

Late List –Planning Committee 13.12.23

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
6	UTT/23/2616/PINS Land To The North Of Eldridge Close Clavering	<p>Clavering Parish Council OBJECTS to the above planning application as it</p> <p>FAILS the Uttlesford District Council (UDC) Local Plan (2005) policies S7 Protection of Countryside ENV5 Protection of Agricultural Land GEN1 Access GEN2 Design GEN 7 Nature</p> <p>UDC's Local Plan (2005) is saved as currently the district has a 5.14 Year Housing Land Supply (YHLS). UDC is at Regulation 18 stage of its new Draft Local Plan being written to 2041. It is acknowledge that the current saved plan may not entirely reflect the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council OBJECTS to the planning application as it is CONTRARY to the National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>It FAILS all three tests of sustainability – economic, environmental and social. Is contrary to: 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 185 c Artificial light</p> <p>It must be remembered at all times that the existing development Eldridge Close, over which this development gains access and to which the proposed application repeatedly refers, was a brownfield site having been small light industrial/agricultural units.</p>

		<p>This planning application is for a site which is open countryside and Grade 2 Agricultural land, ie excellent quality with high yields.</p> <p>Further this site is NOT infilling, it is backland development as the site plans themselves clearly indicate. Clavering Parish Council now demonstrates the reasons for the application failing and being contrary.</p> <p>There has been no Public Consultation with the Village of Clavering for this proposal comprising up to 28 dwellings, either by survey, public exhibition, or leaflet drop.</p> <p>The applicant has not written to the Parish Council to ask to attend the public participation section of its monthly meetings to inform parishioners of the proposal.</p> <p>There was a previous proposal that was consulted on and which was later turned down at Appeal. There was a later proposal for 32 houses which was refused by UDC and which was lodged 17th October 2023 with the Inspectorate for appeal (APP/C1570/W/23/3331461, UTT/22/1578/OP) Though there was a pandemic, the village has seen Public Consultations take place in its Village Hall since March 2020, and developers be invited to the Council meetings.</p> <p>The Council consider that this is a great failure, of what is required of them, by the applicant.</p> <p>This site is recognised as sitting in the Langley Chalk Uplands Landscape Character Assessment and which is acknowledged to have a high sensitivity to change. 28 dwellings placed at this site will detract from the nature and existing character of the countryside for the Village of Clavering and will not recognise its intrinsic beauty and character. The proposed screening would be considered inadequate; it would also mean that the development will be highly visible in the countryside when viewed from footpaths and especially when trees are not in leaf. This proposed development remains a significant impact on the countryside. As the field is currently under plough, the suggestion for wildflower areas to give a biodiversity positivity would not be viable as the land is fertile land (not a requirement for wildflowers).</p> <p>There is a proposed water garden and village pond and though this is not spring-fed as are all other known village ponds which are natural, nor does it appear to connect to the village's water courses.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>In the previously dismissed appeal for 9 houses at the proposed site (APP/C1570/W/21/3267624) the Inspector clearly stated, referencing paragraph 174(b) of the NPPF: 'This proposal would detract from the setting of this settlement and the character of the countryside. This would be the case for any scheme which extended across the full extent of this field.'</p> <p>The access to the site is via an un-adopted road and there is a plan to have a 'pinchpoint,' which indicates traffic build up for the vehicles on the proposed site. It is also unclear from the submissions as to whether some cars will cross the pavements in order to reach the inner access road of the proposed site from their dwellings.</p> <p>Concern is raised as 28 more dwellings will be accessing Eldridge Close which is currently built to the standard to take vehicles from 24 dwellings only.</p> <p>It is also known that 28 new dwellings in a rural area are recognised to generate at least 112 vehicle crossings per day at the access point to the main highway system.</p> <p>There is an existing inadequacy of provision for pedestrian footpaths on Eldridge Close, which are narrow, yet per this application the pavements are expected to take pedestrians from a total of 56 dwellings.</p> <p>The planned access creates issues for pedestrian safety both on the proposed development and Eldridge Close.</p> <p>It has been stated that there will be street lighting on the site to improve pedestrian safety. Clavering has only one area (ex Council housing with bungalows for the elderly) where there is some form of street lighting, though this is not all through the night; there is no other street lighting in the village as this would obviously have a negative impact on the wildlife of Clavering – which is obviously in a very rural setting.</p> <p>It is noted that 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 are many infrastructure requirements which are not met in this application.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>The chalk streams in this area are already drying up and nearby Newport is already taking water allocated to nearby Wicken.</p> <p>There is inadequate explanation of how sewerage will reach the pipes to be processed by Thames Water as currently the pipework used at Eldridge Close necessitates a pump which is maintained by the resident's management group of Eldridge Close.</p> <p>Contrary to the statements made in the application's Transport Statement, there are no bus services in Clavering, other than the two school bus services in term-time only which run one return journey to Saffron Walden and Bishops Stortford – outward in the morning and inward in the afternoon. There is NO connectivity for these school services with the rail station at Newport nor Audley End. Further, these buses are for school children use only.</p> <p>Though Essex County Council designates the position of safe bus-stops on the highway, a desk-top exercise shows that in Clavering there is no regular bus service. The inaccurate use of a desk-top survey, rather than site and village visits, shows an inadequacy in the Transport Statement. Whilst it may be possible to cycle to the rail stations, there are no safe cycle paths to either station and narrow winding lanes must be used. One route (via Hobbs Aerie (Arkesden) to Audley End) has already seen a cyclist killed in October 2020, with no fault apportioned to the car-driver nor cyclist.</p> <p>Regarding the three strains of Sustainability, this application fails as follows:</p> <p>Economic Role 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>The applicant makes a statement that the development would support the viability of public transport in Clavering – but if none exists, how would it do that? It should be noted that a recent Essex Passenger Transport Review for Uttlesford does not introduce any service to Clavering.</p> <p>Environmental Role The proposed development has a significant impact on the countryside as detailed above and also does not introduce true, positive biodiversity.</p>
--	--

