

**ADDENDUM LIST –Planning Committee 7<sup>TH</sup> February 2024**

**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	<b>UTT/23/3112/PINS</b> Land North of Knight Park, Thaxted Road, Saffron Walden	NONE
7	<b>UTT/23/3113/PINS</b>  <b>Land West Of The Cricketers, Clatterbury Lane, Clavering</b>	<p><b>UDC Principal Conservation Officer</b></p> <p>The proposal was submitted in Outline with full details reserved for future approval hence it is noted that design details are not required as part of this application. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) suggests that two distinct Character Areas have been designed, however the ‘distinctiveness’ is not clear on the illustrative masterplan. A development of this scale could produce a significant negative effect on the character and appearance of its countryside setting. Therefore, any new development requires exceptional architectural detailing to justify if on balance, the benefit outweighs the harm.</p> <p>The study to show the proposed outline massing in context is beneficial. The information provided suggests the development will be largely screened behind vegetation. However, it is not possible to comment further without architectural massing studies in context, and rendered visualisations as seen from a variety of viewpoints from the public highways, and local properties</p> <p>The proposed development will inevitably affect the openness of the rural site. Further information about design quality is required to review if on balance, a development in this location can be justified.</p>
		<b>Essex County Council- Archaeology:</b> No objections
		<b>UDC Urban Design Officer:</b> The proposal is, in general terms, compatible with the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, massing, and form. However, with regards to layout, the proposal is an introverted, cul-de-sac type arrangement,

	<p>which is not the prevalent layout typology of Clavering, which, on the whole, has a more linear structure.</p> <p>As this is an outline application, there is currently insufficient information available at this stage to ascertain the proposals in respect of strategies to minimise water and energy consumption or waste reduction or recycling.</p> <p>The proposals are for a cul-de-sac type development accessed from a single point of entry and egress. As such, this form of development and its inherent layout are contrary to the linear, ribbon type development that has historically formed the village of Clavering. Furthermore, development of this scale with the limited outward connections and sustainable travel options will, in all likelihood, be overly reliant on cars for the majority of journeys. This coupled with the introverted nature of the layout risks creating a dormitory development that does not fully integrate with its neighbourhood.</p>
	<p><b>Parish Council</b></p> <p>Clavering Parish Council <b>OBJECTS</b> to the planning application as it is <b>CONTRARY</b> to the National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>It FAILS all three tests of sustainability – economic, environmental and social. Is contrary to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 11 Sustainable development</li> <li>Para 20d Conserving and enhancing the natural environment</li> <li>Para 40 Community Engagement</li> <li>Para 114a Access to Sustainable Transport</li> <li>Para 114b Safe and suitable access to the Site</li> <li>Para 116a b c &amp; d Pedestrian and vehicle conflicts</li> <li>Para 124b Undeveloped Land</li> <li>Para 128c Maintaining an area's prevailing setting</li> <li>Para 135c Sympathetic builds</li> <li>Para 180b Build contributing to and enhancing the natural and local environment</li> <li>Para 191c Introduction of artificial light</li> </ul> <p>It must be remembered at all times that the existing development of Eldridge Close, opposite this development, was a brownfield site having been originally agricultural chicken sheds. These sheds</p>

