

Late List –Planning Committee 21 August 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	UTT/24/1732/PINS Land to the West of Thaxted Road, Saffron Walden	<p><u>Saffron Walden Town Council</u></p> <p>For context to this response, SWTC responded to the initial detailed application UTT/23/2962/DFO (which was refused by Uttlesford District Council in July 2024) and copies of the SWTC responses are attached (appendices one and two). SWTC also spoke at the Uttlesford District Council Planning Committee Hearing, a copy of the points raised is attached (appendix three).</p> <p>At its 8 August 2024 meeting, the SWTC Planning and Transport Committee resolved to object to this application due to the below grounds, these being similar to those raised under application UTT/23/2962/DFO.</p> <p>Reasons for objection:</p> <p>a. The affordable housing layout is not distributed in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Plan (SWNP) policy SW2 ii. Uttlesford Design Code 2024 policies U1.8c, U1.9c and U1.10c, requiring affordable housing to be well distributed throughout developments. iii. Regulation 19 Uttlesford Local Plan Core Policy 56 requiring affordable housing to be distributed throughout developments. <p>b. The Public Open Space provision is of poor quality in contrary to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Uttlesford Local Plan 2005 policy (ULP) GEN6 ii. SWNP policy SW17 and paragraph 11.3.8. iii. Uttlesford Design Code 2024 P1.1c and N.1.9c requiring sensory play areas for people of all ages integrated within the open space network, with a clear management strategy (N1.11c). iv. Regulation 19 Uttlesford Local Plan Core Policy 67 requiring new public open spaces to provide high quality provisions, the current proposals do not include a play area. <p>c. The proposed sustainable transport connections are of poor value, not demonstrating support for active travel, the proposals breach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. ULP GEN1(c) ii. SWNP SW12, SW3 and paragraphs 96 and 108.
---	--	--

		<p>iii. Uttlesford Design Code 2024, policies M2.2c, M2.6c, M2.7c, M2.8c iv. Regulation 19 Uttlesford Local Plan Core Policy 26 requires sustainable transport measures be prioritised in new developments</p> <p>d. Insufficient noise mitigations in relation to the neighbouring skate park. The proposal conflicts with:</p> <p>i. SWNP SW3(5a) ii. ULP ENV2, GEN2</p> <p>The Environmental Health Officers comments (dated 24 May 2024 Appendix 2) correctly cite the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 193 which states new development should integrate effectively with existing community facilities...facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established.</p> <p>SWTC as the owner of the skate park raises these concerns to ensure the future use of the skate park is protected and unaffected. The development, as the agent of change, must provide suitable mitigations. The hedgerow between the development site and the skate park (identified to the left) is managed by SWTC. The hedge is maintained to a suitable height to ensure the sunlight reaches the skatepark bowl, allowing the bowl to dry during inclement weather. Growing the hedgerow higher as a noise mitigation measure would not be suitable because it would be at the detriment of the skatepark maintenance routine.</p>
--	--	---



This is because green algae spreads by attaching and clinging itself to hard surfaces, and it will begin to grow on cement or concrete when the surface stays constantly damp. Although algae itself does not damage the structural stability of the cement or concrete, it can still cause problems.

Algae growth on concrete is primarily caused by environmental factors such as moisture, shade, and organic debris. When outdoor concrete surfaces are exposed to damp conditions with limited sunlight, algae find the perfect breeding ground. The presence of fallen leaves, dirt, or other organic matter can further promote algae growth by providing nutrients for their development. It's important to note that algae thrive in humid environments and can quickly spread across concrete surfaces if left untreated. Algae not only create unsightly green or black stains on concrete but also pose potential safety hazards due to the slippery surface they create when wet. These slimy patches can make walking on the affected areas dangerous, especially after rain or irrigation. Moreover, algae growth can lead to discoloration and deterioration of the concrete over time if not addressed promptly. For these reasons growing the hedgerow as a noise mitigation would not be a suitable noise mitigation measure.

Saffron Walden Town Council Response to S62A/2024/0051 3

Whilst writing it must be noted SWTC has submitted a formal Public Right of Way application to Essex Legal Services, the proposed route of which goes across the application site (see map of proposed route on page 5). The applicant was formally notified of this on 8 December 2023 and Essex Legal Services confirmed receipt of the application in January 2024.

