

Late List –Planning Committee 16/10/2024

**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.

	Application reference number	
--	------------------------------	--

Item Number	UTT REF ADDRESS	Comment
6	UTT/24/1958/PINS Land Adj. To Village Hall, East Of Cambridge Road Ugley	<p><b><u>ECC Ecology- Revised Comments received</u></b>  Objection removed – subject to conditions  The proposal will now include a schedule within the S106 to prevent the removal of the trees from the residential gardens.</p> <p><b><u>ECC Highways</u></b>  The Highway Authority have advised a new hourly bus service operating along Pound Lane, connecting the site to Stansted village and Bishops Stortford in one direction and Stansted Airport in the other. The service is also planned to operate at a 2 hourly frequency in the late evenings and on Sundays.</p> <p><b><u>Woodland Trust</u></b>  Objection</p> <p>We are concerned that two Pedunculate Oak trees we consider likely veteran specimens will be subject to deterioration as a result of the proposals.</p> <p>Where trees are likely to be affected by a planning application, an arboricultural impact assessment or appraisal is essential to determine the impact of the proposal on any trees.</p> <p>This is particularly important in the case of ancient and veteran trees, which would be subject to deterioration where new development is proposed in their vicinity. The applicant has submitted very limited arboricultural information, so it is not possible to fully determine the status of these trees or assess the impact of the proposals.</p> <p><b><u>UDC Landscape Officer</u></b></p> <p>Recommendations of conditions- prior to the commencement of the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed tree survey and root protection scheme,</li> <li>• Submission of existing and proposed ground levels,</li> <li>• Full soft and hard landscaping scheme.</li> </ul>

		<p><b><u>UDC Planning Officer Comments</u></b></p> <p>The following applications which are locate nearby the application site have been approved and were considered a sustainable location, these include:</p> <p><b>UTT/23/0913/FUL-1 no. dwelling, Cambridge Road, Ugley Approved</b></p> <p>There are opportunities to use sustainable transport to access services in the nearby vicinity, by bicycle and by bus is largely seen to accord with the social dimension of the NPPF on sustainable development, and with policy GEN1 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005</p> <p><b>UTT/22/1694/PIP- 1 no. dwelling, The Cottage, Snakes Lane, Ugley Allowed at appeal</b></p> <p>Overall, the occupants of the proposed house would be reliant on private cars to an extent, but other options are available reasonably near to the site that would encourage movement by means other than driving a car.</p> <p>Due to the nearby location of these sites in relation to the current application, these decision should be a material planning consideration. As such due to the transport public transport connections to the site the development would encourage movement by means other than driving a car.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given that the site is previously developed land, as defined by the NPPF and weight should be applied to this.</p> <p>In terms of the tilted balance, these points should be taken into consideration to whether any adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.</p>
7	UTT/24/1383/FUL King Edward Vi Almshouses Abbey Lane	<p>In the 1st page of the officer's report, the reference number should have been UTT/24/1383/FUL. The reference UTT/23/0976/FUL refers to the previous application that was withdrawn.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.5.6 in the officer's report, Flat 9: There is no Juliet balcony; this reference should be replaced with the word 'window'.</p>

	Saffron Walden	<p>Paragraph 14.4.18 in the officer’s report should have its last sentence omitted “A condition to withdraw permitted development rights would be necessary to preserve the significance of the heritage assets and the character and appearance of the area, including the retention of appropriate fenestration openings, the avoidance of any additional bulk and massing on the roof with dormers, and the avoidance of any outbuildings”.</p> <p>This is because the permitted development rights in Classes A, B, E, F of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 solely refer to dwellings and do not apply to flats, any changes to which would require planning permission.</p> <p>For the same reason, the 1st sentence in paragraph 14.5.6 in the officer’s report should be rephrased as:  <i>“A condition to withdraw permitted development rights would <b>not</b> be necessary to safeguard the residential amenity of existing and future occupiers <b>as any changes to the approved fenestration/openings and any additional built form would require planning permission. A condition to withdraw the permitted development right under Class A of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the Order would be necessary to ensure that no fences, walls or other means of enclosure would be permitted without a planning assessment of how that would affect the significance of the heritage assets and the local character”.</b></i></p> <p>For the same reasons, condition 24 should be rephrased as:  <i>“Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development within <del>Classes A, B, E, F of Part 1 of Schedule 2 and</del> Class A of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the Order shall take place without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.</i></p> <p>REASON: To <del>prevent the site becoming overdeveloped, to</del> preserve the character and appearance of the area, to preserve the significance of designated heritage assets, and to safeguard residential amenities in the area, in accordance with the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan Policies GEN2, ENV1, ENV2, policy SW3 of the Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023)”.  In paragraph 14.4.13 of the officer’s report, the reference should have been to paragraph 209 of the NPPF, not 203.</p>
--	----------------	---

8	<p>UTT/24/0124/FUL  Land To The Rear  Of The Fighting  Cocks  Mutlow Hill  Wendens Ambo  Saffron Walden</p>	<p><u>Fighting Cocks, Mutlow Hill (ref. UTT/24/0124/FUL): Addendum List updates</u></p> <p>1. At paragraph 1.4.4.4 the extracted comments from Place Services (Conservation Officer) have been underlined in error.</p> <p>2. At paragraph 14.4.17 should read 'For these reasons, it is considered the proposed layout fails to make a positive contribution to the immediate locality and the rural countryside setting. Furthermore, Officers take the view that the site will lead to overdevelopment and urbanisation of the site, given that other applications have been submitted to the front of the site (with some developments already approved). Therefore, the totality of all developments combined will harm the intrinsic character of the countryside and harm to the designated heritage asset. Additional development resulting from the current development would intensify and overdevelop the site'.</p> <p>3. At paragraph 16.4, the first sentence should read 'In light of the above, the Planning Balance of paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the NPPF (2023) tilts against development, as the benefits include:...'</p> <p>4. An additional paragraph 16.7 should be added to state that 'The application is hereby recommended for refusal as, Officers are of the view, the adverse impacts outweigh the benefits of the proposal'.</p>
9	<p>UTT/23/3208/FUL  Formerly Known As  The Canada Shed  Parsonage Lane  Stansted</p>	<p>In paragraph 16.5 in the officer's report, the phrase should be 'limited' weight.</p>
10	<p>UTT/24/1855/FUL  Land West Of Bury  Farm  Station Road  Felsted</p>	<p>None</p>

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.