		<p>were then converted to small seed-bed light industrial units, and as the sheds fell into disrepair the site came forward as a brownfield site. The then tenant businesses were re-located to updated premises on other farms/modern light industrial estates.</p> <p>This planning application is for a site which is in open countryside and which has been used for grazing for many centuries. Clavering Parish Council now demonstrates the reasons for the application failing and being contrary.</p> <p>There has been no Public Community Consultation with the Village of Clavering for this proposal comprising up to 28 dwellings, either by survey, public exhibition, or leaflet drop. Neither the applicant nor any agent has attended a monthly Clavering parish council meeting to bring forward any details of a planning application which has been seen previously for other developments proposed in Clavering.</p> <p>In November, the applicant emailed the Parish Council requesting a meeting and was advised of the protocol for a pre-application meeting. However, the applicant's S62A planning application was made 4th December 2023, as evidenced in their documentation, and so precluded any pre-Application consultation as they then attempted to instigate the protocol on 10th January 2024 via Uttlesford District Council.</p> <p>As mentioned, Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Clavering is a village without 'connectivity' in respect of sustainable transport. There are no daily bus services all year round as the Parish Council has to state repeatedly when often presented with Applicants' Transport Statements claiming otherwise. This is confirmed and evidenced by an Essex County Council (ECC) Transport submission dated 15th December 2023 for another S62A submission (S62A/2023/0025) for a site off Eldridge Close in the same area of the village as this application. ECC's submission states there is no public transport and also clearly states given the location of the site (...) the only practical option will be the car. This should be taken into consideration by the Inspector when assessing the overall sustainability and acceptability of the site.</p> <p>For Clavering, the only bus services are the two school bus services in term-time alone which run one return journey to Saffron Walden and the same to Bishops Stortford – outward in the morning and</p>
--	--	--

		<p>inward in the afternoon. There is NO connectivity for these school services with the rail stations at Newport nor Audley End. Further, these buses are designated for school children use only. It should be noted that the recent Essex Passenger Transport Review for Uttlesford does not introduce any new public daily bus service to Clavering.</p> <p>Though Essex County Council designates the position of safe bus-stops on the highway, a desk-top exercise clearly 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.</p> <p>Whilst it may be possible to cycle to the rail stations and local market towns, there are no safe cycle paths, and these are not easy either, given the topography of the surrounding countryside and its narrow winding roads with no central road-marking or designated, separated cycle paths.</p> <p>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>This is contrary to Paragraph 114a which indicates that there should be a promotion of access to sustainable transport.</p> <p>The UDC Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation of last December details the Uttlesford Settlement Services and Facilities Study as an evidence base for its ongoing consideration of its Settlement Hierarchy and which is still under review.</p> <p>Though Clavering scores highly for having a school, village hall, two places of worship, pub, a 'destination restaurant with rooms', and even seven postboxes, the score for transport which contained 9 separate elements to be totalled was zero.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council considers that the proposed accesses for vehicles and pedestrians are dangerous.</p> <p>The pedestrian access is sited on an extremely tight entry into the Stickling Green Road on a bend. Drivers travelling around this blind bend position their vehicles tightly to the current trees and hedging verge so as to avoid a possible collision with car exiting the same road.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>A pedestrian will be blind to cars coming along Clatterbury Lane (aka Arkesden Rd) from the direction of the B1038.</p> <p>The proposed vehicle access is indicated to be moved from its current field entrance to a position closer to the blind bend on the Stickling Green Road.</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. The expectation is that, on a probability of which is the least dangerous, any pedestrian will use the vehicular access and this brings about a conflict of pedestrians and vehicles.</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>It is also considered that any removal of the roadside boundary hedge and trees present in order to improve sight lines will cause harm regarding existing biodiversity.</p> <p>It is surprising that the hairstreak butterfly, which surveys have previously indicated to be present at this site given the Elm habitat, is not mentioned in the surveys of the current wildlife and the wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Further, the repositioned vehicle access planned for this narrow country lane is opposite the light industrial estate.</p> <p>One unit, being in a rural location, deals with farm vehicles including tractors. Low loaders as well as articulated trucks, which are unable to manoeuvre onto the site due to the narrow road, park on Stickling Green Road in order to off-load their goods using forklifts, &amp; etc. where the development's new vehicle access is proposed.</p> <p>This places the proposed development's new vehicle access in conflict with the existing traffic using the road. Also, though Stickling Green is a country lane, it serves two large farms and is also a route to access neighbouring villages.</p> <p>The proposed development site is recognised as sitting in the Langley Chalk Uplands Landscape Character Assessment, which is acknowledged to have a high sensitivity to change.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>This field to be developed has been under pasture for many years and Paragraph 124b of the NPPF acknowledges that undeveloped land can perform many functions, including supporting wildlife and for carbon storage.</p> <p>28 dwellings placed at this site will detract from the nature and existing character of the countryside of the Village of Clavering and will not recognise its intrinsic beauty and character.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The site is close to the Conservation Area of Clavering; it is visible from the B1038 and also from the heritage asset, the Cricketers PH, when trees are not in leaf and adjoins Hill Green Farmhouse, a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Any form of street lighting on the site to improve pedestrian safety would obviously have a negative impact on the wildlife of Clavering – which is obviously a very rural and does not have street lights.</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 true, positive biodiversity. .</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 &amp; Coronation 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 &amp; 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>A previous Planning Inspector considered this site for a development of 31 dwellings and dismissed the Appeal. See APP/C1570/A/12/2184181, UTT/0507/12/OP (UDC then had a 4.1 YHLS)</p> <p>There has been no change to the provision of the limited range and distribution of facilities in Clavering nor their location since this dismissed Appeal.</p> <p>The pedestrian route to the facilities has already been deemed unsafe. At the narrow section referenced in the appeal decision, the footpath/pavement is barely the width of a child’s pushchair and is actually inaccessible for mobility scooter.</p> <p><i>The main road through the village, the B1038, also narrows at this point; the road has no central markings as it is so narrow and is also on a bend. Frequently, agricultural vehicles and other large vehicles pass each other by mounting the narrow pavement. It is for this reason that the children are bussed to Clavering Primary School from Eldridge Close (the brownfield site) as the route is not safe to walk.</i></p> <p><i>The Inspector of the dismissed Appeal stated: ‘Most of the facilities are at the other, southern end of the village. 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.</i></p>
--	--	---