UDC Urban Design Officer

This application for 168 homes and associated landscaping is substantially unchanged from an application I have commented on previously (UTT/23/2962/DFO comments dated 13.12.23), therefore my comments remain and are repeated here again, having regard to the applicant's rebuttal to these comments (16.02.24) and in light of the newly adopted SPD, the Uttlesford Design Code.

Generally, the proposals for this site do not deliver sufficiently high-quality design for a gateway site such as this, sitting as it does on the south-eastern edge of Saffron Walden on one of the main roads into the town, Thaxted Road. The proposals also do not sufficiently promote connectivity beyond the site to local amenities, such as the open space to the north-west, the locally known 'green mile', or future linkages to the proposed sites adjacent within the emerging local plan, nor to existing adjacent development.

Regarding the Uttlesford Design Code, there are numerous areas where the proposals do not meet the requirements of the Code or do not provide sufficient information to demonstrate compliance. These are identified below.

Context, Character & Identity

The scheme lacks a clearly identifiable character or identity, having no focal point or destination. The public realm is predominantly streets, there are pockets of landscaped space, the two parcels to the west, but they do not relate particularly well to the housing or have a clear function. The large area of landscaped space labelled 'infiltration basin', has the potential to be a successful space if well landscaped but does not relate particularly to the housing either.

The excessive use of character areas – there are 6 proposed in the applicant's Design Code – does not reflect any meaningful sense of character, identity or place. The grain and typology of built form,

		<p>architectural style and landscaping within the 6 character areas is not sufficiently different to create truly different character areas with a sense of place.</p> <p>Uttlesford Design Code Does not comply: B1.4C, B1.5C, B2.6C, B2.7C, N1.5C, N1.6C, P1.1C, P1.3C, P3.5C, H2.3C Insufficient information supplied to demonstrate compliance: C1.1C, C1.2C, ID1.1C, ID1.4C, ID2.5C, B1.1C, B1.2C, N1.7C, N1.8C, N1.9C, N1.10C, N1.11C, P1.4C, P1.12C</p> <p>Streets, Legibility & Wayfinding Overall, the primary street layout is excessively curvilinear with extensive reliance on private drives and cul-de-sacs and there are no clear opportunities to extend streets to connect with future or existing development. The layout of the street and the wide radii and carriageway width signify a car-prioritised road. Whilst the applicant maintains that the consented framework plan sets out this route, this does not change my view in respect of its design.</p> <p>The entire site is served by a Type E Access Road, which is reasonable, and these should be designed to a 20mph limit. The wide radii and overly circuitous route do not support this aim. Additionally, no details are provided of street furniture provision or specification.</p> <p>The supplied drawing ‘Location of focal point buildings’ indicates three building types placed in six locations to aid wayfinding. The large apartment block, according to the Applicant’s Design Code, should be a ‘Statement’ building and a ‘Corner’ or ‘Focal’ building. The other ‘Focal’ buildings are standard house types clad in white weatherboarding.</p> <p>None of these buildings are significantly focal to act as wayfinding architectural features. In addition, some of the focal buildings present largely blank gables and timber fences as a vista terminal (e.g. Plot 57). This does not comply with the applicant’s Design Code as a carefully located and considered design. Other corners have splayed plots with garden fences and walls (Plot 37, 50) which do not adequately address the street and create un-overlooked pockets of ambiguous ownership.</p> <p>There is an over-reliance on on-street parking and minimal street trees, for example, 36 on-street car parking spaces between Plots 37 and 50 with 3 street trees. Small pockets of landscaping help to mitigate, but this still creates a heavily car dominated street scene.</p> <p>Uttlesford Design Code</p>
--	--	--

Does not comply: M1.2C, M1.4C, M1.5C, M1.11C, M1.12C, M3.6C, P1.5C, P2.5C, P3.1C
Insufficient information supplied to demonstrate compliance: M2.4C, P1.2C

Walking & Cycling

The site is gently sloping, rising approximately 20m from Thaxted Road to the southern-most tip and there are two primary routes for walking and cycling. One enters from Thaxted Road through the middle of the site and the other enters to the eastern edge of the site. The routes form a loose figure of eight primarily following the site perimeter, onto open countryside to the east and the public open space to the north-west. The eastern loop is referred to as the Orbital Greenway and is a shared route for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.

