

**PLANNING COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES,
LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on WEDNESDAY, 13
SEPTEMBER 2023 at 10.00 am**

Present: Councillor R Freeman (Chair)
Councillors N Church, J Emanuel, N Gregory, R Haynes,
M Lemon, J Loughlin and M Sutton

Officers in attendance: N Brown (Head of Development Management and Enforcement), C Edwards (Democratic Services Officer), C Gibson (Democratic Services Officer), J Lyall (Planning Lawyer), M Shoesmith (Development Management Team Leader), L Trevillian (Principal Planning Officer) and C Tyler (Senior Planning Officer).

PC61 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillors Bagnall and Pavitt. Councillor Gregory substituted for Councillor Pavitt and had sent apologies for lateness.

PC62 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Additional wording was agreed on item PC57 to Councillor Emanuel's proposal that it "include the size of properties and potential to be a signatory for the S106 to take ownership and management of the proposed village green area."

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 August 2023, as amended, were approved as an accurate record.

PC63 S62A/2023/0021. UTT/23/1848/PINS - MOORS FIELDS, STATION ROAD, LITTLE DUNMOW

The Principal Planning Officer presented an application for the approval of reserved matters for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 160 dwellings and a countryside park pursuant to conditions 1 and 2 of outline planning permission UTT/21/3596/OP. He said that comments had just been received from Essex CC Highways expressing concerns on many issues. The Conservation Officer had no objections and the Housing officer had stated that they would like to see the Internal National Space Standards met.

He invited Members to comment on the proposal as consultees and recommended that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to advise the Planning Inspectorate that UDC recommend planning permission be withheld until observations on Design, Parking Provision, Boundary Treatments, Pedestrian and Cycle Movement, Residential Amenity, Play Space and General Issues had been addressed.

In response to various questions from Members, officers:

- Said that no comments had been received from Place Services (Ecology).
- Said that a tree protection condition could be inserted.
- Said that the approved Design Code required an 8m buffer zone from Ainsworth Drive and was required to be fenced off.
- Said that Natural England had recognised the Woodland area as a priority habitat.
- Explained that a design code had been produced by a previous developer in consultation with the Design Officer.
- Said that the Parish Council were a small Council and would have first option on the S106 land and hub. They were likely to pick up the hub but if they did not want to take responsibility for the land then it would be taken on by a Management Company.

Members discussed:

- The application being very premature; no pre-app discussion had taken place.
- There being no buffer zone.
- The development being very linear; with a poor not appropriate layout.
- Significant highways issues.
- Parking concerns for visitors and triple tandem parking being unsatisfactory.
- Anglia Water concerns and the possibility of a Grampian condition being utilised at the reserved matters stage.
- Concerns that dustcart traffic tracking might involve mounting kerbs.
- The need to reinforce Internal National Space Standards.
- Possible overdevelopment of the North West block of dwellings; officers confirmed that the block was in line with the parameter plan.

Members welcomed the excellent report from the officer. All Members were content with the recommendations outlined on pages 16, 17 and 18 of the report, together with additional comments to be sent to PINS in respect of Highways concerns, wood priority habitat, lack of a buffer zone, dustcart tracking concerns, the generic design of the development together with there being no pre-app discussion. In addition reference be made to Anglian Water issues, with consideration to be given to a Grampian condition.

PC64

S62A/2023/0022. UTT/23/1970/PINS - PASSENGER TERMINAL, STANSTED AIRPORT, STANSTED

The Development Management Team Leader presented an application for partial demolition of the existing Track Transit System and full demolition of 2 skylink walkways and the bus-gate building. Construction of a 3-bay extension to the existing passenger building, baggage handling building, plant enclosure and 3 skylink walkways and associated hardstanding.

She recommended that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to advise the Planning Inspectorate that the Council recommend planning

permission be approved, subject to conditions as set out in Section 15 of the report.

Councillor Gregory joined the meeting at 10.42 am but took no part in the item.

No questions were raised by Members.

Members discussed:

- The application being an improvement on existing customer services facilities with a spectacular design by Norman Foster.
- Disappointment that no improvement to drop-off facilities had been proposed.
- Concerns at the lack of public transport access to the airport from various local villages.
- Difficulties faced previously by compensation claimants; the Planning Lawyer advised that resolution of previous claims could not be conditioned as part of this application but compensation arrangements could be publicised as part of the S106 Agreement. These failures to resolve compensation claims could be highlighted in the comments to be made to PINS.
- The Construction Environmental Plan as described in Condition 12.

Members were content with the recommendation that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to advise the Planning Inspectorate that the Council recommend planning permission be approved subject to the 24 conditions as set out in Section 15 of the report, together with additional comments to be sent to PINS in respect of the lack of public travel connections, no proposed improvements to drop-off facilities and the previous lack of resolution of some compensation claims.

There was a brief comfort break adjournment from 11.05 am to 11.15 am.

PC65 UTT/23/1045/DFO - LAND EAST OF LONDON ROAD, GREAT CHESTERFORD

The Senior Planning Officer presented an application following outline application UTT/20/2724/OP, reducing the scheme to 111 dwellings, including details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. The principle of the development, along with details of access of the development had already been approved.

He recommended that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to grant permission for the development subject to those items set out in section 17 of the report.

In response to questions from Members, officers:

- Showed on the map where the affordable housing was located.
- Confirmed that only two bungalows would have PV panels, with other properties having heat source pumps.

Members discussed:

- The diplomatic resolution of all play area issues. There was general discussion around ensuring that play areas were well located in future developments.
- Landscaping issues considered to be sparse; the need to plant thicker, stronger, reasonable aged plants to the side of the Eastern board. Officers said that the landscaping was in line with the parameter plan and that a landscaping condition could be drawn up to ensure that plants were of a reasonable standard form.
- The need to ensure that landscaping in the areas between houses and the play area was low level to ensure good visibility.
- The balance between only having two properties with PV panels and other properties utilising heat source pumps, with some Members preferring a greater number of solar panels. The Head of Development Management and Enforcement said that it was not for the Committee to re-design dwellings and the Planning Lawyer confirmed that the application was compliant with the Town and Country Planning Act 1973 S70.
- The orientation of the dwellings.
- The Construction Management Plan covering a wheel washing condition and contractor parking on site.

Councillor Church said that he was not satisfied with the proposed split between solar panels and heat source pumps and was looking for more energy security. He proposed deferral for further discussions to take place. The Planning Lawyer stated there would be a risk if the matter was deferred as all was policy compliant. Councillor Lemon seconded the proposal. This was lost.

Councillor Gregory thanked both the Senior Planning Officer and the Head of Development Management and Enforcement for their “diplomatic triumph” on this application and proposed approval of the application, with additional landscaping condition. This was seconded by Councillor Emanuel.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Director of Planning be authorised to grant permission for the development subject to those items set out in section 17 of the report, together with additional landscaping condition.

The meeting ended at 11.50 am.