		<p><i>The footpath is, however, narrow in places, and 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 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.'</i></p> <p>It should be noted that there were limited public bus services at the time of this Appeal but these were withdrawn by ECC some years ago.</p> <p>There have been no alterations to the road nor pavement since this 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>At the date of its meeting 31st January, Clavering Parish Council had not seen any Section 106 agreement detailed for education, health &amp; etc.</p> <p>It has been demonstrated that the proposed 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>With the exception of the now non-existent daily public bus service, Paragraph 15 of the Appeal Decision APP/C1570/A/12/2184181 still remains valid for this proposed developed.</p> <p>Clavering Parish Council (CPC) believes that the provision of housing at this site is not outweighed by the damage caused to the countryside.</p> <p>CPC pays heed to the opinion of an Inspector who indicated 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 <b>REFUSED</b></p>

		<p><b>Planning History</b></p> <p>It is noted the planning history submitted to the Planning Inspectorate included details of planning application UTT/22/2917/OP, I confirm that application is not relevant to this current application site or proposed development. As such this will be confirmed to the Planning Inspector within the Council's written submission.</p>
		<p><b>Committee Report- Amendment</b></p> <p><b>Existing Paragraph 14.18.1</b>  The development site is located outside development limits. The Council's October 2023 published land supply figure is 5.14 years, however cannot demonstrate the necessary 20% buffer (paragraph 77 of the NPPF). In line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF - paragraph 11 (d) (ii). In this case the tilted balance is engaged.</p> <p><b>Revised Paragraph 14.18.1</b>  The 5-Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS) figure has been updated twice recently. In October 2023, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) published a 5YHLS figure of 5.14 years with the necessary 5% buffer. However following paragraph 79(c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), a 20% buffer must be added to the LPA's housing requirement because of the updated HDT. This means that the current 5YHLS is 4.50 years (instead of 5.14 years). In line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF - paragraph 11 (d) (ii). In this case the tilted balance is engaged.</p>
8	UTT/22/3126/FUL	<p>Two attachments to the Takeley Parish Council consultation response were not uploaded to the website. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DEFRA guidance on Common land and town or village greens</li> <li>- A plan showing the extent of the Smiths Green Village Green (VG117) that covers the verges along the protected lane.</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer comments:</b>  This has already been considered. The village green status of the verges is not reason to withhold planning permission. Should permission be granted, it would be for the applicant to secure rights over this land. If they were unsuccessful in their request, any permission would need to be revised.</p>