Both the pedestrian/cycle way and the Orbital Greenway lack passive surveillance for the most part, with the majority of houses adjacent to these routes presenting largely blank flank gables offering very limited passive surveillance and no animation or street activity (for example, Plot 62, 70, 77, 78 89, 90 and 106). Where windows have been included into gables, these are predominantly to non-habitable rooms such as stairs and bathrooms. Small windows to living rooms have been included to some house types, but these still do not create meaningful passive surveillance of these walking and cycling routes.

Where active frontages are addressing the cycle/footway, they are set behind the roadway. Similarly, the central cycle/footway has back garden fences addressing it (plots 12-16, 33 and 48, 17, 32 and 56) albeit with a strip of soft landscaping between fence and footway. It is not clear from the submitted information whether either route is proposed to be lit after dark, which coupled with the lack of passive surveillance raises concerns over the safety, or perceived feeling of safety, of these routes and therefore their likely usefulness as active travel routes.

There is a walking-only route (as indicated on the walking and cycling network plan) that follows the primary road, which, as stated previously, is unnecessarily curvilinear and circuitous, measuring approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ kilometre from the furthest dwelling to Thaxted Road. This route does not seem conducive to regular use. In addition, pedestrians using this as a walking route will need to cross the road three times along its length as there is not a consistent provision of footway on either side of the road. This does not support an active travel priority approach. The applicant has stated that this route is unlikely to be used as a primary walking route, given its protracted layout.

		<p>The pedestrian route exits the site by the pedestrian crossing on Thaxted Road, near to the One Minet Skatepark and opposite Cardamon Road. The central walking / cycle route exits by the junction opposite Tiptofts Lane (north). This section of Thaxted Road has three lanes, with a segregated right-turning lane and no cycle lane, so does not seem a good location for cycle traffic to merge.</p> <p>Uttlesford Design Code Does not comply: M2.1C, M2.12C Insufficient information supplied to demonstrate compliance: M2.3C, M2.9C, M2.10C, M2.11C</p> <p>Cycle, Waste & Recycling Storage The majority of cycle storage is located in garden sheds with the remainder in garages. Neither location is suitably convenient to promote and encourage modal shift in travel behaviours. It is not clear from the supplied information where refuse and recycling are stored prior to collection day. The Applicant's Design Code states that waste and recycling storage space will be located in the garden where possible. In many cases, for example plots 57-62, 73-77, 107-144 etc., there does not appear sufficient room to manoeuvre either a bicycle or a wheelie bin from the garden to the street if on-plot parking bays are occupied. Other plots have convoluted routes requiring long walking distances to waste collection points through narrow fenced passageways, for example plots 17, 18, 32, 20-21, 45-48.</p> <p>Uttlesford Design Code Does not comply: M3.12C Insufficient information supplied to demonstrate compliance: H4.2C</p> <p>Wider Connections There are three pedestrian points of access to the open space to the west of the site. Two of these are accessed from the pedestrian/cycle path and one is accessed via a footpath from the end of a cul-de-sac. The Orbital Greenway, as stated in the Applicant's Design Code, "is a strategic link proposed by Uttlesford Council and Essex County Council, forming a route around the edge of Saffron Walden for walkers, cyclists and horse riders". There is one egress point for this route beyond the site boundary at the southern edge. The Orbital Greenway links to Thaxted Road opposite Tiptofts Lane (south). There is currently no footpath on the west side of Thaxted Road and whilst a footpath is indicated within the drawings this would be outside of the application boundary, so clarity should be sought on how this will</p>
--	--	--

be delivered and any mitigations required for the loss of the existing hedgeline. There is insufficient detail in the submitted information to ascertain how this will be achieved. The pedestrian and cycle routes and the Orbital Greenway would benefit from more tangible connections so that they could provide more strategic routes through the site to the wider area, in support of the strategic linkages within the emerging Local Plan. The primary street pattern and secondary cul-de-sac streets also show no potential for future connections beyond the site. Whilst not a material consideration yet, the emerging Local Plan included this site within the Saffron Walden site allocation framework and promotes strategic connections across and beyond the framework masterplan. In its current form, the proposals do not offer any obvious connections beyond the site boundary to link into future development.