		<p>The application documents show urban street scenes of housing which are contrary to the existing street scenes of rural Clavering.</p> <p>See also comment below regarding car use.</p> <p>Social Role 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.</p> <p>There are thriving groups from Beavers and Cubs through Cricket and Bowls teams to a Drama Group, which has received awards from the National Operatic & Dramatic Association and whose village Christmas panto this year has some 50 participants, and a History Group, which carried out its own local archaeological dig in 2021 with one potentially to take place in 2025. This is clear evidence that there is no need to introduce housing to revitalise the village – which the Localism Act 2011 wished to do.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the centres of social activity, including the school, village shop and church are at greater distances from the proposed development than the 800m considered acceptable.</p> <p>The pedestrian route to these has already been deemed unsafe by a previous Planning Inspector when considering a site for development near this current application. See APP/C1570/A/12/2184181 Paragraph 16. UTT/0507/12/OP (UDC then had a 4.1 YHLS) ‘Most of the facilities are at the other, southern end of the village.</p> <p>At a fairly brisk walking pace, it takes about 20 minutes to reach the Primary School and probably another couple of minutes to enter the building. It takes about 24 minutes to walk to the supermarket/postoffice, and no doubt longer if accompanied by a child, buggy and a bag full of shopping on the way back. (...)</p> <p>The footpath is, however, narrow in places, and (...) (the) comment that you never see parents walking through this section through the middle of the village is unsurprising. Thus the appeal site is not well located with regard to convenient access to the limited range and distribution of facilities towards the</p>
--	--	--