9	<b>UTT/23/1470/OP Stansted Distribution Centre, Start Hill, Great Hallingbury</b>	<p>Additional information received from agent re condition :</p> <p>There is a restriction attached to the Audi Garage permission which restricts the number of people working there to 35, however it is not only the Audi Garage situated within our proposed Plot B which is included within the PSZ. Within the area of our proposed Plot B located within the PSZ, both the Audi Garage and existing Units 2A and 2B (as shown on PL002 attached) are included. Units 2A and 2B would have 28 people working there by our calculations (see Section 4: PSZ on Page 7 of the DAS pdf), and therefore within that Plot B area located in the PSZ there are currently the potential for 63 people working in the PSZ already not 35. We're proposing 60 people which is therefore a reduction on existing.</p> <p>In the other zones, we're working off similar numbers to what you have suggested – 25 in Plot C (including existing building at Unit 1A) and 30 at Plot D. We suggest setting Plot C at 25 due to its size and allowing a slight reduction to take account of additional people which may be within the roads/footpaths outside of the plots but still within the PSZ.</p> <p>The key is limiting to maximum 120 people and we agree to this figure. However, we think it's reasonable to split as set out below and allow slight flexibility by including the word "approximately" as long as the 120 people limit is met. Therefore, our suggested wording is:</p> <p>The maximum number of people living, working or congregating within and outside the public protection zones of the site edged in red, (excluding the area to the west which was previously the builders yard) shall not exceed 120 at any one time. Across the plots within the public protection zones (shown within Plan PL004), this should be split approximately as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Plot B (PSZ part) – 60 people</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Plot C and Existing Building 1A – 25 people</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Plot D (PSZ part) – 30 people</li> </ul> <p>The estate manager shall keep a register of employees and visitors to be provided to the Local planning authority on request at any one time.</p>
		<p>MAG Group Safeguarding Technical Officer 25<sup>th</sup> January 2024</p>
		<p>we do not feel that there is a sufficient hook via the Reserved Matters process to ensure that these critical assessments against the obstacle limitation surfaces, instrument flight procedures and line of sight for aviation lighting are conducted at the right stage of the development. Therefore, can we please suggest the addition of the below condition which can be part-discharged as each phase of the development progresses:</p> <p>-No construction above ground level shall commence on site until the following assessments have been undertaken and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the aerodrome safeguarding authority for Stansted Airport:</p>

		<p>-Obstacle Limitation Surfaces Assessments          -Instrument Flight Procedures Assessments          -A technical assessment of whether the development will obscure aviation lighting, where necessary, at the discretion of the Aerodrome Safeguarding Authority for Stansted Airport.          Reason: In the interests of aviation safety.          We believe that the above condition would provide sufficient assurance that the required assessments are completed at the correct time. In addition to the above please can we request that Condition 26 explicitly states that it should be discharged in consultation with the Aerodrome Safeguarding Authority for Stansted Airport; given the critical location we wouldn't want it slipping through the net</p>
		<p>Legal advice</p>
		<p>we should put in place a condition that creates a ceiling for the number of people permitted in the Public Protection Zone and we should also require the submission of a scheme to be submitted a reserved matters stage that sets out how the numbers of people within the zone should be controlled. The scheme should require details of monitoring and control of people accessing the site, record keeping of numbers of people within the site at any one time and details of entry and exit every date. The scheme should also set out measures to limit congregation within any one particular area of the site. The scheme should also mean that all of the details of the above should be able to be supplied to the Council on request for any given time period.          If the desire is to be built out in phases each phase should involve revisiting the scheme to see what is appropriate give the existing phases.          I would envisage the scheme working in a similar manner to a lorry monitoring scheme on a minerals and waste site but that is just a simple example for comparison</p>
		<p>Recommended change to condition 50 to now read:          Condition 50: Public Safety The maximum number of people living, working or congregating within the public protection zones of the site, (excluding the area to the west which was previously the builders yard) shall not exceed 120 at any one time. The estate manager shall keep a register of employees and visitors, within the site at any one time, to be provided to the Local planning authority on request at any given time period.           REASON: In the interest of public safety as the site is located in close proximity to Stansted Airport in accordance with Uttlesford District Council adopted plan (2005) Policy AIR7</p>