Uttlesford Design Code

Does not comply: M1.9C

UDC- Principal Conservation Officer

The assessment at Outline Application stage determined that the proposed development would not have an impact on the Saffron Walden Conservation Area or the nearby Grade II listed Barn at Herberts Farm.

The Outline Application included a design code with references to local buildings and stated that the proposed development would include the use of high quality and traditional materials. However, this application provides minimal information to suggest a scheme of high quality.

The information provided on proposed materials does not suggest a palette of high quality or traditionally made materials. The proposed materials resemble traditional materials, however, appear to be mass-produced products that are not tailored to the characteristics of nearby Saffron Walden, and as referenced in the Outline Design Code. Additionally, information about the materiality of windows, doors and rainwater goods has not been provided.

The quality of space is not illustrated within this application. A drawing for each building type has been provided however there are no street scenes to translate the formal information, and to show the quality and scale of space as seen from within the development. I would have expected the sketch scenes submitted at Outline stage to be developed and reissued as part of this application

		<p><u>Conclusion</u> I do not consider the proposals to result in harm to the significance of the heritage assets in proximity of the site.</p> <p>If the application is to be approved, I suggest Conditions associated with the following are attached to any consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ full materials palette, including a detailed schedule for each character area.▪ walkthrough visualisations and/or street scenes with proposed materials accurately applied, to illustrate the quality of each character area. <p><u>ECC Place Services Ecology Consultant</u></p> <p>No objections subject to being in accordance with the conditions imposed on the outline planning permission.</p> <p><u>UDC Environmental Health Officer</u></p> <p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>The updated noise assessment uses The Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH) guidance document 'Clay Target Shooting: Guidance on the Control of Noise' (2003) to assess noise from the Skatepark inline with recommendations from Environmental Health. An unattended noise survey was carried out between 21st June to 24th June 2024.</p> <p>The report determines the SNL to be 51 dBA. The Clay Pigeon guidance states that "Annoyance is less likely to occur at a mean shooting noise level (mean SNL) below 55 dB(A), and highly likely to occur at a mean shooting noise level (mean SNL) above 65dB(A). The likelihood of annoyance at levels within</p>
--	--	--

		<p>this range will depend upon local circumstances...” Therefore, as 51 dB is below the threshold set out in the guidance and therefore indicates that there should be a low impact on future residents.</p> <p>Overall, the additional survey does address some points raised in my previous comments. However, I would like to raise the following concerns:</p> <p>I appreciate the longer measurement period, but as I said in my original response the information is still vague. Due to the fact the measurement is completely unattended there is still no data on how many users were in attendance of the park, general age of the users (the older the children are the more likely they are to engage in tricks etc) and there is no information about typical uses and the intensity of use of the skatepark at Saffron Walden.</p> <p>The report states that the park is mainly used by school aged children so would be quiet during school hours which I agree with. However, the assessment was carried out on a weekend in June. I believe it would’ve been more appropriate to carry out the assessment during the school summer holidays to obtain a more robust assessment.</p> <p>To gain a better understanding of the noise environment at the Skatepark, I visited on the 2nd August 2024 from 14:00 – 18:00, it was a sunny day with warm weather. Throughout the visit the park was busy and in use by children of a range of ages. I listened from different points in the park, particularly close to the boundary of the development site. The majority of the users on the day I attended were Scooter users and used the bowls to engage in tricks. The noise environment includes a rolling sound from the scooters in the bowls, impact of the scooters landing, talking between the users, and it was particularly noisy when the users ‘failed’ a trick.</p> <p>Due to the fact the survey was unattended, there is insufficient information to determine whether use across the measurement weekend was representative of ‘typical use’.</p> <p>Due to the uncertainty in the assessment, we are unable to change our decision. I would recommend that further assessment is completed. Further assessment should include an attended measurement is carried out, ensuring to include evening use as well as daytime use. I would also recommend the acoustician discusses the best time to take measurements with the former secretary/ or another member of the Skatepark to better understand busiest times, typical use etc.</p>