		<p>far end of the village. These circumstances would inevitably result in a greater use of private transport and a significant increase in traffic along village roads, ill-suited to accommodate it in terms of physical and environmental capacity.'</p> <p>It should be noted that children from the Eldridge Close development (the brownfield development) must be bussed by ECC to Clavering Primary School due to the unsafe pavement route. There have been no alterations to the road nor pavement since that finding so from a social, as well as environmental, thread this is not acceptable as car use would be required.</p> <p>It should also be noted that there are no healthcare facilities in Clavering; the nearest doctor's surgery is 3 miles away in Newport along routes which have no pavements, whilst the dental surgeries are 6 miles away in Saffron Walden along similar routes. There is no public transport to these.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council draws the Inspector's attention to the fact there is no local healthcare provision in the Draft Section 106 Agreement.</p> <p>It may be considered that as UDC's Saved Local Plan is out of date, this application must be considered under the NPPF and so the tilt of the balance of harm will be employed. If this is so, it has been demonstrated above that the build fails all three strains of sustainability – so should not be permitted – even before the evidence of it causing harm to the countryside, its agriculture and its landscape, urbanisation, natural environment.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council (CPC) believes that the provision of housing is not outweighed by the damage caused to the countryside. CPC pays heed to the opinion of the Inspector at another appeal in Clavering that 'Clavering is sustainable for certain locations' and this site is not such a location.</p> <p>Accordingly it is respectfully requested that this application should be REFUSED</p>
7	UTT/23/2682/PINS Land At Warish Hall Farm North Of Jacks Lane	TBC

	Smiths Green Lane Takeley	
8	UTT/22/1261/FUL Land To The West Of Mill Lane Hatfield Heath	TBC
9	UTT/23/0062/DFO Land East Of Parsonage Road Takeley	TBC
10	UTT/23/2555/FUL Land Behind The Old Cement Works Thaxted Road Saffron Walden	TBC
11	UTT/23/0990/FUL 7 Shire Hill Saffron Walden	TBC
12	UTT/23/2119/FUL Land Between 39 And 41 Cromwell Road	Paragraph 14.6.2 of the officer's report should be replaced as follows: Nearby residents, including a wheelchair user, have raised concerns for the loss of the existing footways that cross through the application site. However, the development would retain the existing hard surfaced footway to the west of the application site, which exceeds 2m in width. This would allow all users to be able to access the shops and services provided across the road without

	Saffron Walden	<p>exceptions. Some residents have also raised concerns over the safety of this footway due to its darker condition from the use of fencing for the proposed private gardens. However, it would not be the applicant's responsibility to provide lighting features for the public realm and the landscaping condition can ensure that the necessary fencing would not be overly high. The development would comply with policy SW12 of the Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
		<p>The following comments have been received by third parties in addition to the ones references in paragraph 11.3.1 of the officer's report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Brick construction to match surrounding properties would be necessary. ○ Access restrictions – loading and turning areas. ○ Restrictions on bin collections. ○ Compromise in pedestrian safety. ○ Creation of dark footways for pedestrians due to tall fences. ○ Streetlight blocked by the proposed houses. ○ Smaller driveways. ○ Houses closer to the road. ○ Built form should not be any further back than the adjoining properties' first floors. ○ First floor rear Juliets should be replaced by small, obscure-glazed windows. ○ Side windows should be preferred as neighbouring properties have no side windows. ○ Green space maintained at public expense by the council. ○ Municipal space. ○ Used by many, including children. ○ Safety and security fears. ○ Additional parking pressures in the area. ○ More difficult and painful for disabled individuals to use the footways. ○ Concerns over first-floor balconies. ○ Impact on gardens due to the loss of light. ○ Cover for break-ins. ○ Much needed green space – lack of green spaces in the area. ○ Property opposite with cladding does not fit in with the rest of the area. ○ Drainage concerns. ○ Busy road. ○ Revised do not resolve all objections previously raised. ○ Revised internal layouts slightly better. ○ Revised plans show one property stepped further back from neighbouring gardens.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The length of the first floor rear elements in the revisions goes back double the distance to all neighbouring properties. ○ Concerns over the need for these properties to be stepped at the back. ○ Revisions do not remove full-length double doors and double window. ○ Rear elevation should include bathrooms with frosted glass. ○ Revisions should include 2-bed houses or the third bedroom at ground floor. ○ ECC Highways need to put no parking signage/road markings. ○ Committee should visit the site. ○ Original objections before the revisions still stand.

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.