		<p>Recommended change to condition 26 to now read:  External Lighting:  Condition 26: Details of any external lighting to be installed on the site, including the design of the lighting unit, and any supporting structure, the polar throw and the extent of the area to be illuminated, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Aerodrome Safeguarding Authority for Stansted Airport prior to the development commencing. Only the details thereby approved shall be implemented.</p> <p>REASON: To protect the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties in accordance with Uttlesford Local Plan Policies ENV11, GEN2 and GEN4 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (adopted 2005)</p>
		<p>Recommended change to condition 42 to now read  Condition 42: No development to take place, including any ground works, until detailed assessments relating to aerodrome safeguarding have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Stansted Airport to determine the following as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to obscure aviation lighting</li> <li>• Impacts upon Obstacle Limitation Surfaces Assessment (precise heights of buildings and ground levels required)</li> <li>• Bird mitigation to ensure no birds hazardous to aviation are attracted to the site during the operational phase;</li> <li>• The prohibition of standing water</li> <li>• Glint and glare impacts upon aviation receptors</li> <li>• Detailed and quantitative wind turbulence impacts of the development upon aviation receptors where necessary</li> <li>• Impact on CNS equipment</li> </ul> <p>Instrument flight Procedures Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A technical assessment of whether the development will obscure aviation lighting, where necessary, at the discretion of the Aerodrome Safeguarding Authority for Stansted Airport.</li> </ul> <p>REASON: To ensure that development does not breach aerodrome safety. In accordance with Uttlesford Local Plan policy GEN2</p>

		Further conditions recommended:
		<p>Condition53 : Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (use classes ) (amendment)(England) Regulations 2020 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) and The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) the premises shall be solely used for class B8 use with supporting class E9 (g) and/or B2 use and no other purposes unless agreed in advance in writing by the local Planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public safety and to enable the Local Planning Authority to fully consider the effects of any development permitted by these orders</p>
		Condition 55:
		<p>Bus infrastructure: prior to occupation of the development, the provision of the following bus infrastructure entirely at the developer's expense:</p> <p>a. Improvements at eastbound stop (known as Spellbrook Motors opp.)</p> <p>i. Removal of existing pole and flag</p> <p>ii. New Essex standard shelter to be installed</p> <p>iii. Flag, timetable and clearway plate to be attached to shelter</p> <p>iv. Bus stop clearway markings on carriageway</p> <p>b. New westbound stop (name to be confirmed)</p> <p>i. New Essex standard shelter to be installed</p> <p>ii. Raised kerbs to be installed</p> <p>iii. Flag, timetable and clearway plate to be attached to shelter</p> <p>iv. Bus stop clearway markings on carriageway</p> <p>c. Real time passenger information</p> <p>i. 28" in-shelter display at eastbound stop</p> <p>ii. 28" in-shelter display at westbound stop</p> <p>Reason: in the interests of reducing the need to travel by car and promoting sustainable development and transport in accordance with policy DM9 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011</p>
		Changes to heads of terms for S106
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial contribution towards sustainable transport £25,000 (for the purposes of improving</li> </ul>

