>o Minimisation of overlooking.</li> <li>o Replacement hedgerow.</li> <li>o Biodiversity enhancement measures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<p>o Construction Management Plan.</p> <p>A summary of the additional representations received for the application that have not been covered in paragraph 11.3.1 of the committee report is presented below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous comments are still relevant.</li> <li>• Pre-app expressed concern.</li> <li>• Previous decisions are material considerations.</li> <li>• Consistency in decision-making necessary.</li> <li>• Harm to the effectiveness of the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>• Ecological and biodiversity concerns.</li> <li>• 1 no. dwelling is a minimal benefit.</li> <li>• Tandem garage under the house / on-street parking concerns.</li> <li>• Heritage Statement not balanced.</li> <li>• Land ownership issues.</li> <li>• Construction Management Plan not enough.</li> <li>• Visibility from streetscene and footpath.</li> <li>• Responses from Conservation and Landscape support the objections.</li> <li>• Unacceptable living conditions for the occupants of the proposed dwelling.</li> </ul>
18	UTT/23/0308/HHF  54 Ross Close  SAFFRON WALDEN	none
19	UTT/22/3020/FUL  Newport Road  SAFFRON WALDEN	none

Note – The purpose of this list is to draw Members attention to any late changes to the officer report or late letters/comments/representations. Representations are not reproduced in full they are summarized

Late items from **STATUTORY CONSULTEES** are reproduced in full.