7	UTT/23/2006/FUL Foxtons Yard Stortford Road Great Dunmow	<p>Further Representation Received from Agents on behalf of Tescos</p> <p>We act on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited in respect of the above application and made previous representations on 29th January 2024. We have now reviewed the Officer's Report to Wednesday's Planning Committee and as a result, need to make further representations arising from its content.</p> <p>Our objections relate to the following important considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal is contrary to the Development Plan's Development Limits Policy; - Inappropriate approach to the Decision Making process; and - Lack of condition necessary to restrict the permission to 'limited assortment discount retailing' and maximum sales areas <p><u>The proposal is contrary to the Development Plan's Development Limits Policy</u></p> <p>Policy 0S1 :TOA is a core strategic policy of the Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan and indeed is the first policy to appear in the Plan.</p> <p>It contains the following objectives for the identified Town Development Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Directing future housing growth in line with allocations set out in this Plan;</i> - <i>Protecting the rural setting of Great Dunmow; and</i> - <i>Containing the spread of the town by promoting infill within existing built-up areas.</i> <p>As evident in Figure 16 of the Plan, the application site would clearly lie outside of the Town Development Area. Therefore, the application site is treated as countryside. The proposed development would unequivocally be contrary to this Policy, through its very nature of proposing development outside of the defined Town Development Area i.e. within the countryside.</p>
---	---	--

		<p>Similarly, the site is also located outside the settlement development limits on the Uttlesford Local Plan proposals map (2005). Policy S7 (The Countryside) of the Local Plan advises that <i>"In the countryside, which will be protected for its own sake, planning permission will only be given for development that needs to take place there, or is appropriate to a rural area."</i></p> <p>The Officer's report, at paragraph 14.4.4, acknowledges that the site lies outside the settlement development limit of Great Dunmow as per Policy S7 of the Local Plan and Policy DS1 of the Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan. However, the Officer does not adequately analyse this as being contrary to the development plan.</p> <p>The proposed development is not compliant with the development plan, indeed there is no demonstration in accordance with Policy S7 that the development needs to take place in the countryside. The previous fencing supplies land use represents an appropriate rural area development, but this does not represent an appropriate precedent for the proposal as it is a completely different offering to a large foodstore.</p> <p>The Officer's report does not consider this non-compliance with key policies as part of the planning balance taken at paragraphs 16.1-16.6 and thus the statutory duty under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004¹ has not been undertaken.</p> <p><u>Inappropriate approach to the Decision-Making process</u></p> <p>The Officer's Report fails to correctly undertake the statutory decision-making exercise required under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (see footnote 1). To satisfactorily discharge this statutory duty, the Council must determine whether or not the proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole, and only then can it consider whether any other material considerations would indicate that determination should be made otherwise.</p> <p>To blur these two distinct stages of the decision-making approach is to fail to comply with the duty imposed by Section 38(6). While the Officer's Report does acknowledge the existence of this duty at paragraph 12.1, the Report does not adequately discharge it.</p> <p>Whilst the Officer's Report, at paragraphs 16.1-16.6 lists the benefits and negative impacts of</p>
--	--	---

		<p>the scheme as material considerations, the Report does not conclude, here or anywhere else, on whether the proposed development would accord with the development plan as a whole.</p> <p>It is our view that designations are fundamental to the operation of the plan-led system and thus conflict with Policy S7, given the site's location outside the defined settlement boundary, would result in the proposed development conflicting with the development plan as a whole. As above, in such circumstances, it is then necessary to consider whether this conflict is outweighed by other material considerations.</p> <p><u>Lack of condition to restrict the permission to 'limited assortment discount retailing'</u></p> <p>The applicant's assessment of the proposal, as set out within their Planning and Retail Statement affords positive weight to the provision of a discount food retailer. However, there is no condition proposed within the Officer's Report to permit 'use only as a limited line discounter,' and explicitly limit the convenience and comparison goods sales areas to the proposed amounts (1,210sqm convenience and 302sqm comparison).</p> <p>In the absence of such a condition, the permission would not be specific to Lidl or another discount food retailer. Therefore, the stated benefits from introducing a discount retailer (particularly as set out by the applicant in Section 5 of their PRS) should be disregarded and cannot be afforded any weight in decision making and the planning balance. This is pertinent in preventing unacceptable impacts arising from the development on the vitality and viability of Great Dunmow Town Centre. Increases to floor area also have ramifications on retail impact, traffic and parking and maximum limits should be imposed to prevent future extensions at the site without obtaining further planning permission.</p> <p>For all of the above reasons, planning permission should be refused. In the event that planning permission is granted, which we do not concur with for the reasons above, a condition should be imposed to limit the retailer to a discount foodstore and impose limits on sales area.</p>
--	--	--