		<p>sustainable transport links to the site. The contribution may be put towards a feasibility study and/or design and/or implementation of some or all of a cycle route link between the site and Bishops Stortford; and/or improvements to the Flitch Way and/or National Cycle Route 16; and/or to improve the frequency, quality and/or geographical cover of bus routes serving the site; and/or towards cycling and walking improvements in the vicinity of the site identified in the Uttlesford Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workforce travel plan with monitoring £6,760 index linked</li> <li>• Car club contribution £43,335 or if not feasible a financial contribution towards sustainable transport</li> <li>• Cycle hire hub £69,000 or if not feasible a financial contribution towards sustainable transport</li> <li>• Travel vouchers £5,700</li> <li>• Real time passenger information display at eastbound stop £10,845.09 index linked – this is the commuted sum figure for the maintenance of the RTPi display</li> <li>• Real time passenger information display at westbound stop £10,845.09 index linked – this is the commuted sum figure for the maintenance of the RTPi display</li> <li>• New west bound shelter £8,700.23 – this is the commuted sum figure for the maintenance of the new westbound shelter</li> </ul>
10	UTT/23/0707/FUL	<p>Date: 29.01.2024  <b>UTT/23/0707FUL</b> - Erection of 9 bungalows with associated works  <b>LOCATION: Land South Of Deynes Road Debden Essex.</b>          Debden Parish Council submitted comments, previously (17th April 2023) objecting to the Application on various grounds including <b>any</b> building on the field in question and supported the objections from residents set out on the Council’s planning portal.          We have the following observations and comments:          1. NOTIFICATION of HEARING by PLANNING COMMITTEE:</p> <p><b>NO NOTICE</b> of the hearing date from UDC Planning Department was received by DPC, fortunately District Councillor Luck was sent the Planning Committee Agenda for the Planning Committee Meeting fixed for <b>10th January 2024</b>, issued on 2 January, noted the Application was due to be heard and informed DPC on <b>3rd January</b>.</p>

		<p><b>DPC feel that we were not given ample notice, especially as this information was announced over the Christmas/New year holidays. We had very little time to represent/consult/notify our community and this hearing date fell in-between DPC meetings.</b></p> <p>1. Debden Residents advised DPC that they were “<i>tracking</i>” the Application on the UDC Planning website but had not received any notification of several additional documents added to the website in mid-December.</p> <p><b>DPC feel that local residents should be kept informed, given ample notice and enough time in order to respond.</b></p> <p>1. District Councillor Luck informed DPC that there would be a Site Inspection in the morning of Monday <b>8th January</b> by some members of the Planning Committee, accompanied by the UDC Planning Case Officer and Nigel Brown, Head of Development Management &amp; Enforcement.</p> <p>1. That same afternoon, (8th Jan) DPC noted a “<b>Late List</b>” to the Planning Meeting Agenda had been posted on the documents for the Application on the Council’s Planning portal, stating the Applicant has requested that <b>an Addendum is added</b> to the committee report with the addition of further information.</p> <p>1. The Parish Clerk received an email advising that following the site visit the Application had been withdrawn from the Agenda for the Planning Committee Meeting fixed for 10th January 2024, stating “<i>The application will now be reported to Planning Committee on 7/2</i>”.</p> <p>1 Broctons Barn, Rook End Lane, Debden, Essex CB11 3LR. Mobile: 07915 885908 • E: <a href="mailto:clerk@debden-pc.gov.uk">clerk@debden-pc.gov.uk</a></p> <p>1. On <b>8th January</b> a letter was added to the portal from <b>ECC Place Services, Historic Buildings and Conservation Advice</b>. The letter describes the listed building, Deynes Farmhouse and its setting and stated that the “<b><i>proposed development of the site raises concerns...</i></b>” and commented that “<b><i>the proposed development of nine bungalows with associated landscaping and new access shall adversely impact the setting of heritage assets</i></b>”. It refers to urbanisation and that this would be “<b><i>contrary to Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</i></b>”.</p>
--	--	---



		<p>It conceded that with <b>“regards to the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework), the harm would be less than substantial and I suggest towards the middle of the spectrum (Paragraph 202).”</b></p> <p>The final sentence reads <b>“...consider this application to be contrary to Paragraph 206.”</b></p> <p><b>DPC notes that if the letter had been available earlier, it may have provoked even more objections to the development.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On <b>9th January</b> the Parish Clerk received an email letter from the Planning Department advising of a Planning Application <b>re-consultation</b> as the <b>Application had been amended</b>, and comments on those amendments could be made. The amended and additional documents were available to view on the portal on that day.</li>   <li>1. On <b>11th January</b> the <b>Planning &amp; Capacity Team of Anglian Water Services Limited</b> emailed UDC to state it only comments on planning applications for major proposals of 10 dwellings or more, but stated <b>“However, if there are specific drainage issues you would like us to respond to, please contact us outlining the details.”</b></li> </ol> <p><b>It does not mention connections to the existing drainage, only that the Applicant “should check for any Anglian Water assets which cross or are within close proximity to the site.”</b></p> <p><b>DPC would like to ask UDC Planners to request a response from Anglian Water as to the efficacy of proposed pumping system of the new dwellings to the existing sewers and the capacity, not only of the sewers in Deynes Road but to the effect it would have in Rook End Lane and its vicinity.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On <b>19 January</b>: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <b>Essex County Council Development and Flood Risk Environment and Climate Action</b> responded to the amended Application and stated that having reviewed it, it wished to issue a <b>holding objection</b> to the granting of planning permission on several grounds, and an advisory comment stated, <b>“Please note that where</b>  1 Broctons Barn, Rook End Lane, Debden, Essex CB11 3LR. Mobile: 07915 885908 • E: clerk@debden-pc.gov.uk</li>   <li>i <b>required.”</b></li> <li>ii <b>ECC Place Services, Historic Buildings and Conservation Advice</b> issued a letter referring to the Applicant’s Heritage Response to its previous advice and states that the Heritage Response goes</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
--	--	---

		<p>on to undertake a balancing exercise, but such an exercise is not within the remit of ECC Place Services, it is for UDC consider representations regarding the planning balance (i.e. how that harm might be weighed).</p> <p><b><i>“Our conclusions remain that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building, contrary to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, through change in its setting.” and</i></b>  <b><i>“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset Paragraph 205 states that ‘great weight should be given to the assets conservation’. This is irrespective of the level of harm, in line with statutory duty.”</i></b>  <b>DPC are in agreement with both responses and are lodging these further comments of objection to the amended Application - UTT/23/0707FUL, in light of all of the above.</b></p>
		<p>The applicant has requested that an Addendum is added to the committee report with the addition of the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The applicant has requested that an Addendum outlines the tilted balance status with regards to the housing delivery test, in accordance with the new NPPF updates (December, 2023)</li> <li>- The applicant has requested that the Council’s need for bungalows in the area is highlighted in the Addendum as this has not been mentioned in the officer’s report. The Council’s report here -</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/media/1454/Housing-Strategy-2021-2026/pdf/Housing_Strategy_2021-2026A.pdf?m=637743891541030000">https://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/media/1454/Housing-Strategy-2021-2026/pdf/Housing_Strategy_2021-2026A.pdf?m=637743891541030000</a> states that there is a shortage of bungalows within the district for both market purchase and affordable rent.</p>
11	<b>UTT/23/2494/FUL</b>	<p>The Landscape Officer comments have now been provided:</p> <p><i>I concur with the comments of Place Services Historic Environment Team that “The design of the proposed storage unit which includes solar panels to the roof slope, which will be visible in some views from the Conservation Area, is industrial in character and of poor quality, and likewise the toilet block is also of a low design quality. Paragraph 206 of the NPPF requires that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. In my opinion, improvements could be made to the design of the storage unit and toilet block to better meet the requirements of paragraph 206.”</i></p>

		<i>The proposed storage building would impact on the inherent openness of the site, and its juxta position with the existing pavilion is considered a visually awkward arrangement compounded by necessary changes in existing ground levels.</i>
12	<b>UTT/23/2538/FUL</b>	NONE
13	<b>UTT/23/1950/FUL</b>	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 summarised

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