8	<p>UTT/24/0741/FUL Land Known As 7 Acres Warish Hall Farm Parsonage Road Takeley</p>	<p>At paragraph 9.1, a second response from Takeley Parish Council was not included that stated:</p> <p><i>The application is for units 11 and 12 but the swept path analysis is for units 3, 5, 8 and 9. The turning circle is likely to be tighter to manoeuvre in and out of units 11 and 12 and it is likely to have a different effect on the flow of pedestrians and cyclists, which is not shown. The illustrations show the path of a 12m long fixed vehicle and ECC Highways says that permitted vehicles would come in a variety of sizes including 12m fixed vehicles but also articulated lorries which can go up to 16.5m – 18.75m. Can we please see illustrative evidence to match the application?</i></p> <p>This query has been discussed with ECC Highways who have confirmed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The industrial estate is to remain private. - The applicant has indicated that the largest vehicle likely to be used as a result of their proposal is a 12m rigid vehicle. This is also supported by the actual size of the units at approximately 250sqm. - The applicant has signed the declaration included in the application form stating that they are providing truthful information to the best of their knowledge at the time of the application. - Swept path analysis drawing has been submitted demonstrating the movements of a 12m rigid truck. Although units 11 and 12 are not specifically shown, the movements can be mirrored from the swept path directly opposite. - In the unlikely scenario that an articulated lorry was to enter the site there is still the opportunity to manoeuvre and turn in our view, even if they need the help of a banksman. It is also noted that articulated lorries have better manoeuvrability than rigid trucks. - The units are situated at a distance from the public highway making it unlikely that a lorry would choose to reverse onto the highway rather than turn even if this turning required multiple manoeuvres. <p>Paragraph 10.9.1 is mistakenly leftover from a previous report and not relevant to this application, there are no urban design comments and no changes to the layout.</p> <p>At paragraph 14.3.4 it states:</p> <p>The size of the approved units would be unchanged at 1000sqm.</p>
---	---	--

		<p>This is unclear and should state the following:</p> <p>The total size of the approved units would be unchanged at 1000sqm. Each individual unit remains at 250sqm.</p> <p>Condition 20 refers to a refused DoC application – the reference should be UTT/24/0445/DOC.</p> <p>Condition 21 & 30 have now been approved so should both read as follows:</p> <p>21. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved north/south footpath details as submitted and discharged under application UTT/24/0980/DOC.</p> <p>REASON: To enable future or existing development to be linked to the pedestrian cycle network in the interests of reducing the need to travel by car and promoting sustainable development and transport, in accordance with policies DM9 & DM10 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011, Policy GEN1 of the Adopted Local Plan and the NPPF.</p> <p>30. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved north/south footpath details as submitted and discharged under application UTT/24/0980/DOC.</p> <p>REASON: To enable future or existing development to be linked to the pedestrian cycle network in the interests of reducing the need to travel by car and promoting sustainable development and transport, in accordance with policies DM9 & DM10 of the Development Management Policies as adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011, Policy GEN1 of the Adopted Local Plan and the NPPF.</p> <p>Conditions 31 and 32 should be removed. It was not noticed that the ecology comments uploaded to the system were for a different site, and so these conditions are not relevant.</p>
9	UTT/24/0814/FUL Brick Kiln Farm St Edmunds Lane Dunmow	<p>At paragraph 11.4.1 it reads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The required statutory consultations have been made.</i> • <i>The material consideration will be considered in the following report.</i> • <i>Some of the</i>

		<p>Please disregard the 3rd line that states: “• <i>Some of the</i>”</p> <p>At paragraph 17.1 it reads: “The original planning permission was updated by the approved section 73 planning application (Ref. UTT/23/1853/FUL) which was granted 11 January 2024. This produced a new decision notice and planning conditions which this proposal is based on. The conditions on this decision notice are still in effect unless they have been discharged. In granting permission under this new section 73 the local planning authority may also impose new conditions – provided the conditions do not materially alter the development. For the purpose of clarity, decision notices for the grant of planning permission under section 73 should set out all of the conditions imposed on the new permission, and restate the conditions imposed on earlier permissions that continue to have effect.”</p> <p>This should read: “<i>The outline planning permission was granted under (Ref. UTT/13/0847/OP) which was granted on the 11th July 2013 and the subsequent details following outline permissions was granted under (Ref. UTT/14/0265/DFO) which was granted on the 5th June 2014. The conditions on these decision notices are still in effect unless they have been discharged. In granting permission under this new section 73 the local planning authority may also impose new conditions – provided the conditions do not materially alter the development. For the purpose of clarity, decision notices for the grant of planning permission under section 73 should set out all of the conditions imposed on the new permission, and restate the conditions imposed on earlier permissions that continue to have effect.</i>”</p>
10	UTT/24/0898/OP Land To The North Of Mayes Place Monk Street Thaxted	NONE
11	UTT/24/0834/FUL Land At The Stackyard High Street Little Chesterford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • At paragraph 14.12.13 it reads:

		<p><i>'ECC Archaeology have not commented on this application, however, archaeology conditions were added to the previous outline application and, again, it would be prudent to add such conditions given the archaeological sensitivities to the north of the site.'</i></p> <p>This should read:</p> <p><i>'ECC Archaeology have not commented on this application, however, archaeology conditions were added to the previous outline application and later discharged under application ref. UTT/23/2445/DOC.</i></p> <p><i>Despite, the archaeological sensitivities to the north of the site, the associated works have been previously approved and discharged. The Archaeological Evaluation Report supplied confirms limited historical findings from investigations. Thus, archaeological conditions will no longer be required.'</i></p> <p>In light of the above, conditions 10, 11, and 12 will be removed in the event the application is approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A further condition will be required to ensure the compliance with ECC Ecology consultee comments. <p>Prior to the works above slab level, a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for protected and Priority species, prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This is to include the enhancement measures contained in the Ecological Survey and Assessment (Samsara Ecology, project no. 362, version 1, March 2024) and should contain the provision of integral bat boxes and the planting of native hedgerows. The content of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy shall include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures;b) detailed designs or product descriptions to achieve stated objectives;c) locations, orientations, and heights of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans;d) timetable for implementation;e) persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures;f) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).
--	--	--

		<p>The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.</p> <p>Reason: To conserve and enhance protected and priority species and habitats and allow the local planning authority to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (as amended) and in accordance with the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan Policies GEN7, ENV8, and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition 4 to be replaced with the following condition: <p><i>‘Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, details of all hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the dwellings hereby approved, and shall be maintained as such in perpetuity.</i></p> <p><i>The landscaping details to be submitted shall include:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) proposed finished levels (earthworks to be carried out);</i> <i>b) means of enclosure of the land (boundary treatments);</i> <i>c) hard surfacing and other hard landscape features and materials;</i> <i>d) existing and protected via Tree Preservation Order(s) trees, hedges or other soft features to be retained;</i> <i>e) planting plans for the woodland planting, including specifications of species, sizes, planting centres, number and percentage mix;</i> <i>f) details of planting or features to be provided to enhance the value of the development for biodiversity and wildlife;</i> <i>g) details of siting and timing of all construction activities to avoid harm to all nature conservation features;</i> <i>h) management and maintenance details.</i> <p><i>All planting, seeding or turfing and soil preparation comprised in the above details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings, the completion of the development, or in agreed phases whichever is the sooner, and any plants which</i></p>
--	--	---

	<p><i>within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation. All landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the guidance contained in British Standards, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.</i></p> <p><i>REASON: To protect the character and openness of the countryside location, to protect trees and hedges to be retained (including TPO trees) and avoid unnecessary damage to their rooting systems, as well as to ensure no loss of amenity for the neighbouring occupiers and the occupants of the dwelling hereby approved, in accordance with the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan Policies S7, GEN2, GEN4, the Essex Design Guide, and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).'</i></p> <p>Little Chesterford Parish Council (LCPC hadn't originally forwarded comments to Planning)</p> <p>Little Chesterford Parish Council would like to object to the intensification of development of this site over that granted by the outline planning permission. Whilst we support the provision of a wider housing mix, particularly the provision of smaller units, the increased impact on the local environment outweighs these benefits.</p> <p>It should be noted that this site is within the countryside, being outside development limits, and the "titled balance" does not apply since there is an up-to-date Neighbourhood plan with housing allocation. The site is on the edge of the small village of Little Chesterford, whose only village amenities are the village hall and Church. It was assessed for residential development for 5 units at the request of the landowner by the Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan (2023). Examination through the Housing Land Assessment and Housing Site Selection processes lead to the site NOT being selected for development. Additionally, this proposal does not meet the criteria for residential development which now form part of the development plan under the neighbourhood plan policy GLNCP 9 – Housing.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate the developer's design efforts, the massing and scale of the proposed development, including its associated outbuildings, is larger than that shown in the indicative plans for which outline permission was granted. This will have an adverse effect on the important views from the PROW as you leave the village heading north, contrary to Neighbourhood Plan Policy GLNCP 4(b). The sections currently submitted by the developer in this direction - Section C-C – do not show the southern part of the development, and so don't show the full massing of the buildings as they would impact the important view 38 "View along river valley and to chalk uplands from the green adjacent to Manor Cottages Little Chesterford, which is described as "The</p>
--	--

	<p>view north-eastwards to the distant chalk uplands is framed by the oak tree on the green adjacent to Manor cottages”. This view will be blocked by the development, the surrounding outbuildings and garden walls. The existing sections also show mature trees softening the landscape that do not currently exist and will not do so for decades after planting.</p> <p>The green in front of Manor cottages is defined as a Local Green Space in the Great and Little Chesterford Neighbourhood Plan (LGS15) and is described in the designation as “an important open green area that transitions from the built village environment to the cultivated fields that run along the Cam river valley, and opens up the views to the surrounding chalk uplands”. The nature of this green space would be changed by the current proposal to include suburban planting in addition to surface parking area for Manor cottages contrary to the Policy GLNCP/7 – Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Despite our previous comments, the ecological surveys and reports have made no mention of the owl species known to inhabit the site. There is extensive local documentation of the breeding Little Owls that have nested on the site for many years, but they are not mentioned, nor the Barn Owls that hunt there, nor the otters have been filmed in the internationally rare chalk stream just 50 metres away from the site, the River Cam. This calls the quality of the ecological reports into question. There seems to have been no consideration of the decaying agricultural paraphernalia currently on site as an important habitat, whilst it is well known that these conditions often provide varied habitats for wildlife. The net biodiversity calculations do not seem consistent with the destruction of existing habitats both man-made and natural (trees/bushes to be removed). Specific investigations and mitigations should be put in place for the well-known existing and established fauna over and above the generic requirements.</p> <p>Little Chesterford village has no streetlights, and the large numbers of external lights specified in the development will increase light pollution – harming the habitat of nocturnal animals such as otters as well as spoiling residents’ enjoyment of darker skies.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the intensification of the vehicular use of the access which forms the well-used footpath to and from Great Chesterford, and the safety of pedestrians using it. A larger number of dwellings in this unsustainable rural location will inevitably lead to increased use. The narrow section of the track between Orchard House and Saxon Lodge is constrained with no opportunity for improvement.</p> <p>There is currently a well-used riverside path adjacent to the site which is mentioned in the document as a “Possible permissive path”, but no further information has been given, and creation of this path may not be in</p>
--	--

		<p>the control of the proposer. Should the proposal be approved, we would like to see a condition to create and maintain this path be included.</p> <p>Cumulatively, all these harms are significant and extensive, and outweigh the benefits of a small number of smaller housing units located in the countryside.</p>
12	<p>UTT/24/1188/HHF The Fuchsias Old Mead Lane Henham</p>	<p>At paragraph 14.3.5 it reads: <i>“It must also be noted, that if the applicant would be able to get a building of a similar size and scale if the existing ground levels had not been reduced by utilizing the dwellings Permitted Development Rights.”</i></p> <p>This should read: <i>“It must be noted, that the applicant would be able to get a building of a similar size and scale if the existing ground levels had not been reduced by utilizing the dwellings Permitted Development Rights.”</i></p>
13	<p>UTT/24/1516/FUL Chesterford Park Little Chesterford</p>	NONE
14	<p>UTT/24/1194/LB Walden Place Freshwell Street Saffron Walden</p>	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.